

Student Perception of Professors with Accents

by
Margarett Waller

A thesis presented to the Honors College of Middle Tennessee State University in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation from the University Honors
College

Spring 2021

Thesis Committee:

Karen Davis, Thesis Director

Kathryn Blankenship, Second Reader

Ennio Piano, Thesis Committee Chair

Student Perception of Professors with Accents

by Margaret Waller

APPROVED:

Karen Davis, Thesis Director
Ph. D., CCC-SLP, Behavior and Health Sciences

Ennio Piano, Thesis Committee Chair
Ph.D, Economics and Finance

ABSTRACT

Though research has been conducted that assess various factors relating to students' perception of professors with accents, few address the impact personal and educational factors, if students' confidence and outcomes are affected as a result of taking a course taught by non-native professors, and what strategies students use and find helpful when they experience difficulty understanding instruction due to accent. This study aimed to investigate the above variables by distributing surveys to students taking courses taught by non-native professors. Results indicated that gender, race, speaking more than one language, having exposure to non-native languages, and being interested in the subject were associated with a more favorable perception of the non-native professor. No significant relationship was found between age, region, major, class, attendance, punctuality, class set up, student outcomes, student confidence, previous non-native professor experience, or previous language learning attempts. Limitations regarding recruitment and survey materials are discussed as well as recommendations for future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Methodology	6
Analysis and Results	11
Discussion	19
References.....	25
Appendices.....	28
Appendix A.....	29
Appendix B	31
Appendix C	33
Appendix D.....	38
Appendix E	48
Appendix F.....	49
Appendix G	52
Appendix H.....	70
Appendix I	87

List of Terms

Comprehensibility- how easy it is for the listener to understand what is being said.

Intelligibility- how well an individual's speech is understood.

Accent- a distinct difference in the pronunciation of a language that is influenced by a previously acquired language.

Standard American English (SAE)- customarily refers to a variety of English language that is generally used in professional communication in the United States and taught in American Schools (Kretzschmar & Myer, 2012).

Non-native accent- a nonnative accent can be defined as speech that systematically diverges from native speech due to interference from phonological and acoustic-phonetic characteristics of talker's native language (Atagi & Bent, 2017).

Student outcomes- the student's grade in each course. Positive outcomes are seen as a letter grade of A or B, and negative outcomes are seen as a grade of C, D, or F.

Introduction

In recent years, there has been a sharp increase in the number of instructors from foreign countries in the U.S., especially in higher education (Kueppers, 2017). While universities typically celebrate their diversity, it is worth noting that issues concerning linguistic and cultural barriers have arisen as a result of this sudden increase in international educators. Several studies have been conducted in order to assess what, if any, differences exist in the classrooms of international professors, how they impact the success of their students, and how students perceive their professors with non-native accents.

Accent, as defined in this study, is a distinct difference in the pronunciation of a language that is influenced by a previously acquired language. Based upon one's accent, assumptions about their social class, ethnicity, personality, competence, and intelligence can be made about the speaker by the listener (Acker, 2012; Ahn & Moore., 2011; Carlson & McHenry, 2006). These assumptions made by the listener tend to be less favorable, especially if they are white and make up the majority of the demographic (Acker, 2012; Ahn & Moore, 2011). This is further supported by a study done by Timming (2016) to determine how non-native accents impact an individual's employability. The results showed that speakers from countries with higher perceived wealth and status, England and America, were rated higher than countries with a lower perceived wealth and status, India, China, and Mexico. Carlson and McHenry (2006) also explored the impact of non-native accents on employability and found that racial

stereotypes of specific dialects and accents influenced listeners' perceptions of non-native accents and employability.

However, foreign born faculty are being employed at increasing rates in higher education. According to Martinez (2016), U.S. four-year institutions are depending upon foreign born faculty to diversify campuses due to the low number of native Black and Hispanic/Latino faculty. International professors constitute more than half of those faculty in the minority category, yet they face challenges on the U.S. campuses (Omiteru et al. 2018). Previous research has found that professors with accents are judged more harshly than professors who speak Standard American English (SAE) (Alberts, 2008; Bresnahan et al. 2002). Professors with strong accents in a study done by Acker (2012) were shown to be rated more poorly than professors with no accent. Students may also have a negative expectation for an accented professor if they had an accented professor in the past that was difficult to understand (Bresnahan et al., 2002). One study discussed by Alberts (2008) showed that “older students, international students and students with higher grade point averages generally found foreign-born instructors to be as effective in teaching as native-born instructors” (p.190). One reason for these negative attitudes could be some students expressing prejudice or stereotypes they may hold since students were more likely to report an accent from professors whose ethnicity was different from their own (Alberts, 2008). Another reason could be the increased cognitive load that is required to understand accented speech may frustrate the student and cause them to have a negative perception of the professor (Alberts, 2008).

Not every student, however, has a negative view of professors with accents. In certain classes, accent may make the student more favorable to the professor. For example, in language classes it is viewed positively for them to be a native speaker of the target language. (Arboleda & Castro, 2012; Ballard & Winke, 2017). Many students also report that having a professor with an accent required them to pay more attention in class, which helped further motivate them to learn (Alberts, 2008; Kavas & Kavas, 2008). Studies have also found that people tend to react more favorably to accents they are familiar with and become more accustomed to accents over a relatively short amount of time (Ahn & Moore, 2011; Ballard & Winke, 2017; Carlson & McHenry, 2006).

Students themselves have mixed feelings on how they perceive their professors with accents. Another important aspect to look at is if and how these professors impact the success of their students. Many studies have been done on this topic, but there has yet to be an agreed upon answer. Kavas and Kavas (2008) found in their research that some studies found having a foreign accented professor negatively impacted student success, some had a positive impact, and some had no impact at all. Alberts (2008) also found that while some studies showed that foreign accented professors negatively impact student outcomes, others found that the issue lies not with the professor, but the American students that are either unaccustomed or unwilling to adjust to a nonnative speaker. According to Acker (2012), the perceptions of the students themselves about their professors may be what is having an impact on their learning and performance in the class.

Other barriers that may be impacting students and professors' relationships causing in the classrooms are language and cultural gaps. According to Kavas and Kavas (2008), language gaps can come from students getting upset because of the amount of effort they have to put into understanding their professors. Cultural issues can arise from the difference that may exist between typical student-teacher relationships in America as opposed to in the instructor's culture, as well as differences in teaching style (Kavas & Kavas, 2008). The language gap, especially accent, is what most students complain or worry about (Alberts, 2008).

As seen, in the studies listed above, accent plays a major role in how individuals are perceived and treated by others. People tend to make judgements about a variety of attributes which may be negative depending on factors such as the listener's ethnicity, listener's familiarity with the accent, and how they perceive the individual's country of origin (Acker, 2012; Ahn & Moore, 2011; Carlson & McHenry, 2006; Timming, 2016). As demonstrated in the study by Carlson et al. (2006), stereotypes about certain ethnic groups can have an impact on those with strong accents. People's negative perceptions about an individual's accent may also be a reflection of stereotypes they hold (Alberts, 2008). When looking at foreign accented professors and how their students perceive them, student attitudes tend to be mixed, as are the results as to whether foreign accented professors have an impact on their student's success (Alberts, 2008; Kavas & Kavas, 2008). This research aims to add to the current literature by analyzing what factors affect student's perception of professors with accents and their outcomes in the context of a rural university.

Significance of Study

This study seeks to provide a clearer understanding of undergraduate students' perceptions of their international professors and perception of themselves in a course instructed by an international professor at Middle Tennessee State University. This study seeks to add to the body of research addressing the experiences of students and international faculty at institutions of learning across the United States.

Research Questions

This research aims to answer the following questions:

1. What factors influence students', attending a rural public institution, perception of professors with non-native accents?
2. How does the strength of the professor's non-native accent correlate to their students', attending a rural public institution, confidence in succeeding in the course?
3. How does the strength of professor's non-native accent correlate to students', attending a rural public institution, outcomes in the course?
4. What strategies do students utilize to succeed in the course taught by a professor with a non-native accent?

For the first research question, it was hypothesized that students who are younger, white, have not attempted to learn a second language, attend class less frequently, and/or are not interested in the class would be more likely to have a negative perception of their non-native professors. Conversely, older students, students from other racial groups, those who attend class regularly and on time, those who have attempted to or are fluent in another language, and/or those who are interested in the class would have a more positive perception of their professors with

accents. Regarding the second research question, it was hypothesized that the lower a professor's accent is rated, the lower overall confidence students would have in their success. For the third research question, it was hypothesized that students who give a lower accent rating would be more likely to have lower outcomes in the course. Lastly, it was hypothesized that utilization of office hours would be the highest rated strategy students used to succeed in their courses taught by non-native professors.

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to examine the factors that influence students' perception of their non-native professors, how the strength of the professors' accent correlates to students' confidence of success in the course as well as their outcomes, and what strategies students use to succeed in courses taught by non-native professors. This chapter presents the research methods and procedures to accomplish this goal. This chapter consist of five sections: research design, participants, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis.

Research Design

The research design of this study was a cross-sectional survey. A cross-sectional survey collects information from a sample that has been selected from a predetermined population at a single point in time (Fraenkel et al., 2012). The cross-sectional survey is regarded as an appropriate method to describe the prevalence of behavior among a sample population and any associations of outcomes (Wang & Cheng, 2020). The researcher collected demographic information from the participants as well as other

personal factors that may impact the students' performance in class. For the questions regarding which demographic features and personal factors impact students' perception of professors with accents, it was gathered through surveys given to students. In order to assess the strength of the professors' accents, speech samples were taken and rated by a panel of student assessors.

Participants

A total of three professors and 134 undergraduate students participated in this investigation. The professors are employed at a large public 4-year university located in Middle Tennessee. In this section the participants will be described in more detail.

International Professors

The international professors ($N = 2$) were two full-time employees at Middle Tennessee State University. In describing the participants, International Professor 1 and International Professor 2 will be used as Pseudonyms. Professor 1 is a Hispanic male faculty member in the College of Business whose primary language is Spanish. Professor 2 is White male faculty member in the College of Basic and Applied Sciences. Professor 2 is from Britain and presents with an accent but speaks and is proficient in the English language. They provided a short speech sample, as seen in Appendix B, that was recorded for later analysis, answered a brief questionnaire, and sent surveys to their students at specified dates.

Native English-Speaking Professors

The Native English-Speaking Professor ($N = 1$) was a full-time employee at Middle Tennessee State University. The professor's primary language is English and

is proficient in Standard American English. This Hispanic female faculty member in the College of Behavior and Health Sciences, was born in the U.S.

Undergraduate Students

The student participants ($N = 134$) were undergraduate students enrolled in courses taught by professors participating in the study at Middle Tennessee State University. The participants identified English as their primary language. Of the 134 students who completed the survey, 42.5% ($N = 57$) were male and 57.5% ($N = 77$) were female. The racial makeup of the participants consisted of 60.4% ($N = 81$) White students, 18.7% ($N = 25$) Black students, and 20.9% ($N = 28$) students belonging to other racial groups. 30.6% ($N = 41$) were between the ages of 18-20, 55.2% ($N = 74$) were between the ages of 21-25, 4.5% ($N = 6$) were between the ages of 26-30, and 9.7% ($N = 13$) were 31 or older. Regarding classification, 11.2% ($N = 15$) were Sophomores, 38.8% ($N = 52$) were Juniors, 49.3% ($N = 66$) were Seniors.

Instrumentation

The selected instruments in this study were utilized from previously validated and published surveys and scales. The purpose of this research was to obtain description of participants' abilities and perceptions and to identify any correlations of these perceptions to student outcomes. The independent variables in this study are international professor's accents and the dependent variables would be student's perceptions and academic outcomes. The following instruments are described.

Intensity Rating Scale

To determine the intensity of the professor's accent a speech sample was collected. The "Rainbow Passage" which contains every sound produced in the English

language, was read by all participating professors. The strength of an individual's accent is often determined by the listener's perception (Hahner et al., 2002). Based on current research (Crannell, 2010; McKinney, 2019), there are limited ways to measure accent intensity quantitatively. For this research, the strength of an individual's accent was assessed by a panel of five monolingual English-speaking students rating intelligibility, comprehensibility, and intensity of accent on a Likert scale. The five students rated the recordings separately with the primary investigator present. Their ratings were then averaged together. By having third party individuals listen to the sample and rate it, the goal was to represent what the average perception of students would be and to avoid bias.

Professor Questionnaire

A 14-item questionnaire (Appendix C) was used to collect demographic data such as the professors' country of origin, primary language, years of residency in English-speaking countries, as well as strategies they recommend their students utilize if they have trouble understanding them because of their accent. The questionnaire consisted of multiple-choice questions, Likert scales, and open-ended questions. The questionnaire was developed utilizing Qualtrics and the link was distributed via the recruitment email. The questionnaire took participants less than 10 minutes to complete. The data collected from the questionnaire was used to add support for the interpretation of their speech samples by providing information about their experience with English language and their own native languages. Their suggested strategies were utilized in the subsequent student surveys.

