UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

HEARING RACE: THE EFFECTS OF RACE AND ACCENT ON LANGUAGE ATTITUDES AND INTERGROUP COMMUNICATION OUTCOMES

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

DORIS E. ACHEME
Norman, Oklahoma
2022

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/335958

HEARING RACE: THE EFFECTS OF RACE AND ACCENT ON LANGUAGE ATTITUDES

AND INTERGROUP COMMUNICATION OUTCOMES

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

BY THE COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF

Dr. Ioana A. Cionea, Chair

Dr. Elena Bessarabova

Dr. Meta G. Carstarphen

Dr. Claude Miller

Dr. Gretchen Montgomery

© Copyright by DORIS E. ACHEME 2022
All Rights Reserved.

DEDICATION

To my parents, Gloria and Godwin Acheme,

for your endless encouragement and support throughout my educational pursuit.

I hope that this achievement serves as a symbol of the fruit of your labor, sacrifices, and prayers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I sit and reflect upon the end of one season and the beginning of another, I am overwhelmed with thankfulness to God for the many people who have invested in my academic career in one way or the other. I have, indeed, been blessed with and fortunate to be surrounded by individuals who have supported me in all ramifications, be it intellectual, physical, emotional, and spiritual. And for that, I am eternally grateful.

I want to begin by expressing my profound gratitude to my amazing, incredible, and selfless advisor, Dr. Ioana Cionea. Dr. C., thank you so much for all that you have done for me, both as an academic and as a human. You've always believed in me—pushing and challenging me to grow and become a better scholar and person. Thank you for always giving me a listening ear, whether it was when I was developing research ideas; figuring out what classes to take; navigating the Ph. D. program and my academic career; applying to jobs and going on campus visits; trying to make sense of how to interpret my (mediation) data; (re)reading and editing my research papers and dissertation manuscript; and so many more instances. I am extremely grateful to you for your prompt email responses and your very detailed feedback. Thank you for never failing to be my second pair of eyes, ears, and brain😊. My Ph.D. endeavor would not have been possible without your unending and relentless support and encouragement. I am happy and grateful that I had you to go through the program with. You are the best advisor and mentor anyone could ask for. You are awesome!!!

I also want to express my gratitude to Dr. Gretchen Montgomery. I like to think that you were brought to OU in your first few years for me. Not only do both our research interests in intergroup communication align, but also in language attitudes—how amazing! Gretchen, I have enjoyed every moment I have spent with you, particularly the times when you pushed and

questioned my thinking about (social psychological) intergroup processes. Thank you for being a sounding board whenever I needed to orally process ideas or even interpret research results. I am grateful to you for being honest with me about what a career as a tenure-track professor would look like and preparing me for that. Words cannot express how grateful I am for your constant support and encouragement over the few years you have been here at OU. I am looking forward to our future collaborations and also growing our friendship. Thanks, lady!

To Dr. Claude Miller, I want to express my deepest gratitude for being an exceptional and exemplarily experimental researcher. Claude, I have always admired how critical and smart you are when it comes to designing experiments. That was the reason why I decided to not only audit your undergraduate class but also enroll in an independent study with you and join the research teams that you led. In almost all the research meetings that we have had, I always learned something from you about design and/or data analyses. I believe you like to make moments with your students "teachable" ones, and I appreciate that about you. Thank you for the times when you listened to my ideas and challenged my thinking. I have enjoyed defending my perspectives/rationale to you. I am grateful for the times that you sat with me to run data analyses and discuss the results. I have learned so much from you and I appreciate you, sir.

I am extremely grateful to my other Dr. C—Meta Carstarphen for nurturing my research interest in racial ideologies and race relations. Dr. C, right from the time I took a class with you, we have had very stimulating conversations surrounding the social construction of race. You pushed me to think critically about the power dynamics underlying the social issues I am interested in exploring in my research. I have enjoyed every conversation that we have had, not only because you are a renowned scholar but also because you are a (critical) rhetorician. As a member of my committee, you brought a different perspective to the discussion and allowed us

(social scientists) to view things using different lenses. Thank you for your encouragement and support and for being a great example to me as a Black woman starting her career in academia. I am thankful for you, ma'am.

To Dr. Elena Bessarabova, I would like to express my sincere thanks to you for all your support, starting from when I took "introduction to quantitative methods" with you. I believe that my interest in quantitative methods grew as a result of taking that class with you. Of course, given that I took the class in my third semester, it felt like learning a foreign language, but after taking the class and going over the notes in my third year, a lot of things clicked for me. I realized how thorough you are as a professor and how you introduced us, early on, to foundational and key areas in post-positivist research. I have always admired how smart and yet very humble you are. Thank you for pushing me, especially when it came to research design. I am sincerely grateful to you and Dr. Banas for always supporting me and having my back and for always opening your home to me. I appreciate you both.