Student Survey

The first survey sent to students consisted of 20 questions survey, was given to collect demographic information such as race, gender, age, and region where they grew up as well as educational factors like their class attendance, punctuality, major, previous classes taken taught by non-native professors, and language learning experience. The Qualtrics survey consisted of multiple-choice questions and Likert scales. The link was distributed to students via their professors and took students less than 15 minutes to complete. The second and third surveys (Appendix D) consisted of 26 survey questions. These surveys were identical to the first with the addition of three questions asking about their current grade, what grade they expected to receive in the course, and if they benefited from their professors' instruction.

Due to time constraints, only the results from the third survey were utilized in this study. The data collected from the questionnaires was used to determine the students' perceptions of their non-native professors and what factors lead to those perceptions. Students' perception of their professor's teaching capability was determined by averaging the students' ratings in the following six categories: intelligence, informed, trained, expertise, competence, and brightness. Using Cronbach's Alpha, it was determined that the reliability of this measure was 0.96. Accent was determined by the average of the students' ratings in intelligibility, comprehensibility, and strength of accent. Using Cronbach's Alpha, it was determined that the reliability of this measure was 0.82.

Procedures

There were several steps in this investigation. In this section, the following will be described: 1.) recruitment of professors 2.) distribution of professor questionnaire 3.) distribution of student surveys 4.) rating of accent intensity.

The professors were recruited during the Fall 2020 semester recruited via mass email sent to MTSU faculty, as seen in Appendix A. After professors took the Instructor survey (Appendix C), the professors then contacted the primary investigator and scheduled an appointment to record speech samples via Zoom.

The primary investigator sent the student survey links on October 2nd, October 29th, and November 23rd and professors distributed the link to their students through D2L or email. After obtaining consent, students completed a brief questionnaire administered by their professors at three points throughout the semester.

To rate professor's accent intensity, the panel of five students were individually brought into a room with the primary investigator and listened to the speech samples. The students were be given rating scales, as seen in Appendix G, to score each of the speech samples on intelligibility, comprehensibility, and intensity of accent. The five scores were averaged together, resulting in a numerical representation of the professor's intensity of accent.

Analysis and Results

The survey data were analyzed using the IBM SPSS Statistics computer program. Within SPSS, independent samples t-tests were utilized to analyze the relationship gender, motivation, language status (Monolingual vs. Bi- or Multi-Lingual),

childhood language exposure, previous language learning attempts, and previous non-native professor experience had on students' perception of their professor's accent and teaching capability. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances was used to analyze the assumptions for these measures. One-way ANOVA tests were conducted to find the differences between groups for students' race, age, region they predominantly grew up in, academic major, class, attendance, punctuality, class set up, current grade, and expected grade and their perceptions of the professor's accent and teaching capability. Frequency tables were utilized to determine which recommended strategies students thought were most effective and would utilize themselves.

Personal Factors Impacting Perception of Non-Native Accents

To determine whether differences existed in students' perception of their non-native professor's teaching capability and accent based on gender, language status, language learning, and language exposure, independent samples t-tests were run. One-way ANOVA analyses were run to examine whether differences existed between perception of capability and accent based on the following factors: race, age, major, class, and region.

For the Standard American English (SAE) control, it was determined that the students' gender, age, major, class, and language status was not significantly correlated to their perception of the professor's accent or professors' teaching capability. Although race was not significant factor for perceptions of accent, there was a significant difference ($p = 0.010$) in the teaching capability ratings for students in other racial groups ($M = 5.50$, $SD = 2.12$) compared to Black ($M = 6.79$, $SD = 0.25$) and White ($M = 6.87$, $SD = 0.32$) students. This shows that students in other racial groups rated the

professor lower in capability than black and white students. Region was not significant for accent but was significant for teaching capability. There was a significant difference ($p = 0.006$) between students from other countries ($M = 5.33, SD = 1.89$) and students from the Western ($M = 7.0$), North Eastern= ($M = 6.75, SD = 0.35$), and Southern ($M = 6.88, SD = 0.31$) regions of the U.S. These results indicate that students from other countries had lower perception of the SAE professors' teaching capability compared to students from the United States.

Students' exposure to other languages while they were growing up did not have a significant impact on accent perception, but it did have a significant impact ($t = 0.88, p = 0.42$) on the students' perception of teaching capability. Students who did have language exposure ($M = 6.42, SD = 1.20$) gave the professor a lower rating than students who did not have language exposure ($M = 6.85$ and $SD = 0.32$). Previous language learning attempts did not have a significant impact on students' perception of teaching capability ($t = 1.0, p = 0.368$). Students who had attempted to learn a second language ($M = 6.83, SD = 0.33$) gave higher capability ratings than students who have not attempted to learn a second language ($M = 6.53, SD = 0.64$).

For International Professor 1, it was determined that language learning, previous language exposure, age, major, class, and region did not have a significant impact on students' perception of the professor's teaching capability or accent. Though gender was not found to be significant factor for accent, it was significant for perception of teaching capability ($t = 2.15, p = 0.03$). Female students ($M = 6.61, SD = 0.64$) rated the professor higher in capability than male students ($M = 6.26, SD = 0.99$). Race was determined not to significantly impact students' perception of capability but did was

significant for accent rating ($p = 0.033$). The results supported the hypothesis that White students ($M = 5.52$, $SD = 1.06$) rated the professor lower than Black ($M = 6.10$, $SD = 1.09$) and students from other racial groups ($M = 6.07$, $SD = 0.90$).

The language status of student was significant in the rating of both capability ($t = 2.13$, $p = 0.038$) and accent ($t = 3.84$, $p = 0.00$). As hypothesized, bilingual/multilingual students ($M = 6.66$, $SD = 0.50$) rated the professor higher in capability than monolingual students ($M = 6.33$, $SD = 0.95$). The same is seen in the accent rating in which bilingual students ($M = 6.30$, $SD = 0.60$) rated the professor higher than the monolingual students ($M = 5.61$, $SD = 1.11$).

For International Professor 2, gender, language status, language exposure, language learning, race, class, age, and region did not have a significant effect on capability or accent ratings. Major was not found to be significant for capability but did have a significant effect on students' perception of accent ($p = 0.024$). Students in the same department as the professor ($M = 5.67$, $SD = 0.37$) rated the professor higher in accent than students in other majors ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.94$).

Educational Factors Impacting Perception of Non-Native Accents

To determine the correlation of students' perception of their non-native professor's teaching capability and accent on previous non-native professor experience and motivation for taking the course, independent samples t-tests were run. One-way ANOVA analysis was run between capability and accent on the following factors: attendance, punctuality, and class set up.

For the SAE group, attendance, punctuality, motivation, and previous non-native professor experience were not significant for students' perception of teaching capability or accent. Class set up, however, was found to be significant for both capability ($p = 0.001$) and accent ($p = 0.49$). Students who reported taking the course online ($M = 6.89$, $SD = 0.24$) rated the professor higher in capability than students who reported taking the class via other modes ($M = 5.67$, $SD = 1.54$). Similarly, online students ($M = 6.83$, $SD = 0.38$) rated the professor higher in accent than students in the other group ($M = 6.33$, $SD = 0.58$). Students in the General Education group rated the professor lower in both teaching capability ($M = 5.67$, $SD = 1.53$) and accent ($M = 6.33$, $SD = 0.58$) than all other groups. Between the four groups, the students who said they were interested in the subject rated the professor the highest in accent ($M = 7.00$, $SD = 0.00$) and second highest in capability ($M = 6.92$, $SD = 0.17$). Students who reported taking the course for other reasons rated the professor highest in capability ($M = 7.00$, $SD = 0.00$) and second highest in accent ($M = 6.83$, $SD = 0.24$). Students in the major/minor group also rated the professor relatively high in both capability ($M = 6.88$, $SD = 0.26$) and accent ($M = 6.82$, $SD = 0.39$). For students' motivation in taking the course, most students reported taking the course as a requirement for their major/minor, 3 reporting it was a General Education requirement, 4 claiming they were interested in the subject matter, and 2 reporting they took the course for other reasons.

For International Professor 1, attendance, punctuality, class set up, motivation, and previous non-native professor experience were not found to be significant. The majority of respondents for this professor reported that they took the course because it was a requirement for their major or minor, with only 10 students claiming they were

interested in the subject and 9 students stating they course was a General Education requirement. Although there was not a difference in students' capability ratings between major/minor students and those who were interested in the subject, there was a difference in accent ratings. Students who were interested, as predicted, rated the professor higher in accent ($M = 6.10$, $SD = 0.65$) than major/minor students ($M = 5.75$, $SD = 1.06$).

For International Professor 2, attendance, punctuality, and previous non-native professor experience were not found to be significant. While class set up was not significant for students' capability rating, it was significant for accent ($p = 0.002$). Students who took the course online ($M = 5.63$, $SD = 0.37$) rated the professor higher in accent than the student that in a different setting ($M = 4.00$). However, as stated previously, the overall small sample size and singular student in the other group be the reason for this difference. For motivation, the majority of students reported they were taking the course because it was a major/minor requirement, with 3 students reporting they were interested in the subject and 1 stating it was for a General Education requirement. There was not much difference between the three groups in their ratings of the professor's teaching capability or accent, with the exception of the General Education respondent. They rated the professor lower in accent ($M = 4.00$) than students who took the course for their major/minor ($M = 5.63$, $SD = 0.37$) and those who were interested in the subject ($M = 5.67$, $SD = 0.33$). However, due to the small sample size, this is likely not significant.

Accent Strength Compared to Confidence in Succeeding in the Course

To determine the difference between student groups' perception of their non-native professor's accent on their perceived benefit from their professor's instruction, an independent samples t-tests was run. One-way ANOVA analysis was run between accent and the students' expected final grade in the course at the time they completed the survey.

The SAE professor received an average rating of 6.84 in intelligibility, a 6.84 in comprehensibility, a 6.64 in accent strength, and an overall accent rating of 6.77 from their students. From the panel of the panel of monolingual English-speaking students gave the professor a rating of 7 in intelligibility, a 6.8 in comprehensibility, a 7 in accent strength, and an overall accent rating of 6.93. It was found that the professor's accent rating did not have a significant effect on the students' expected final grade or their perceived benefit from their instruction.

International Professor 1 received an average rating of 6.34 in intelligibility, a 6.31 in comprehensibility, a 4.64 in accent strength, and an overall accent rating of 5.76 from their students. The panel of monolingual English-speaking students gave the professor a rating of 6 in intelligibility, a 5.4 in comprehensibility, a 4.8 in accent strength, and an overall accent rating of 5.4. While the expected final grade did not correlate to students' accent rating, it did correlate to students' reported benefit from their professor's instruction ($p = 0.001$, $t = 3.41$). Students who claimed to benefit from the professor's instruction ($M = 5.86$, $SD = 0.95$) rated the professor higher in accent than students who did not feel they benefited from instruction ($M = 4.52$, $SD = 1.51$), which aligns with the original hypothesis.

International Professor 2 received an average rating of 6.82 in intelligibility, a 6.82 in comprehensibility, a 2.82 in accent strength, and an overall accent rating of 5.48 from their students. Comparatively, the panel of students gave the professor a rating of 6.4 in intelligibility, a 5.4 in comprehensibility, a 2.8 in accent strength, and an overall accent rating of 4.87. It was found that the professor's accent rating did not have a significant effect on the students' expected final grade or their perceived benefit from their instruction.

Accent Strength Compared to Academic Outcomes in the Course

One-way ANOVA analysis was run between accent and the students' current reported grade in the course at the time they completed the survey. The students' current grade was determined not to have a significant effect on the accent rating for any of the professor groups.

Strategies Used to Succeed

A frequency table was used to determine how effective students thought the recommended strategies for how to succeed in a course taught by a non-native professor, as well as how likely they were to utilize these strategies. Between all professor groups, 71.7% of students rated the use of office hours if they did not understand their professor due to their accent as extremely or very useful, and 86.6% of students said they would utilize this strategy. Meanwhile, students' ratings for the usefulness of listening to other speakers with similar accents were dispersed, with 36.6% of students finding the strategy extremely to very useful, 34.3% finding it moderately useful, and 28.3% finding it only slightly to not at all useful. Of the students

surveyed, only 16.4% said they would utilize this strategy if they had difficulty understanding their professor.

Discussion

The primary goal of this research was to discover which factors, if any, influenced students' perception of their non-native professors, the correlation of accent strength to the students' confidence in succeeding in the course, the correlation of accent strength to the students' outcomes in the course, and to identify which strategies students used to succeed in courses taught by non-native professors with accent.

What factors influence students', attending a rural public institution, perception of professors with non-native accents?

Personal Factors Impacting Perception of Non-Native Accents

Based on the results of the study, previous research findings that indicate students tend to judge international professors with accents more harshly if they are of a different ethnicity were supported (Alberts, 2008). The White students in the International Professor 1 group gave the professor more negative ratings in accent than students of other races. However, this difference was not seen in the students' ratings in the professor's capability. In the SAE group, race was found to be significant for students' ratings of the professor's teaching capability, but this was likely due to the small sample size. The assertion that older students and international students by

Alberts (2008), was not supported by the results of this study. This may be due to the majority of students in the Professor 1 group being older and from the U.S.

Based on the results of the Professor 1 group, the hypothesis that persons who speak more than one language and had been exposed to other languages as a child would have a positive impact on the students' perception of the professor were supported. This may indicate that students who are bi- or multi-lingual have a more favorable view of international professors due to being familiar with the difficulty of communicating in a non-native language. Another reason for this could be due to the professor's native language being Spanish, which is a common second language spoken in the southern region of the U.S. Because of the prevalence of Spanish speakers in the South, and the fact that the majority of grew up in the South, it is likely that students who reported being exposed to other non-native languages as children were familiar with the accent. This familiarity, as noted by Ahn and Moore (2011), Ballard and Winke (2017), and Carlson and McHenry. (2006), may contribute to students' positive perception of the professor due to their familiarity with the accent. However, since specific information concerning which languages were spoken or familiar to students was not gathered, it is not possible to verify this. Contrary to the primary investigator's hypothesis, language learning experience did not significantly impact students' perception of their non-native professors. Due to there being only one non-native English-speaking professor in this study, further research should be conducted to find the impact this factor has on student perception.

Students' academic major was found to not have an impact on their perception of neither Professor 1 nor the SAE professor but was found to be significant for accent

for Professor 2. However, the Professor 2 sample size was small and contained only one student who was not in the same college as the professor. For all groups surveyed, the vast majority of students belonged to the same college as the professor. It is possible that, if this study was repeated in more Gen Ed courses, where there is a higher likelihood of more diverse majors who may have less interest in subject, results would vary. The hypothesis that upperclassman would have a more positive view of professors with accents was also not supported by this study. This is likely due to the study being primarily made up of upperclassman, with only 15 participant reporting as Sophomores. Lastly, gender was found to be a significant factor in students' positive perception of non-native professors. To the primary investigator's knowledge, there is no previous research which asserts that identifying as female correlates to positive perception of non-native speakers. Further research should be conducted to find if this was a coincidence or if gender is truly a predictor of student perception.

Educational Factors Impacting Perception of Non-Native Accents

The previous research findings that having a negative experience with a non-native professor leads the individual to feel negatively about other non-native professors was not supported (Bresnahan et al., 2002). Having a previous non-native professor was not found to be significant in any of the groups surveyed. The hypothesis that attendance and punctuality would be significant in students' perception of non-native professors was not supported. This is likely due to classes being predominately online due to COVID-19. Therefore, it is possible that, if this study was repeated under normal circumstances, students' punctuality and attendance would have an impact on their perception of non-native professors. Although class set up was found to significant for

both the SAE professor and Professor 2, it was not significant for Professor 1. It is worth noting that there appeared to be confusion among students in all three professor groups as to which class set up category they belonged to. This may have been due to students not knowing how their course was classified due to the numerous class modality options that were created in response to COVID-19. Therefore, it is not certain if students' reported class set up was accurate. However, it appears that students were confused about how what modality their class was considered. Only 11 out of all participants reported their course was not given in an online format. Under normal conditions, it is possible that classroom set up would have an impact due to the audio conditions of the room. For all groups surveyed, students who reported they were interested in the subject matter on average gave their professors higher ratings in capability and accent, which aligns with the hypothesis.

How does the strength of the professor's non-native accent correlate to their students', attending a rural public institution, confidence in succeeding in the course?

Contrary to the hypothesis, it was found that students expected final grade in the course did not correlate to their perception of their professor in any of the groups surveyed. However, for Professor 1, it was found that students who reported benefiting from their professor's instruction also gave a positive rating in accent. While this does not necessarily indicate the students' confidence in their grade, it does show that students who have a positive perception of their professor feel they learned from them.

How does the strength of professor's non-native accent correlate to students,' attending a rural public institution, outcomes in the course?

Student outcomes were determined by the students' current grade in the course. While it would have been ideal to know the actual final grade of the students, it is unlikely there would have been as high a volume of respondents if the survey was given after the semester was over. For all groups surveyed, it was determined that their current grade did not have a significant effect on their accent rating.

What strategies do students utilize to succeed in the course taught by a professor with a non-native accent?

The results showed that the majority of students found the strategy of using a professor's office hours if they had trouble understanding their professor due to accent useful and would use the strategy themselves, which aligns with the original hypothesis. The unpopularity of the other strategy, listening to other speakers with similar accents, was likely due to the extra work it would require of the student.

Limitations

One of the major limitations of this study was the lack of international professor participants. The initial goal was to recruit 4-6 non-native English-speaking professors and 2-3 native English-speaking professors, all from a variety of different disciplines. While the participants represented different departments, there was only one non-native English-speaking participant, one non-American native English-speaker, and one SAE speaker in this study. Recruitment was likely hindered by COVID-19, as many professors had to adjust their classes to be online during this time, they likely were not as interested in participating in a semester-long study as they would be in a typical semester. Since the recruitment was difficult, the study started weeks later than was anticipated by the primary investigator. Therefore, students' initial perceptions of their

professors were not obtained in this study. Additionally, many professors submitted responses to the initial instructor survey, but did not contact the primary investigator to schedule a speech sample as indicated in the recruitment email.

Another limitation is the difference in number of respondents for each group. The majority of students were in the Professor 1 group, with 25 belonging to the SAE group and 11 in the Professor 2 group. This disparity in sample sizes made it difficult to accurately compare between groups. Lastly, due to limited responses from professors regarding the strategies they recommend for students who have trouble understanding their instruction due to accent, there were few options for students to choose from as to which strategies they thought were most effective. This means there was limited data with which to answer the research question pertaining to which strategies students used to succeed in courses taught by a professor with a non-native accent.

Future Research

Future research should consider not only the students' perception of their professor's accent, but the professor's own feelings and perceptions on the impact their accent has on their instruction. This would allow the researcher to gain the insight into the confidence the professor has in their own ability to teach in a non-native language compared to their students' perceptions. Lastly, future iterations of this study should be conducted at other institutions, especially those with larger populations and in varied regions.

REFERENCES

- Acker, G. M. (2012). The impact of accent on college students' perceptions and evaluations of professors. *Journal of Communication Media Studies*, 4(1), 63-73.
- Ahn, J. & Moore, D. (2011). The relationship between students' accent perception and accented voice instructions and its effect on students' achievement in an interactive multimedia environment. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia*, 20(4), 319-335.
- Alberts, H.C. (2008). The Challenges and opportunities of foreign-born instructors in the classroom. *Journal of Geography*, 32(2), 189-203.
doi:10.1080/03098260701731306
- Arboleda Arboleda, A., & Castro Garces, A. Y. (2012). The accented EFL teacher: Classroom implications. *PROFILE: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 14(2), 45-62.
- Atagi, E., & Bent, T. (2017). Nonnative accent discrimination with words and sentences. *Phonetica*, 74(3), 173-191.
- Ballard, L., & Winke, P. (2017). Students' Attitudes Towards English Teachers' Accents: The Interplay of Accent Familiarity, Comprehensibility, Intelligibility, Perceived Native Speaker Status, and Acceptability as a Teacher. In Isaacs T. & Trofimovich P. (Eds.), *Second Language Pronunciation Assessment: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 121-140). Bristol; Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters / Channel View Publications. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.21832/j.ctt1xp3wcc.11>

- Bresnahan, M. J., Ohashi, R., Nebashi, R., Liu, W. Y., & Shearman, S. M. (2002). Attitudinal and affective response toward accented English. *Language & Communication, 22*, 171-185.
- Carlson, H. K., & McHenry, M. A. (2006). Effect of accent and dialect on employability. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 43*, 79-83.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1920.2006.tb00008.x>
- Crannell, K. C. (2010). *Voice and articulation*. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Fraenkel, J.R., Wallen, N.E. & Hyun, H.H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th Ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Giroux, S. (2017). An Introduction to Survey Questionnaire Design. Retrieved from <http://methods.sagepub.com.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/video/an-introduction-to-survey-questionnaire-design>
- Hahner, J. C., Sokoloff, M. A., & Salisch, S. L. (2002). *Speaking clearly: improving voice and diction*. McGraw-Hill.
- Jover, J. M. N., & Ramírez, J. A. M. (2018). Academic performance, class attendance and seating location of university students in practical lectures. *Journal of Technology and Science Education, 8*(4), 337–345. doi: 10.3926/jotse.353
- Kavas, A., & Kavas, A. (2008). An Exploratory Study of Undergraduate College Students' Perceptions and Attitudes Toward Foreign Accented Faculty. *College Student Journal, 42*(3), 879–888. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-182975282/an-exploratory-study-of-undergraduate-college-students>

- Kretzschmar, W. A., & Meyer, C. F. (2012). and Charles F. *Standards of English: Codified varieties around the world*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kueppers, G. (2017). Student perceptions of L2 instructors: How foreign accent and cultural education affect student learning and perceived instructor credibility (Master's thesis, George Mason University). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1920/10833>
- McKinney, R. (2019). *Heres how to do accent modification: a manual for speech-language pathologists*. Plural Publishing.
- Omiteru, E., Martinez, J., Tsemunhu, R. & Eugene, A.F. (2018). Higher education experiences of international faculty in the U.S. deep south. *Journal of Multicultural Affairs*, 3(2), 1-18.
- Timming, A. R. (2016). The effect of foreign accent on employability: A study of the aural dimensions of aesthetic labour in customer-facing and non-customer-facing jobs. *Work, Employment and Society*, 31(3), 409-428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017016630260>
- Wang, X., & Cheng, Z. (2020). Cross-sectional studies: Strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations. *CHEST*, 158(1), 65-71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2020.03.012>

Appendices

Appendix A

Greetings,

My name is Margaret Waller and I am a student working on my Honor's Thesis for the Fall 2020 semester. I am currently looking for volunteers to participate in my study. If possible, please forward this email to your international faculty members, encourage them to take the survey below, and follow up with either myself or my thesis advisor to schedule a speech sample at the emails listed below.

Primary Investigator: Margaret Waller

PI Department & College: Behavior and Health Sciences, Middle Tennessee State University

Faculty Advisor (if PI is a student): Karen Davis, Ph.D., CCC-SLP

Protocol Title: Student Perception of Professors with Accents

Protocol ID: 20-2209 **Addendum:** A2021-183 **Approval:** 09/03/2020 **Expiration**

Date: 07/31/2021

Study Description & Purpose – My

thesis, Student Perception of Professors with Accents, will explore what factors impact student perception of non-native professors, how it impacts students' confidence in success, and what strategies are most effective in overcoming difficulties in understanding accent in the classroom. In my research, I would like to investigate the factors that influence students' perceptions of instructors with non-native accents and to see how strength of accent correlates to student's confidence in success in the course.

Target Participant Pool – The target populations for this study are international professors of a variety of different nationalities across different disciplines, native English-Speaking professors in fields corresponding to those of the participating international professors, and the students of these professors.

Risks & Discomforts – There are no known risks or discomforts for the participants.

Benefits – This study will benefit participants by providing the students with suggested strategies from international professors to use if they do not understand their professor. The professors will also benefit from having students that are better informed on how to communicate their difficulty understanding them. Based on the results, the researchers will provide recommendations to institutions and international professors on how to help students and faculty overcome difficulties caused by language barrier.

Additional Information – The participants will be requested to do the following:

- Taking a brief questionnaire

- Providing a recorded speech sample (will take no more than 10 minutes)
- Giving links to online surveys to students in your Fall 2020 courses at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester
 - o In order to maximize student participation, it is asked, but not required, that completion of the surveys is either done during class time or incentivized by credit. The survey given to students would take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete, and the links to the surveys would be sent days before it would need to be given.

Compensation – NONE

Contact Information – Margaret Waller

mkw4h@mtmail.mtsu.edu
#M01388209

Karen Davis
615-898-5425
Karen.Davis@mtsu.edu

Please enter the survey by clicking the link in the bottom of the email. You will be given a chance to read the entire informed consent to assist you make a final determination (if using a Qualtrics Survey).

If interested, complete the attached survey and contact me at the email provided to schedule a time to collect the speech sample. Links to the student surveys will be sent after the instructor survey is completed. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact my advisor, Dr. Karen Davis.

Yours Sincerely,

Margarett Waller

Qualtrics link for Survey – Instructor Survey:

https://mtsu.ca1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6S5ZcPFoc4blg3r

Appendix 5-A. continued

Reading Passage

Rainbow Passage

When the sunlight strikes raindrops in the air they act like a prism and form a rainbow. The rainbow is a division of white light into many beautiful colors. These take the shape of a long round arch, with its path high above, and its two ends apparently beyond the horizon. There is, according to legend, a boiling pot of gold at one end. People look, but no one ever finds it. When a man looks for something beyond his reach, his friends say he is looking for the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

Throughout the centuries men have explained the rainbow in various ways. Some have accepted it as a miracle without physical explanation. To the Hebrews, it was a token that there would be no more universal floods. The Greeks used to imagine that it was a sign from the gods to foretell war or heavy rain. The Norsemen considered the rainbow as a bridge over which the gods passed from earth to their home in the sky. Other men have tried to explain the phenomenon physically. Aristotle thought that the rainbow was caused by reflection of the sun's rays by the rain. Since then, physicists have found that it is not reflection, but refraction by the raindrops which causes the rainbow. Many complicated

(continues)

Appendix 5-A. continued

Reading Passage, continued

ideas about the rainbow have been formed. The difference in the rainbow depends considerably upon the size of the water drops, and the width of the colored band increases as the size of the drops increases. The actual primary rainbow observed is said to be the effect of superposition of a number of bows. If the red of the second bow falls upon the green of the first, the result is to give a bow with an abnormally wide yellow band, since red and green lights when mixed form yellow. This is a very common type of bow, one showing mainly red and yellow, with little or no green or blue.

Appendix C

Instructor Survey

Start of Block: Default Question Block

IC Primary Investigator: Margaret Waller

PI Department & College: Behavior and Health Sciences, Middle Tennessee State University

Faculty Advisor (if PI is a student): Karen Davis, Ph.D., CCC-SLP

Protocol Title: Student Perception of Professors with Accents

Protocol ID: 20-2209

Approval Date: 08/05/2020

Expiration Date: 07/31/2021

Information and Disclosure Section

1. **Purpose:** This research project is designed to help us evaluate what factors impact student perception of non-native professors, how it impacts students' confidence in success, and what strategies are most effective in overcoming difficulties in understanding accent in the classroom.

2. **Description:** This research is a cross-sectional survey that will aim to collect information from a predetermined population, which are international professors and their students. The survey aims to identify factors influences students' perception of professor's with non-native accents, if there is a correlation between non-native accents and student academic performance and do identify strategies that students utilize for academic success.

This research project consists of a two-phase process:

- 1.) Determining the intensity of professor's accent
- 2.) Students perceptions of international instructors with non-native accent.

Phase 1:

- Instructors will complete a survey examining demographic information, questions addressing experiences, and opinions.
- A speech sample will be collected from the instructor and rated for accent intensity

Phase 2:

- The instructor will distribute three online surveys during the beginning, middle, and end of the semester to students

- The students will complete the survey via Qualtrics, a web-based survey system.

3. **Duration:** The whole activity should take about 10-15 minutes. There is no compensation for participation.

4. **Here are your rights as a participant:**

- Your participation in this research is voluntary.
- You may skip any item that you don't want to answer, and you may stop the experiment at any time (but see the note below) If you leave an item blank by either not clicking or entering a response, you may be warned that you missed one, just in case it was an accident. But you can continue the study without entering a response if you didn't want to answer any questions.
- Some items may require a response to accurately present the survey.

5. **Risks & Discomforts:** There are no known risks or discomforts for the participants.

6. **Benefits:** This study will benefit participants by providing the students with suggested strategies from international professors to use if they do not understand their professor. The professors will also benefit from having students that are better informed on how to communicate their difficulty understanding them. Based on the results, the researchers will provide recommendations to institutions and international professors on how to help students and faculty overcome difficulties caused by language barrier

7. **Identifiable Information:** You will NOT be asked to provide identifiable personal information

8. **Compensation:** There is no compensation for participating in this study

9. **Confidentiality.** All efforts, within reason, will be made to keep the personal information private but total privacy cannot be promised. Your information may be shared with MTSU or the government, such as the Middle Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board, Federal Government Office for Human Research Protections, if you or someone else is in danger or if we are required to do so by law.

10. **Contact Information.** If you should have any questions about this research study or possibly injury, please feel free to contact Margaret Waller by email at

mkw4h@mtmail.mtsu.edu OR my faculty advisor, Karen Davis, at karen.davis@mtsu.edu or at 615-898-5425. You can also contact the MTSU Office of compliance via telephone (615 494 8918) or by email (compliance@mtsu.edu). This contact information will be presented again at the end of the experiment.

IC2 I have read and understand the informed consent information above, am aware of the potential risks of the study, and understand that I can withdraw from this study at any time.

I consent

I do not consent

Skip To: End of Survey If I have read and understand the informed consent information above, am aware of the potential risk... = I do not consent

IC3 I confirm that I am 18 years or older.

I am

I am not

Skip To: End of Survey If I confirm that I am 18 years or older. = I am not

Q1 Gender

Male

Female

Non-binary

Other

Q2 Race

- East Asian/Pacific Islander
 - Black/African American
 - Hispanic/Latinx
 - South Asian/Indian
 - Middle Eastern
 - Native American/Indigenous
 - Caucasian/White
 - Other
-

Q3 Age

Q4 What is your country of origin?

Q5 Do you have U.S. citizenship?

- Yes
 - No
-

Display This Question:

If Do you have U.S. citizenship? = No

Q7 In which country/countries do you have citizenship?

Q9 What is your native language?

Q10 What language do you primarily speak?

Q11 How many years have you lived in a predominately English-speaking country?

Q12 What is your perceived intelligibility (how well an individual's speech is understood), comprehensibility (how easy it is for the listener to understand what is being said), and accent?

	Extremel y clear	Moderatel y clear	Slightl y clear	Neithe r clear nor unclear	Slightly unclea r	Moderatel y unclear	Extremel y unclear
Intelligibility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comprehensibilit y	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q13 Do you feel that students have difficulty understanding instruction due to accent?

Yes

No

Display This Question:

If Do you feel that students have difficulty understanding instruction due to accent? = Yes

Q14 What strategies would you recommend to students that have difficulty understanding your instruction due to accent?

Appendix D

Student Survey #3

Start of Block: Default Question Block

IC Primary Investigator: Margaret Waller

PI Department & College: Behavior and Health Sciences, Middle Tennessee State University

Faculty Advisor (if PI is a student): Karen Davis, Ph.D., CCC-SLP

Protocol Title: Student Perception of Professors with Accents

Protocol ID: 20-2209 Approval Date: 08/05/2020 Expiration Date: 07/31/2021

Information and Disclosure Section

1. **Purpose:** This research project is designed to help us evaluate what factors impact student perception of non-native professors, how it impacts students' confidence in success, and what strategies are most effective in overcoming difficulties in understanding accent in the classroom.

2. **Description:** There are several parts to this project. They are:

- complete all three surveys given by your professor at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester

3. **Duration:** The whole activity should take about 10-15 minutes. The participants will be compensated as described below.

4. Here are your rights as a participant:

- Your participation in this research is voluntary.
- You may skip any item that you don't want to answer, and you may stop the experiment at any time (but see the note below)
- If you leave an item blank by either not clicking or entering a response, you may be warned that you missed one, just in case it was an accident. But you can continue the study without entering a response if you didn't want to answer any questions.

- Some items may require a response to accurately present the survey.

5. **Risks & Discomforts:** There are no known risks or discomforts for the participants.

6. **Benefits:** This study will benefit participants by providing the students with suggested strategies from international professors to use if they do not understand their professor. The professors will also benefit from having students that are better informed on how to communicate their difficulty understanding them. Based on the results, the researchers will provide recommendations to institutions and international professors on how to help students and faculty overcome difficulties caused by language barrier

7. **Identifiable Information:** You will NOT be asked to provide identifiable personal information

8. **Compensation:** Class credit/extra credit MAY be given at the discretion of your instructor

9. **Confidentiality.** All efforts, within reason, will be made to keep the personal information private but total privacy cannot be promised. Your information may be shared with MTSU or the government, such as the Middle Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board, Federal Government Office for Human Research Protections, if you or someone else is in danger or if we are required to do so by law.

10. **Contact Information.** If you should have any questions about this research study or possibly injury, please feel free to contact Margaret Waller by email at mkw4h@mtmail.mtsu.edu OR my faculty advisor, Karen Davis, at karen.davis@mtsu.edu or at 615-898-5425. You can also contact the MTSU Office of compliance via telephone (615 494 8918) or by email (compliance@mtsu.edu). This contact information will be presented again at the end of the experiment.

IC2 I have read and understand the informed consent information above, am aware of the potential risks of the study, and understand that I can withdraw from this study at any time.

I consent

I do not consent

Skip To: End of Survey If I have read and understand the informed consent information above, am aware of the potential risk... = I do not consent

IC3 I confirm that I am 18 years or older.

I am

I am not

Skip To: End of Survey If I confirm that I am 18 years or older. = I am not

Q1

Gender

Male

Female

Non-binary

Other

Q2 Race

- East Asian/Pacific Islander
 - Black/African American
 - Hispanic/Latinx
 - South Asian/Indian
 - Middle Eastern
 - Native American/Indigenous
 - Caucasian/White
 - Other
-

Q3 Age

Q4 What region of the U.S. did you predominately grow up in?

- North East
 - South
 - Midwest
 - West
 - I am from a country other than the U.S.
-

Q5 What is your major(s)?

Q6 Class

- Freshman
 - Sophomore
 - Junior
 - Senior
-

Q7 Language Status

- I consider myself to be a Monolingual Native English Speaker (English is the first and only language I learned to speak fluently)
 - I consider myself to be Bilingual/Multilingual (I learned English as well as one or more other languages that I can speak fluently)
-

Q8 Were you exposed to languages other than your native language as a child?

- Yes
 - No
-

Q9 Have you attempted to learn another language other than your native language?

- Yes
 - No
-

Q30 For which professor are you taking this survey?

- Luis Lange
 - David Nelson
 - Rebecca Fischer
 - Frances Gibson-Ezzell
-

Q10 Which of the following best describes your class attendance?

- Never absent
 - Occasionally absent
 - Absent once a week
 - Absent 2-3 times a week
 - Only comes to class for tests/other mandatory in-class assignments
-

Q11 Which of the following best describes your punctuality?

- Never late
 - Occasionally late
 - Regularly arrives 1-5 minutes late
 - Regularly arrives 5-10 minute late
 - Regularly arrives 10+ minutes late
-

Q12 Have you taken a class taught by a non-native English speaker in previous semesters?

Yes

No

Q13 Reason I chose to take this course (check all that apply)

It was a Gen Ed requirement

It was required for my major/minor

I find the subject matter interesting

Other

Q14 What is the type of class set up?

Lecture hall

Classroom

Lab

Online

Web Assisted

Remote

Other

Display This Question:

If What is the type of class set up? = Online

And What is the type of class set up? = Web Assisted

And What is the type of class set up? = Remote

And What is the type of class set up? = Other

Q33 If the course is partially or entirely delivered online, what method(s) of delivery does your instructor use?

Zoom meeting

YouTube videos

Email/D2L text instructions

Q16 Rate your professor on the following categories

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Unintelligent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Intelligent
Uninformed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Informed
Untrained	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Trained
Inexpert	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Expert
Incompetent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Competent
Stupid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Bright

Q17 Rate your professor on their intelligibility (how well an individual's speech is understood), comprehensibility (how easy it is for the listener to understand what is being said), and perceived accent.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Unintelligible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Intelligible
Incomprehensible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Comprehensible
Strongly Accented	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	No Accent

Q18 If I have trouble understanding my professor because of their accent, I would (select all that apply)

Visit professor during office hours

Listen to other speakers with similar accents to familiarize myself with the professor's accent

Q19 Rate the usefulness of the following strategies

	Extremely useful	Very useful	Moderately useful	Slightly useful	Not at all useful
Visit professor during office hours	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Listen to other speakers with similar accents to familiarize myself with the professor's accent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q20 What is your current grade in this course?

- A
 - B
 - C
 - D
 - F
 - I do not know
 - Prefer not to disclose
-

Q21 What do you think your final grade in this course will be?

- A
 - B
 - C
 - D
 - F
 - Prefer not to disclose
-

Q22 Do you feel you have benefited from your professor's instruction?

- Yes
- No

End of Block: Default Question Block

Appendix E

Rate this sample on intelligibility (how well an individual's speech is understood), comprehensibility (how easy it is for the listener to understand what is being said), and perceived accent.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Unintelligible								Intelligible
Incomprehensible								Comprehensible
Strongly Accented								No Accent

Appendix F

IRB
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
 Office of Research Compliance,
 010A Sam Ingram Building,
 2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd
 Murfreesboro, TN 37129



IRBN001 - EXPEDITED PROTOCOL APPROVAL NOTICE

Thursday, September 03, 2020

Protocol Title *Student Perception of Professors with Accents*
 Protocol ID **20-2209**

Principal Investigator **Margarett Waller** (Student)
 Faculty Advisor Karen Davis
 Investigator Email(s) *mkw4h@mtmail.mtsu.edu; karen.davis@mtsu.edu*
 Department Health and Human Performance

Dear Investigator(s),

The above identified research proposal has been reviewed by the MTSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) through the EXPEDITED mechanism under 45 CFR 46.110 and 21 CFR 56.110 within the PRIMARY category (4) *Collection of data through noninvasive procedures* and a SECONDARY category (7) *Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior*. A summary of the IRB action and other particulars of this protocol are tabulated below:

IRB Action	APPROVED for ONE YEAR		
Date of Expiration	7/31/2021	Date of Approval	8/5/20
Sample Size	300 (THREE HUNDRED)		
Participant Pool	Target Population 1: Primary Classification: Healthy Adults (18 or older) Specific Classification: University/College Faculty Target Population 2: Primary Classification: Healthy Adults (18 years or older) Specific Classification: Students of Target Population 1		
Exceptions	1. Contact information of the participants allowed for coordinating this research. 2. Simple demographics and academic performance are permitted 3. Voice recording of Target Population 1 is permitted. 4. Online informed consent followed by survey(s) via Qualtrics are allowed.		
Restrictions	1. Mandatory Active Adult Informed Consent. 2. Identifiable data/artifacts, such as, audio/video data, photographs, handwriting samples, personal address, driving records, social security number, and etc., MUST be used for the proposed research purpose only. The data or artifacts collected or information obtained must be destroyed once the data analysis has been completed. 3. Mandatory Final report (refer last page).		
Approved Templates	<i>MTSU Templates:</i> Online Informed Consent templates <i>Non-MTSU Templates:</i> Recruitment Email Scripts		
Comments	COVID-19: Refer to the Post-Approval Action section for important instruction		

Post-approval Actions

The investigator(s) indicated in this notification should read and abide by all of the post-approval conditions related to this approval (*refer Quick Links below*). Any unanticipated harms to participants, adverse events or compliance breach must be reported to the Office of Compliance by calling 615-494-8918 within 48 hours of the incident. All amendments to this protocol, including adding/removing researchers, must be approved by the IRB before they can be implemented.

Continuing Review (The PI has requested early termination)

Although this protocol can be continued for up to THREE years, The PI has opted to end the study by **7/31/2021**. The PI must close-out this protocol by submitting a final report before **7/31/2021**. Failure to close-out may result in penalties including cancellation of the data collected using this protocol.

Post-approval Protocol Amendments:

Only two procedural amendment requests will be entertained per year. In addition, the researchers can request amendments during continuing review. This amendment restriction does not apply to minor changes such as language usage and addition/removal of research personnel.

Date	Amendment(s)	IRB Comments
09/03/2020	An alteration to the recruitment strategy is approved. An email recruitment script to target Department Chairs and International faculty is also approved after a review.	IRBA2021-180

Other Post-approval Actions:

Date	IRB Action(s)	IRB Comments
08/05/2020	Due to the COVID-19 National Emergency, the Office of Compliance grants administrative authority to the Faculty Advisor (FA) to make the necessary changes or revisions to this protocol in the best interest of the health and welfare of the participants and student workers. The FA must notify such revisions upon implementation to the IRB via simple email or using suitable amendment documents. The IRB will audit the revisions at a later date and suggest any remedial measures if necessary.	COVID-19

Mandatory Data Storage Requirement: All research-related records (signed consent forms, investigator training and etc.) must be retained by the PI or the faculty advisor (if the PI is a student) at the secure location mentioned in the protocol application. The data must be stored for at least three (3) years after the study is closed. Additional Tennessee State data retention requirement may apply (*refer "Quick Links" for MTSU policy 129 below*). Subsequently, the data may be destroyed in a manner that maintains confidentiality and anonymity of the research subjects.

The MTSU IRB reserves the right to modify/update the approval criteria or change/cancel the terms listed in this letter without prior notice. Be advised that IRB also reserves the right to inspect or audit your records if needed.

Sincerely,

Institutional Review Board
Middle Tennessee State University
IRBN001 – Expedited Protocol Approval Notice

Quick Links:

- Post-approval Responsibilities: <http://www.mtsu.edu/irb/FAQ/PostApprovalResponsibilities.php>
- Expedited Procedures: <https://mtsu.edu/irb/ExpeditedProcedures.php>
- MTSU Policy 129: Records retention & Disposal: <https://www.mtsu.edu/policies/general/129.php>

Appendix G

Professor 1 Tables

Table 1.1.1

Gender Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Male	56	6.2560	.99441	.13288
	Female	41	6.6138	.64057	.10004
Accent	Male	56	5.6607	1.13617	.15183
	Female	42	5.8968	.92096	.14211

Table 1.1.2

Gender Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Capability	Equal variances assumed	8.302	.005	-2.017	95	.047	-.35787	.17744	-.71013	-.00560
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.152	93.649	.034	-.35787	.16633	-.68814	-.02760
Accent	Equal variances assumed	1.552	.216	-1.102	96	.273	-.23611	.21426	-.66142	.18920
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.135	95.380	.259	-.23611	.20796	-.64894	.17671

Table 1.1.3
Gender Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.86329	-.415	-.821	-.006
	Hedges' correction	.87018	-.411	-.814	-.006
	Glass's delta	.64057	-.559	-.976	-.135
Accent	Cohen's d	1.04967	-.225	-.626	.177
	Hedges' correction	1.05796	-.223	-.621	.176
	Glass's delta	.92096	-.256	-.659	.149

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 1.2.1
Language Status Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

Language Status		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Monolingual	75	6.3289	.94875	.10955
	Bilingual/Multilingual	21	6.6587	.50408	.11000
Accent	Monolingual	76	5.6053	1.10582	.12685
	Bilingual/Multilingual	21	6.3016	.59540	.12993

Table 1.2.2
Language Status Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Test

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper

Capability	Equal variances assumed	7.535	.007	-	94	.129	-.32984	.21561	-.75794	.09825
				1.530						
	Equal variances not assumed			-	62.684	.038	-.32984	.15525	-.64011	-
				2.125						.01957
Accent	Equal variances assumed	7.483	.007	-	95	.007	-.69632	.25142	-	-
				2.770					1.19545	.19720
	Equal variances not assumed			-	61.417	.000	-.69632	.18158	-	-
				3.835					1.05936	.33328

Table 1.2.3
Language Status Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.87331	-.378	-.864	.110
	Hedges' correction	.88036	-.375	-.857	.109
	Glass's delta	.50408	-.654	-1.172	-.123
Accent	Cohen's d	1.01982	-.683	-1.174	-.188
	Hedges' correction	1.02796	-.677	-1.165	-.187
	Glass's delta	.59540	-1.170	-1.763	-.558

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 1.3.1
Language Exposure Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

Language Exposure		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Yes	51	6.5719	.69062	.09671
	No	46	6.2246	1.02272	.15079

Accent	Yes	52	6.0385	.87982	.12201
	No	46	5.4493	1.14658	.16905

Table 1.3.2
Language Exposure Compared to Capability and Accent

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Capability	Equal variances assumed	7.948	.006	1.977	95	.051	.34726	.17568	-.00152	.69603
	Equal variances not assumed			1.939	77.786	.056	.34726	.17914	-.00939	.70391
Accent	Equal variances assumed	3.490	.065	2.872	96	.005	.58919	.20517	.18192	.99645
	Equal variances not assumed			2.826	83.983	.006	.58919	.20848	.17459	1.00378

Table 1.3.3
Language Exposure Compared to Capability and Accent

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.86399	.402	-.002	.803

	Hedges' correction	.87088	.399	-.002	.797
	Glass's delta	1.02272	.340	-.067	.742
Accent	Cohen's d	1.01365	.581	.175	.985
	Hedges' correction	1.02165	.577	.173	.977
	Glass's delta	1.14658	.514	.101	.922

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 1.4.1
Language Learning Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics					
	Language Learning	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Yes	77	6.4567	.85087	.09697
	No	20	6.2167	.97047	.21700
Accent	Yes	78	5.8333	1.03440	.11712
	No	20	5.4833	1.09478	.24480

Table 1.4.2
Language Learning Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Capability	Equal variances assumed	2.129	.148	1.092	95	.278	.24004	.21988	-.19647	.67655
	Equal variances not assumed			1.010	27.075	.321	.24004	.23768	-.24758	.72766

Accent	Equal variances assumed	.671	.415	1.334	96	.185	.35000	.26233	-.17071	.87071
	Equal variances not assumed			1.290	28.328	.208	.35000	.27138	-.20560	.90560

Table 1.4.3
Language Learning Compared to Capability and Accent
Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.87610	.274	-.220	.767
	Hedges' correction	.88309	.272	-.218	.761
	Glass's delta	.97047	.247	-.254	.742
Accent	Cohen's d	1.04663	.334	-.160	.827
	Hedges' correction	1.05489	.332	-.159	.821
	Glass's delta	1.09478	.320	-.186	.817

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 1.5.1
Previous Non-Native Professor Experience Compared to Capability and Accent
Group Statistics

		Previous Non-Native Professor Course	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Yes		88	6.3996	.90251	.09621
	No		9	6.4815	.60349	.20116
Accent	Yes		89	5.7004	1.06131	.11250
	No		9	6.3704	.73493	.24498

Table 1.5.2*Previous Non-Native Professor Experience Compared to Capability and Accent***Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Capability	Equal variances assumed	.677	.413	-.265	95	.791	-.08186	.30841	-.69412	.53040
	Equal variances not assumed			-.367	12.020	.720	-.08186	.22299	-.56761	.40389
Accent	Equal variances assumed	1.107	.295	- 1.845	96	.068	-.67000	.36309	- 1.39072	.05072
	Equal variances not assumed			- 2.485	11.683	.029	-.67000	.26957	- 1.25912	- .08087

Table 1.5.3*Previous Non-Native Professor Experience Compared to Capability and Accent***Independent Samples Effect Sizes**

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.88125	-.093	-.779	.593
	Hedges' correction	.88828	-.092	-.773	.589
	Glass's delta	.60349	-.136	-.821	.558
Accent	Cohen's d	1.03804	-.645	-1.335	.048
	Hedges' correction	1.04624	-.640	-1.325	.047
	Glass's delta	.73493	-.912	-1.706	-.078

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 1.6.1

Perceived Benefit from Instruction Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

		Perceived Benefit from Professor's Instruction	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Yes		90	6.4981	.73417	.07739
	No		7	5.2381	1.60974	.60843
Accent	Yes		91	5.8571	.95341	.09994
	No		7	4.5238	1.51361	.57209

Table 1.6.2

Perceived Benefit from Instruction Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Capability	Equal variances assumed	15.272	.000	3.927	95	.000	1.26005	.32085	.62308	1.89703
	Equal variances not assumed			2.054	6.196	.084	1.26005	.61333	-.22929	2.74940
Accent	Equal variances assumed	5.069	.027	3.407	96	.001	1.33333	.39132	.55656	2.11010
	Equal variances not assumed			2.296	6.371	.059	1.33333	.58075	-.06788	2.73455

Table 1.6.3
Perceived Benefit from Instruction Compared to Capability and Accent
Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.81770	1.541	.738	2.337
	Hedges' correction	.82422	1.529	.732	2.318
	Glass's delta	1.60974	.783	-.123	1.641
Accent	Cohen's d	.99768	1.336	.542	2.125
	Hedges' correction	1.00556	1.326	.537	2.108
	Glass's delta	1.51361	.881	-.054	1.766

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 1.7.1
Race Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	White	55	6.3000	.86090	.11608	6.0673	6.5327	4.00	7.00
	Black/African American	17	6.6373	1.01591	.24639	6.1149	7.1596	2.83	7.00
	Other	25	6.4867	.80640	.16128	6.1538	6.8195	4.33	7.00
	Total	97	6.4072	.87697	.08904	6.2305	6.5840	2.83	7.00
Accent	White	56	5.5238	1.05573	.14108	5.2411	5.8065	3.00	7.00
	Black/African American	17	6.0980	1.09141	.26471	5.5369	6.6592	2.67	7.00
	Other	25	6.0667	.89753	.17951	5.6962	6.4371	3.67	7.00
	Total	98	5.7619	1.05083	.10615	5.5512	5.9726	2.67	7.00

Table 1.7.2
Race Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	1.690	2	.845	1.101	.337
	Within Groups	72.142	94	.767		
	Total	73.832	96			
Accent	Between Groups	7.417	2	3.709	3.534	.033
	Within Groups	99.694	95	1.049		
	Total	107.111	97			

Table 1.8.1
Age Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	18-20	15	6.4778	.70953	.18320	6.0849	6.8707	4.33	7.00
	21-25	66	6.4192	.88927	.10946	6.2006	6.6378	2.83	7.00
	26-30	5	5.8333	1.15470	.51640	4.3996	7.2671	4.33	7.00
	31+	11	6.5000	.90676	.27340	5.8908	7.1092	4.00	7.00
	Total	97	6.4072	.87697	.08904	6.2305	6.5840	2.83	7.00
	Accent	18-20	15	5.6000	.77868	.20106	5.1688	6.0312	4.00
	21-25	66	5.8434	1.13110	.13923	5.5654	6.1215	2.67	7.00
	26-30	5	4.8667	1.06979	.47842	3.5384	6.1950	3.67	6.00
	31+	12	5.8889	.72937	.21055	5.4255	6.3523	4.33	7.00
	Total	98	5.7619	1.05083	.10615	5.5512	5.9726	2.67	7.00

Table 1.8.2
Age Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	1.826	3	.609	.786	.505
	Within Groups	72.006	93	.774		
	Total	73.832	96			
Accent	Between Groups	5.033	3	1.678	1.545	.208
	Within Groups	102.078	94	1.086		
	Total	107.111	97			

Table 1.9.1
Class Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
Class						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	Sophomore	4	6.8333	.19245	.09623	6.5271	7.1396	6.67	7.00
	Junior	35	6.3048	.88698	.14993	6.0001	6.6095	4.00	7.00
	Senior	58	6.4397	.89655	.11772	6.2039	6.6754	2.83	7.00
	Total	97	6.4072	.87697	.08904	6.2305	6.5840	2.83	7.00
Accent	Sophomore	4	6.1667	.83887	.41944	4.8318	7.5015	5.00	7.00
	Junior	35	5.6190	1.06992	.18085	5.2515	5.9866	3.00	7.00
	Senior	59	5.8192	1.05468	.13731	5.5444	6.0941	2.67	7.00
	Total	98	5.7619	1.05083	.10615	5.5512	5.9726	2.67	7.00

Table 1.9.2
Class Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	1.155	2	.577	.747	.477
	Within Groups	72.677	94	.773		
	Total	73.832	96			
Accent	Between Groups	1.563	2	.782	.704	.497
	Within Groups	105.548	95	1.111		
	Total	107.111	97			

Table 1.10.1
Attendance Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
Attendance		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	Never absent	49	6.5714	.75844	.10835	6.3536	6.7893	2.83	7.00
	Occasionally absent	33	6.3434	.86396	.15040	6.0371	6.6498	4.00	7.00
	Absent once a week	15	6.0111	1.15034	.29702	5.3741	6.6481	4.00	7.00
	Total	97	6.4072	.87697	.08904	6.2305	6.5840	2.83	7.00
Accent	Never absent	50	5.9467	.94367	.13346	5.6785	6.2149	2.67	7.00
	Occasionally absent	33	5.7273	1.10697	.19270	5.3348	6.1198	3.00	7.00
	Absent once a week	15	5.2222	1.13855	.29397	4.5917	5.8527	3.00	7.00
	Total	98	5.7619	1.05083	.10615	5.5512	5.9726	2.67	7.00

Table 1.10.2
Attendance Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	3.809	2	1.905	2.557	.083
	Within Groups	70.023	94	.745		
	Total	73.832	96			
Accent	Between Groups	6.115	2	3.058	2.876	.061
	Within Groups	100.996	95	1.063		
	Total	107.111	97			

Table 1.11.1
Punctuality Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
Punctuality		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	Never late	49	6.4558	.90317	.12902	6.1964	6.7152	2.83	7.00
	Occasionally late	40	6.3833	.80790	.12774	6.1250	6.6417	4.33	7.00
	Regularly late	8	6.2292	1.12312	.39708	5.2902	7.1681	4.00	7.00
	Total	97	6.4072	.87697	.08904	6.2305	6.5840	2.83	7.00
Accent	Never late	49	5.8299	.97212	.13887	5.5507	6.1092	2.67	7.00
	Occasionally late	41	5.6341	1.13481	.17723	5.2760	5.9923	3.00	7.00
	Regularly late	8	6.0000	1.12687	.39841	5.0579	6.9421	4.00	7.00
	Total	98	5.7619	1.05083	.10615	5.5512	5.9726	2.67	7.00

Table 1.11.2
Punctuality Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	.392	2	.196	.251	.779
	Within Groups	73.440	94	.781		
	Total	73.832	96			
Accent	Between Groups	1.349	2	.675	.606	.548
	Within Groups	105.762	95	1.113		
	Total	107.111	97			

Table 1.12.1
Class Set Up Compared to Capability and Accent

Class Set Up		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	Online	90	6.4148	.89046	.09386	6.2283	6.6013	2.83	7.00
	Other	7	6.3095	.72921	.27562	5.6351	6.9839	5.17	7.00
	Total	97	6.4072	.87697	.08904	6.2305	6.5840	2.83	7.00
Accent	Online	91	5.8095	1.04011	.10903	5.5929	6.0261	2.67	7.00
	Other	7	5.1429	1.06904	.40406	4.1542	6.1316	3.00	6.33
	Total	98	5.7619	1.05083	.10615	5.5512	5.9726	2.67	7.00

Table 1.12.2
Class Set Up Compared to Capability and Accent

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	.072	1	.072	.093	.761
	Within Groups	73.760	95	.776		
	Total	73.832	96			
Accent	Between Groups	2.889	1	2.889	2.661	.106
	Within Groups	104.222	96	1.086		
	Total	107.111	97			

Table 1.13.1
Current Grade Compared to Accent

Current Grade		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Accent	A	39	5.8376	.85796	.13738	5.5595	6.1157	4.00	7.00
	B	23	5.5942	1.03941	.21673	5.1447	6.0437	3.67	7.00
	C	13	5.1795	1.50071	.41622	4.2726	6.0864	2.67	7.00
	D and under	23	6.1304	.95208	.19852	5.7187	6.5421	4.00	7.00

Total	98	5.7619	1.05083	.10615	5.5512	5.9726	2.67	7.00
-------	----	--------	---------	--------	--------	--------	------	------

Table 1.13.2
Current Grade Compared to Accent

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Accent	Between Groups	8.404	3	2.801	2.668	.052
	Within Groups	98.707	94	1.050		
	Total	107.111	97			

Table 1.14.1
Expected Final Grade Compared to Accent

Descriptives

Expected Final Grade		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Accent	A	38	5.9386	.75875	.12309	5.6892	6.1880	4.33	7.00
	B	39	5.4786	1.20135	.19237	5.0892	5.8681	2.67	7.00
	C	17	6.0196	1.11474	.27036	5.4465	6.5928	3.00	7.00
	D and under	4	5.7500	1.37100	.68550	3.5684	7.9316	4.00	7.00
	Total	98	5.7619	1.05083	.10615	5.5512	5.9726	2.67	7.00

Table 1.14.2
Expected Final Grade Compared to Accent

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Accent	Between Groups	5.445	3	1.815	1.678	.177
	Within Groups	101.666	94	1.082		
	Total	107.111	97			

Table 1.15.1
Region Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
Region		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	North East	1	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	South	78	6.4231	.82471	.09338	6.2371	6.6090	2.83	7.00
	Midwest	8	6.2708	1.10172	.38952	5.3498	7.1919	4.00	7.00
	West	6	6.0278	1.44690	.59069	4.5093	7.5462	4.00	7.00
	I am from a country other than the U.S.	4	6.7917	.41667	.20833	6.1287	7.4547	6.17	7.00
	Total	97	6.4072	.87697	.08904	6.2305	6.5840	2.83	7.00
Accent	North East	1	5.6667	5.67	5.67
	South	79	5.7806	1.02516	.11534	5.5510	6.0102	2.67	7.00
	Midwest	8	5.5417	1.41351	.49975	4.3599	6.7234	3.00	7.00
	West	6	5.3889	1.20031	.49002	4.1292	6.6485	3.67	7.00
	I am from a country other than the U.S.	4	6.4167	.56928	.28464	5.5108	7.3225	5.67	7.00
	Total	98	5.7619	1.05083	.10615	5.5512	5.9726	2.67	7.00

Table 1.15.1
Region Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	1.975	4	.494	.632	.641
	Within Groups	71.857	92	.781		
	Total	73.832	96			
Accent	Between Groups	2.974	4	.744	.664	.619
	Within Groups	104.137	93	1.120		
	Total	107.111	97			

Table 1.16.1
Major Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Major									
Capability	Business	68	6.3235	.98027	.11888	6.0863	6.5608	2.83	7.00
	INFS	27	6.6049	.53738	.10342	6.3924	6.8175	5.00	7.00
	Other	2	6.5833	.58926	.41667	1.2891	11.8776	6.17	7.00
	Total	97	6.4072	.87697	.08904	6.2305	6.5840	2.83	7.00
Accent	Business	68	5.6373	1.16718	.14154	5.3547	5.9198	2.67	7.00
	INFS	28	6.0476	.67106	.12682	5.7874	6.3078	4.67	7.00
	Other	2	6.0000	.47140	.33333	1.7646	10.2354	5.67	6.33
	Total	98	5.7619	1.05083	.10615	5.5512	5.9726	2.67	7.00

Table 1.16.2
Major Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	1.594	2	.797	1.037	.359
	Within Groups	72.238	94	.768		
	Total	73.832	96			
Accent	Between Groups	3.456	2	1.728	1.584	.211
	Within Groups	103.655	95	1.091		
	Total	107.111	97			

Table 1.17
Motivation for Course (General Education) Compared to Capability and Accent

		Group Statistics			
		Reason for Course: Gen Ed Requirement			
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	It was a Gen Ed requirement	8	6.3125	1.01746	.35973
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.
Accent	It was a Gen Ed requirement	8	5.7083	1.04559	.36967
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.

a. t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.

Table 1.18*Motivation for Course (Major/Minor Requirement) Compared to Capability and Accent***Group Statistics**

Reason for Course:		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Major/Minor Requirement					
Capability	It was required for my major/minor	89	6.4307	.86959	.09218
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.
Accent	It was required for my major/minor	90	5.7519	1.05948	.11168
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.

a. t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.

Table 1.19*Motivation for Course (Interested in Subject) Compared to Capability and Accent***Group Statistics**

Reason for Course:		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Interested in subject					
Capability	I find the subject matter interesting	10	6.4333	.48559	.15356
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.
Accent	I find the subject matter interesting	10	6.1000	.64884	.20518
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.

a. t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.

Table 1.20*Motivation for Course (Other) Compared to Capability and Accent***Group Statistics**

Reason for Course: Other		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Other	1	7.0000	.	.
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.
Accent	Other	1	7.0000	.	.
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.

a. t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.

Appendix H

Professor 2 Tables

Table 2.1.1

Gender Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Male	1	7.0000	.	.
	Female	9	6.9815	.05556	.01852
Accent	Male	1	5.3333	.	.
	Female	10	5.5000	.63343	.20031

Table 2.1.2

Gender Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Capability	Equal variances assumed	.	.	.316	8	.760	.01852	.05856	-.11652	.15356
	Equal variances not assumed		01852	.	.	.
Accent	Equal variances assumed	.	.	-.251	9	.808	-.16667	.66435	-1.66953	1.33619
	Equal variances not assumed			.	.	.	-.16667	.	.	.

Table 2.1.3
Gender Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.05556	.333	-1.749	2.395
	Hedges' correction	.06154	.301	-1.579	2.162
	Glass's delta	.05556	.333	-1.749	2.395
Accent	Cohen's d	.63343	-.263	-2.315	1.803
	Hedges' correction	.69313	-.240	-2.116	1.648
	Glass's delta	.63343	-.263	-2.315	1.803

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 2.2.1
Language Status Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

	Language Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Monolingual	8	6.9792	.05893	.02083
	Bilingual/Multilingual	2	7.0000	.00000	.00000
Accent	Monolingual	9	5.4444	.64550	.21517
	Bilingual/Multilingual	2	5.6667	.47140	.33333

Table 2.2.2
Language Status Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Test

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
							Lower	Upper

Capability	Equal variances assumed	1.244	.297	-.478	8	.645	-.02083	.04358	-.12132	.07965
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.000	7.000	.351	-.02083	.02083	-.07010	.02843
Accent	Equal variances assumed	.117	.740	-.452	9	.662	-.22222	.49135	-1.33374	.88929
	Equal variances not assumed			-.560	1.964	.633	-.22222	.39675	-1.95935	1.51490

Table 2.2.3

Language Status Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.05512	-.378	-1.927	1.194
	Hedges' correction	.06106	-.341	-1.739	1.077
	Glass's delta
Accent	Cohen's d	.62854	-.354	-1.885	1.197
	Hedges' correction	.68777	-.323	-1.722	1.094
	Glass's delta	.47140	-.471	-2.023	1.239

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 2.3.1

Language Exposure Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

		Language Exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Yes		6	6.9722	.06804	.02778
	No		4	7.0000	.00000	.00000
Accent	Yes		6	5.5000	.34960	.14272
	No		5	5.4667	.86923	.38873

Table 2.3.2
Language Exposure Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Capability	Equal variances assumed	4.000	.081	-.800	8	.447	-.02778	.03472	-.10785	.05229
	Equal variances not assumed			-.800 1.000	5.000	.363	-.02778	.02778	-.09918	.04363
Accent	Equal variances assumed	1.616	.236	.087	9	.933	.03333	.38474	-.83701	.90368
	Equal variances not assumed			.080	5.077	.939	.03333	.41410	-.109296 1.02630	

Table 2.3.3
Language Exposure Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.05379	-.516	-1.791	.788
	Hedges' correction	.05959	-.466	-1.616	.712
	Glass's delta
Accent	Cohen's d	.63538	.052	-1.136	1.238
	Hedges' correction	.69526	.048	-1.038	1.131
	Glass's delta	.86923	.038	-1.151	1.223

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 2.4.1
Language Learning Compared to Capability and Accent

		Language Learning	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Yes		8	6.9792	.05893	.02083
	No		2	7.0000	.00000	.00000
Accent	Yes		8	5.3333	.61721	.21822
	No		3	5.8889	.38490	.22222

Table 2.4.2
Language Learning Compared to Capability and Accent

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Capability	Equal variances assumed	1.244	.297	-.478	8	.645	-.02083	.04358	-.12132	.07965
	Equal variances not assumed			- 1.000	7.000	.351	-.02083	.02083	-.07010	.02843
Accent	Equal variances assumed	.217	.652	- 1.430	9	.186	-.55556	.38845	- 1.43429	.32317
	Equal variances not assumed			- 1.784	6.097	.124	-.55556	.31145	- 1.31472	.20361

Table 2.4.3
Language Learning Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.05512	-.378	-1.927	1.194
	Hedges' correction	.06106	-.341	-1.739	1.077
	Glass's delta
Accent	Cohen's d	.57378	-.968	-2.343	.454
	Hedges' correction	.62785	-.885	-2.141	.415
	Glass's delta	.38490	-1.443	-3.243	.482

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 2.5.1
Previous Non-Native Professor Course Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

Previous Non-Native Professor Course		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Yes	8	6.9792	.05893	.02083
	No	2	7.0000	.00000	.00000
Accent	Yes	9	5.4074	.59577	.19859
	No	2	5.8333	.70711	.50000

Table 2.5.2
Previous Non-Native Professor Course Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Test

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper

Capability	Equal variances assumed	1.244	.297	-.478	8	.645	-.02083	.04358	-.12132	.07965
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.000	7.000	.351	-.02083	.02083	-.07010	.02843
Accent	Equal variances assumed	.076	.790	-.894	9	.394	-.42593	.47619	-1.50314	.65129
	Equal variances not assumed			-.792	1.336	.545	-.42593	.53799	-4.28128	3.42943

Table 2.5.3
Previous Non-Native Professor Course Compared to Capability and Accent
Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.05512	-.378	-1.927	1.194
	Hedges' correction	.06106	-.341	-1.739	1.077
	Glass's delta
Accent	Cohen's d	.60914	-.699	-2.246	.884
	Hedges' correction	.66655	-.639	-2.052	.808
	Glass's delta	.70711	-.602	-2.202	1.180

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 2.6*Perceived Benefit from Instruction Compared to Capability and Accent***Group Statistics**

		Perceived Benefit from Professor's Instruction	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Yes		10	6.9833	.05270	.01667
	No		0 ^a	.	.	.
Accent	Yes		11	5.4848	.60302	.18182
	No		0 ^a	.	.	.

a. t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.

Table 2.7.1*Race Compared to Capability and Accent***Descriptives**

Race		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	White	5	7.0000	.00000	.00000	7.0000	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Black/African American	4	6.9583	.08333	.04167	6.8257	7.0909	6.83	7.00
	Other	1	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Total	10	6.9833	.05270	.01667	6.9456	7.0210	6.83	7.00
Accent	White	6	5.5556	.80737	.32961	4.7083	6.4028	4.00	6.33
	Black/African American	4	5.3333	.27217	.13608	4.9003	5.7664	5.00	5.67
	Other	1	5.6667	5.67	5.67
	Total	11	5.4848	.60302	.18182	5.0797	5.8900	4.00	6.33

Table 2.7.2
Race Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	.004	2	.002	.700	.528
	Within Groups	.021	7	.003		
	Total	.025	9			
Accent	Between Groups	.155	2	.077	.178	.840
	Within Groups	3.481	8	.435		
	Total	3.636	10			

Table 2.8.1
Age Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	18-20	5	7.0000	.00000	.00000	7.0000	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	21-25	4	6.9583	.08333	.04167	6.8257	7.0909	6.83	7.00
	31+	1	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Total	10	6.9833	.05270	.01667	6.9456	7.0210	6.83	7.00
Accent	18-20	6	5.6111	.25092	.10244	5.3478	5.8744	5.33	6.00
	21-25	4	5.6667	.54433	.27217	4.8005	6.5328	5.00	6.33
	31+	1	4.0000	4.00	4.00
	Total	11	5.4848	.60302	.18182	5.0797	5.8900	4.00	6.33

Table 2.8.2
Age Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	.004	2	.002	.700	.528
	Within Groups	.021	7	.003		
	Total	.025	9			
Accent	Between Groups	2.433	2	1.216	8.084	.012
	Within Groups	1.204	8	.150		
	Total	3.636	10			

Table 2.9.1
Class Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	Junior	4	7.0000	.00000	.00000	7.0000	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Senior	6	6.9722	.06804	.02778	6.9008	7.0436	6.83	7.00
	Total	10	6.9833	.05270	.01667	6.9456	7.0210	6.83	7.00
Accent	Junior	5	5.5333	.18257	.08165	5.3066	5.7600	5.33	5.67
	Senior	6	5.4444	.83444	.34066	4.5687	6.3201	4.00	6.33
	Total	11	5.4848	.60302	.18182	5.0797	5.8900	4.00	6.33

Table 2.9.2
Class Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	.002	1	.002	.640	.447
	Within Groups	.023	8	.003		
	Total	.025	9			
Accent	Between Groups	.022	1	.022	.054	.822
	Within Groups	3.615	9	.402		
	Total	3.636	10			

Table 2.10.1
Attendance Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
Attendance		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	Never absent	5	7.0000	.00000	.00000	7.0000	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Occasionally absent	2	7.0000	.00000	.00000	7.0000	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Absent once a week	3	6.9444	.09623	.05556	6.7054	7.1835	6.83	7.00
	Total	10	6.9833	.05270	.01667	6.9456	7.0210	6.83	7.00
Accent	Never absent	6	5.7222	.38968	.15909	5.3133	6.1312	5.33	6.33
	Occasionally absent	2	4.8333	1.17851	.83333	-5.7552	15.4218	4.00	5.67
	Absent once a week	3	5.4444	.38490	.22222	4.4883	6.4006	5.00	5.67
	Total	11	5.4848	.60302	.18182	5.0797	5.8900	4.00	6.33

Table 2.10.2
Attendance Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	.006	2	.003	1.225	.350
	Within Groups	.019	7	.003		
	Total	.025	9			
Accent	Between Groups	1.192	2	.596	1.950	.204
	Within Groups	2.444	8	.306		
	Total	3.636	10			

Table 2.11.1
Punctuality Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives					
Punctuality	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Minimum	Maximum

						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	Never late	5	7.0000	.00000	.00000	7.0000	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Occasionally late	4	6.9583	.08333	.04167	6.8257	7.0909	6.83	7.00
	Regularly late	1	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Total	10	6.9833	.05270	.01667	6.9456	7.0210	6.83	7.00
Accent	Never late	6	5.7222	.32773	.13380	5.3783	6.0662	5.33	6.33
	Occasionally late	4	5.0833	.83333	.41667	3.7573	6.4094	4.00	6.00
	Regularly late	1	5.6667	5.67	5.67
	Total	11	5.4848	.60302	.18182	5.0797	5.8900	4.00	6.33

Table 2.11.2
Punctuality Compared to Capability and Accent

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	.004	2	.002	.700	.528
	Within Groups	.021	7	.003		
	Total	.025	9			
Accent	Between Groups	1.016	2	.508	1.551	.270
	Within Groups	2.620	8	.328		
	Total	3.636	10			

Table 2.12.1
Class Set Up Compared to Capability and Accent

Descriptives

Class Set Up		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	Online	9	6.9815	.05556	.01852	6.9388	7.0242	6.83	7.00
	Other	1	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Total	10	6.9833	.05270	.01667	6.9456	7.0210	6.83	7.00

Accent	Online	10	5.6333	.36683	.11600	5.3709	5.8958	5.00	6.33
	Other	1	4.0000	4.00	4.00
	Total	11	5.4848	.60302	.18182	5.0797	5.8900	4.00	6.33

Table 2.12.2
Class Set Up Compared to Capability and Accent

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.100	.760
	Within Groups	.025	8	.003		
	Total	.025	9			
Accent	Between Groups	2.425	1	2.425	18.023	.002
	Within Groups	1.211	9	.135		
	Total	3.636	10			

Table 2.13.1
Current Grade Compared to Accent

Descriptives

Current Grade	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Accent	A	4	5.2500	.87665	.43833	3.8551	6.6449	4.00	6.00
	B	3	5.5556	.19245	.11111	5.0775	6.0336	5.33	5.67
	C	2	5.3333	.47140	.33333	1.0979	9.5687	5.00	5.67
	D	2	6.0000	.47140	.33333	1.7646	10.2354	5.67	6.33
Total	11	5.4848	.60302	.18182	5.0797	5.8900	4.00	6.33	

Table 2.13.2
Current Grade Compared to Accent

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Accent	Between Groups	.812	3	.271	.671	.596
	Within Groups	2.824	7	.403		
	Total	3.636	10			

Table 2.14.1
Expected Final Grade Compared to Accent

Expected Final Grade		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Accent	A	6	5.3889	.71233	.29081	4.6413	6.1364	4.00	6.00
	B	2	5.3333	.47140	.33333	1.0979	9.5687	5.00	5.67
	C	1	5.6667	5.67	5.67
	D	2	5.8333	.70711	.50000	-.5198	12.1864	5.33	6.33
	Total	11	5.4848	.60302	.18182	5.0797	5.8900	4.00	6.33

Table 2.14.2
Expected Final Grade Compared to Accent

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Accent	Between Groups	.377	3	.126	.270	.845
	Within Groups	3.259	7	.466		
	Total	3.636	10			

Table 2.15.1
Region Compared to Capability and Accent

Region		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	South	8	6.9792	.05893	.02083	6.9299	7.0284	6.83	7.00
	Midwest	1	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	I am from a country other than the U.S.	1	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Total	10	6.9833	.05270	.01667	6.9456	7.0210	6.83	7.00
Accent	South	9	5.5185	.66898	.22299	5.0043	6.0327	4.00	6.33
	Midwest	1	5.3333	5.33	5.33

I am from a country other than the U.S.	1	5.3333	5.33	5.33
Total	11	5.4848	.60302	.18182	5.0797	5.8900	4.00	6.33

Table 2.15.2
Region Compared to Capability and Accent

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	.001	2	.000	.100	.906
	Within Groups	.024	7	.003		
	Total	.025	9			
Accent	Between Groups	.056	2	.028	.063	.940
	Within Groups	3.580	8	.448		
	Total	3.636	10			

Table 2.16.1
Major Compared to Capability and Accent

Descriptives

Major		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	Biology	8	6.9792	.05893	.02083	6.9299	7.0284	6.83	7.00
	Other	2	7.0000	.00000	.00000	7.0000	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Total	10	6.9833	.05270	.01667	6.9456	7.0210	6.83	7.00
Accent	Biology	9	5.6667	.37268	.12423	5.3802	5.9531	5.00	6.33
	Other	2	4.6667	.94281	.66667	-3.8041	13.1375	4.00	5.33
	Total	11	5.4848	.60302	.18182	5.0797	5.8900	4.00	6.33

Table 2.16.2
Major Compared to Capability and Accent

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.229	.645
	Within Groups	.024	8	.003		
	Total	.025	9			

Accent	Between Groups	1.636	1	1.636	7.364	.024
	Within Groups	2.000	9	.222		
	Total	3.636	10			

Table 2.17
Motivation for Course (General Education) Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

		Reason for Course: Gen Ed Requirement			
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	It was a Gen Ed requirement	1	7.0000	.	.
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.
Accent	It was a Gen Ed requirement	1	4.0000	.	.
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.

a. t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.

Table 2.18
Motivation for Course (Major/Minor Requirement) Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

		Reason for Course: Major/Minor Requirement			
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	It was required for my major/minor	9	6.9815	.05556	.01852
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.
Accent	It was required for my major/minor	10	5.6333	.36683	.11600
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.

a. t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.

Table 2.19
Motivation for Course (Interested in Subject) Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

		Reason for Course: Interested in subject			
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	I find the subject matter interesting	3	7.0000	.00000	.00000
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.

Accent	I find the subject matter interesting	3	5.6667	.33333	.19245
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.

a. t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.

Appendix I

SAE Professor Tables

Table 3.1

Gender Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Male	0 ^a	.	.	.
	Female	25	6.7467	.64212	.12842
Accent	Male	0 ^a	.	.	.
	Female	25	6.7733	.41633	.08327

a. t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.

Table 3.2.1

Language Status Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics					
	Language Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Monolingual	24	6.8611	.29760	.06075
	Bilingual/Multilingual	1	4.0000	.	.
Accent	Monolingual	24	6.8056	.39215	.08005
	Bilingual/Multilingual	1	6.0000	.	.

Table 3.2.2

Language Status Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Capability	Equal variances assumed	.	.	9.420	23	.000	2.86111	.30374	2.23278	3.48944
	Equal variances not assumed			.	.	.	2.86111	.	.	.

Accent	Equal variances assumed	.	.	2.013	23	.056	.80556	.40024	-.02240	1.63351
	Equal variances not assumed						.80556			

Table 3.2.3
Language Status Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.29760	9.614	6.167	12.986
	Hedges' correction	.30777	9.296	5.964	12.557
	Glass's delta
Accent	Cohen's d	.39215	2.054	-.052	4.119
	Hedges' correction	.40555	1.986	-.050	3.983
	Glass's delta

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 3.3.1
Language Exposure Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

	Language Exposure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Yes	6	6.4167	1.20069	.49018
	No	19	6.8509	.31863	.07310
Accent	Yes	6	6.8333	.40825	.16667
	No	19	6.7544	.42806	.09820

Table 3.3.2
Language Exposure Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Capability	Equal variances assumed	8.519	.008	- 1.479	23	.153	-.43421	.29352	- 1.04140	.17298
	Equal variances not assumed			-.876	5.224	.419	-.43421	.49560	- 1.69193	.82351
Accent	Equal variances assumed	.234	.633	.398	23	.694	.07895	.19848	-.33164	.48953
	Equal variances not assumed			.408	8.781	.693	.07895	.19345	-.36033	.51823

Table 3.3.3
Language Exposure Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.62679	-.693	-1.625	.254
	Hedges' correction	.64820	-.670	-1.571	.245
	Glass's delta	.31863	-1.363	-2.366	-.329
Accent	Cohen's d	.42383	.186	-.735	1.104
	Hedges' correction	.43831	.180	-.711	1.067
	Glass's delta	.42806	.184	-.738	1.102

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 3.4.1

Language Learning Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

	Language Learning	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Yes	20	6.7583	.69559	.15554
	No	5	6.7000	.41500	.18559
Accent	Yes	20	6.8333	.33333	.07454
	No	5	6.5333	.64979	.29059

Table 3.4.2

Language Learning Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Capability	Equal variances assumed	.124	.728	.178	23	.860	.05833	.32774	-.61965	.73631
	Equal variances not assumed			.241	10.501	.814	.05833	.24215	-.47774	.59441
Accent	Equal variances assumed	9.003	.006	1.476	23	.153	.30000	.20323	-.12042	.72042
	Equal variances not assumed			1.000	4.539	.368	.30000	.30000	-.49531	1.09531

Table 3.4.3
Language Learning Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.65548	.089	-.892	1.068
	Hedges' correction	.67787	.086	-.863	1.033
	Glass's delta	.41500	.141	-.852	1.117
Accent	Cohen's d	.40647	.738	-.272	1.733
	Hedges' correction	.42035	.714	-.263	1.676
	Glass's delta	.64979	.462	-.591	1.464

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 3.5.1
Previous Non-Native Professor Experience Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

		Previous Non-Native Professor Course	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Yes		12	6.6389	.88144	.25445
	No		13	6.8462	.30017	.08325
Accent	Yes		12	6.6944	.43712	.12619
	No		13	6.8462	.39943	.11078

Table 3.5.2
Previous Non-Native Professor Experience Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Test

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper

Capability	Equal variances assumed	2.922	.101	- .800	23	.432	-.20726	.25900	- .74305	.32852
	Equal variances not assumed			- .774	13.341	.452	-.20726	.26772	- .78415	.36962
Accent	Equal variances assumed	.824	.374	- .907	23	.374	-.15171	.16729	- .49777	.19435
	Equal variances not assumed			- .903	22.331	.376	-.15171	.16792	- .49965	.19623

Table 3.5.3

Previous Non-Native Professor Experience Compared to Capability and Accent

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Capability	Cohen's d	.64698	-.320	-1.107	.473
	Hedges' correction	.66908	-.310	-1.070	.457
	Glass's delta	.30017	-.691	-1.509	.153
Accent	Cohen's d	.41788	-.363	-1.151	.432
	Hedges' correction	.43216	-.351	-1.113	.418
	Glass's delta	.39943	-.380	-1.171	.427

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.

Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.

Table 3.6

Perceived Benefit from Instruction Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

Perceived Benefit from Professor's Instruction		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	Yes	25	6.7467	.64212	.12842
	No	0 ^a	.	.	.
Accent	Yes	25	6.7733	.41633	.08327

No	0 ^a	.	.	.
----	----------------	---	---	---

a. t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.

Table 3.7.1
Race Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
Race						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	White	19	6.8684	.31710	.07275	6.7156	7.0213	6.00	7.00
	Black/African American	4	6.7917	.25000	.12500	6.3939	7.1895	6.50	7.00
	Other	2	5.5000	2.12132	1.50000	-13.5593	24.5593	4.00	7.00
	Total	25	6.7467	.64212	.12842	6.4816	7.0117	4.00	7.00
	Accent	White	19	6.7719	.43109	.09890	6.5642	6.9797	5.67
Accent	Black/African American	4	6.9167	.16667	.08333	6.6515	7.1819	6.67	7.00
	Other	2	6.5000	.70711	.50000	.1469	12.8531	6.00	7.00
	Total	25	6.7733	.41633	.08327	6.6015	6.9452	5.67	7.00

Table 3.7.2
Race Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	3.398	2	1.699	5.753	.010
	Within Groups	6.497	22	.295		
	Total	9.896	24			
Accent	Between Groups	.232	2	.116	.649	.532
	Within Groups	3.928	22	.179		
	Total	4.160	24			

Table 3.8.1
Age Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
Age Ranges		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	18-20	20	6.7250	.71179	.15916	6.3919	7.0581	4.00	7.00
	21-25	4	6.7917	.25000	.12500	6.3939	7.1895	6.50	7.00
	26-30	1	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Total	25	6.7467	.64212	.12842	6.4816	7.0117	4.00	7.00
Accent	18-20	20	6.7333	.45370	.10145	6.5210	6.9457	5.67	7.00
	21-25	4	6.9167	.16667	.08333	6.6515	7.1819	6.67	7.00
	26-30	1	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Total	25	6.7733	.41633	.08327	6.6015	6.9452	5.67	7.00

Table 3.8.2
Age Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	.082	2	.041	.092	.913
	Within Groups	9.814	22	.446		
	Total	9.896	24			
Accent	Between Groups	.166	2	.083	.456	.640
	Within Groups	3.994	22	.182		
	Total	4.160	24			

Table 3.9.1
Class Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
Class						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	Sophomore	11	6.9091	.30151	.09091	6.7065	7.1116	6.00	7.00
	Junior	12	6.5556	.85968	.24817	6.0093	7.1018	4.00	7.00
	Senior	1	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Total	24	6.7361	.65371	.13344	6.4601	7.0121	4.00	7.00
Accent	Sophomore	11	6.8182	.40452	.12197	6.5464	7.0899	6.00	7.00
	Junior	12	6.6944	.45965	.13269	6.4024	6.9865	5.67	7.00
	Senior	1	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	Total	24	6.7639	.42254	.08625	6.5855	6.9423	5.67	7.00

Table 3.9.2
Class Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	.790	2	.395	.918	.415
	Within Groups	9.039	21	.430		
	Total	9.829	23			
Accent	Between Groups	.146	2	.073	.387	.684
	Within Groups	3.960	21	.189		
	Total	4.106	23			

Table 3.10.1
Attendance Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
Attendance						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	Never absent	10	6.7667	.41722	.13194	6.4682	7.0651	6.00	7.00
	Occasionally absent	13	6.7179	.82883	.22988	6.2171	7.2188	4.00	7.00

	Absent once a week	2	6.8333	.23570	.16667	4.7156	8.9510	6.67	7.00
	Total	25	6.7467	.64212	.12842	6.4816	7.0117	4.00	7.00
Accent	Never absent	10	6.8333	.36004	.11386	6.5758	7.0909	6.00	7.00
	Occasionally absent	13	6.7179	.48774	.13528	6.4232	7.0127	5.67	7.00
	Absent once a week	2	6.8333	.23570	.16667	4.7156	8.9510	6.67	7.00
	Total	25	6.7733	.41633	.08327	6.6015	6.9452	5.67	7.00

Table 3.10.1
Attendance Compared to Capability and Accent

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	.030	2	.015	.033	.967
	Within Groups	9.866	22	.448		
	Total	9.896	24			
Accent	Between Groups	.083	2	.042	.224	.801
	Within Groups	4.077	22	.185		
	Total	4.160	24			

Table 3.11.1
Punctuality Compared to Capability and Accent

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Punctuality	Capability Never late	14	6.5833	.82883	.22152	6.1048	7.0619	4.00	7.00
	Occasionally late	9	6.9815	.05556	.01852	6.9388	7.0242	6.83	7.00
	Regularly late	2	6.8333	.23570	.16667	4.7156	8.9510	6.67	7.00
	Total	25	6.7467	.64212	.12842	6.4816	7.0117	4.00	7.00
Accent	Never late	14	6.7857	.38358	.10252	6.5642	7.0072	6.00	7.00

Occasionally late	9	6.7407	.52116	.17372	6.3401	7.1413	5.67	7.00
Regularly late	2	6.8333	.23570	.16667	4.7156	8.9510	6.67	7.00
Total	25	6.7733	.41633	.08327	6.6015	6.9452	5.67	7.00

Table 3.11.2
Punctuality Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Capability	Between Groups	.885	2	.442	1.080	.357	
	Within Groups	9.011	22	.410			
	Total	9.896	24				
Accent	Between Groups	.019	2	.009	.050	.951	
	Within Groups	4.141	22	.188			
	Total	4.160	24				

Table 3.12.1
Class Set Up Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
Class Set Up						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	Online	22	6.8939	.24422	.05207	6.7857	7.0022	6.00	7.00
	Other	3	5.6667	1.52753	.88192	1.8721	9.4612	4.00	7.00
	Total	25	6.7467	.64212	.12842	6.4816	7.0117	4.00	7.00
Accent	Online	22	6.8333	.36732	.07831	6.6705	6.9962	5.67	7.00
	Other	3	6.3333	.57735	.33333	4.8991	7.7676	6.00	7.00
	Total	25	6.7733	.41633	.08327	6.6015	6.9452	5.67	7.00

Table 3.12.2
Class Set Up Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Capability	Between Groups	3.976	1	3.976	15.451	.001	
	Within Groups	5.919	23	.257			

	Total		9.896	24			
Accent	Between Groups		.660	1	.660	4.337	.049
	Within Groups		3.500	23	.152		
	Total		4.160	24			

Table 3.13.1
Current Grade Compared to Accent

		Descriptives							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
Current Grade						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Accent	A	15	6.8444	.41532	.10723	6.6145	7.0744	5.67	7.00
	B	6	6.5000	.45947	.18758	6.0178	6.9822	6.00	7.00
	C	1	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	D	3	6.8889	.19245	.11111	6.4108	7.3670	6.67	7.00
	Total	25	6.7733	.41633	.08327	6.6015	6.9452	5.67	7.00

Table 3.13.2
Current Grade Compared to Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Accent	Between Groups	.616	3	.205	1.216	.329
	Within Groups	3.544	21	.169		
	Total	4.160	24			

Table 3.14.1
Expected Final Grade Compared to Accent

		Descriptives							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
Expected Final Grade						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Accent	A	18	6.7963	.39834	.09389	6.5982	6.9944	6.00	7.00
	B	7	6.7143	.48795	.18443	6.2630	7.1656	5.67	7.00
	Total	25	6.7733	.41633	.08327	6.6015	6.9452	5.67	7.00

Table 3.14.2
Expected Final Grade Compared to Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Accent	Between Groups	.034	1	.034	.189	.668
	Within Groups	4.126	23	.179		
	Total	4.160	24			

Table 3.15.1
Region Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
Region		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	North East	2	6.7500	.35355	.25000	3.5734	9.9266	6.50	7.00
	South	20	6.8750	.31004	.06933	6.7299	7.0201	6.00	7.00
	West	1	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	I am from a country other than the U.S.	2	5.3333	1.88562	1.33333	-11.6083	22.2749	4.00	6.67
	Total	25	6.7467	.64212	.12842	6.4816	7.0117	4.00	7.00
Accent	North East	2	7.0000	.00000	.00000	7.0000	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	South	20	6.7833	.42268	.09451	6.5855	6.9812	5.67	7.00
	West	1	7.0000	7.00	7.00
	I am from a country other than the U.S.	2	6.3333	.47140	.33333	2.0979	10.5687	6.00	6.67
	Total	25	6.7733	.41633	.08327	6.6015	6.9452	5.67	7.00

Table 3.15.2
Region Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	4.389	3	1.463	5.578	.006
	Within Groups	5.507	21	.262		
	Total	9.896	24			

Accent	Between Groups	.543	3	.181	1.052	.391
	Within Groups	3.617	21	.172		
	Total	4.160	24			

Table 3.16.1
Major Compared to Capability and Accent

		Descriptives							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Capability	SLPA	20	6.8333	.31990	.07153	6.6836	6.9831	6.00	7.00
	Other	5	6.4000	1.34164	.60000	4.7341	8.0659	4.00	7.00
	Total	25	6.7467	.64212	.12842	6.4816	7.0117	4.00	7.00
Accent	SLPA	20	6.8167	.38198	.08541	6.6379	6.9954	5.67	7.00
	Other	5	6.6000	.54772	.24495	5.9199	7.2801	6.00	7.00
	Total	25	6.7733	.41633	.08327	6.6015	6.9452	5.67	7.00

Table 3.16.2
Major Compared to Capability and Accent

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Capability	Between Groups	.751	1	.751	1.889	.183
	Within Groups	9.144	23	.398		
	Total	9.896	24			
Accent	Between Groups	.188	1	.188	1.087	.308
	Within Groups	3.972	23	.173		
	Total	4.160	24			

Table 3.17
Motivation for Course (General Education) Compared to Capability and Accent

		Group Statistics			
		Reason for Course: Gen Ed Requirement			
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Capability	It was a Gen Ed requirement	3	5.6667	1.52753	.88192
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.
Accent	It was a Gen Ed requirement	3	6.3333	.57735	.33333

2	0 ^a	.	.	.
---	----------------	---	---	---

a. t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.

Table 3.18

Motivation for Course (Major/Minor Requirement) Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

Reason for Course:		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Major/Minor Requirement					
Capability	It was required for my major/minor	19	6.8772	.25964	.05957
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.
Accent	It was required for my major/minor	19	6.8246	.39076	.08965
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.

a. t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.

Table 3.19

Motivation for Course (Interested in Subject) Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

Reason for Course:		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Interested in subject					
Capability	I find the subject matter interesting	4	6.9167	.16667	.08333
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.
Accent	I find the subject matter interesting	4	7.0000	.00000	.00000
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.

a. t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.

Table 3.20

Motivation for Course (Other) Compared to Capability and Accent

Group Statistics

Reason for Course: Other		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Other					
Capability	Other	2	7.0000	.00000	.00000
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.
Accent	Other	2	6.8333	.23570	.16667
	2	0 ^a	.	.	.

a. t cannot be computed because at least one of the groups is empty.