I couldn't have been able to undertake this endeavor without the endless support of my family. I am indebted to my family for their continued encouragement and prayers, especially being away from home all these years. Throughout my educational pursuits both in Nigeria and in the U.S., You have walked closely with me, never ceasing to support and have my back. You have persistently cheered me on and provided me with emotional, physical, material, and spiritual guidance. I am sincerely thankful to every one of you for encouraging me to pursue my dreams. Thank you so much for all the sacrifices you have made for me to be who I am today and to achieve this dream. I, honestly, wouldn't have been able to do this without your support and love. This achievement is not mine, but *ours*. Thank you!!!

Also, a special thanks to Afabwaje and Philip Kurian for all your encouragement and support. You guys rock! I am also eternally grateful for my church family—Redeemer Church. Thank you for being my home away from home and for supporting me throughout my Ph.D. program. You all have modelled what it looks like to be a follower of Jesus and I am thankful that I got to do life with you all.

Words cannot express my gratitude to my girl, Dr. Val Biwa. I am so thankful that our paths crossed when we met at the OU Showcase Seminar and, afterwards, decided to be roommates. I know that our meeting was orchestrated by God. I am glad that I had you to (literally) go through the Ph.D. program with. We have laughed together, cried together, dreamed together, and now, we start tenure-track positions together—how awesome! Thanks, Val, for being my family and for your relentless love and support. Additionally, I am extremely grateful to the members of my cohort, to all my friends, as well as folks from cohorts above me at OU, such as, Eryn Bostwick, Chris Anderson, Zach Massey, Pavitra Kavya, Jasmine Austin, Haijing Ma, Mizuki Wyant, Dolly Na-Yemeh, and the list goes on, for supporting me in one way or the other. Thank you also to all my professors, colleagues at OU Center for Faculty Excellence, and to my master's advisor, Dr. George Ray, for the roles you all played in my academic pursuit. I appreciate you all.

Finally, to my darling husband—Onjefu Ochai, I wouldn't have survived the Ph.D. program, particularly the last few years of my program without your unceasing support, prayers, and encouragement. Thank you for providing me with the steady emotional support that I need. I am sincerely grateful to you, babe, for being immersed in my research. You never complained whenever I needed someone to listen while I orally processed ideas and thoughts. You were there for me when I needed a shoulder to cry on, when I needed a pep talk, or whenever I needed to

just vent. You are my number one cheerleader and I do not take for granted all the times that you picked up the slack in the home front, particularly when I was working on my dissertation. I am thankful to God for blessing me with you and I am glad that it is you, babe, that I get to do life with. I love you.

"Praise God! from whom all blessings flow" – Rev. Thomas Ken

Table of Contents

Dedication……..... iv

Acknowledgments……..... v

Table of Contents……. x

List of Tables ……xii

Abstract……..……. xiv

Chapter 1 Introduction…….1

Chapter 2 Literature Review……11

Language Ideologies……..…11

History of the Term Race: Taxonomies of Humanity…….25

What is Race? …….34

Social Identity Theory …….46

Chapter 3: Material Generation and Pilot Studies ….…….....59

Stimulus Generation Process ……..…59

Part 1: Audio Sample Development…….……59

Part 2a: Pilot Study 1: Audio Samples Selection…….…….61

Part 2b: Pilot Study 2: Photographs Selection…….…….71

Chapter 4: Main Experimental Study ……...82

Main Experimental Study Method ……82

Main Experimental Study Results…….92

Analytic Strategies……..…….93

Hypothesis Testing……..…….95

Chapter 5: Discussion …….110

References ……...…147

Appendix A…….….177

Appendix B…….….178

Appendix C…….….183

List of Tables

Table 1. Sample Characteristics for Pilot Study 1: Prolific Sample Evaluating SAE Accents (*N* = 151) …….63

Table 2. Sample Characteristics for Pilot Study 1: Nigerian Sample Evaluating Nigerian Accents (*N* = 105) …….64

Table 3. Cronbach's α for Pilot Study 1 Prototypicality, Vocal Attractiveness Measures, Means and Standard Deviations …….67

Table 4: Sample Characteristics for Pilot Study 2: White Prolific Sample Evaluating White Photographs (*N* = 150) …….73

Table 5. Sample Characteristics for Pilot Study 2: Black Prolific Sample Evaluating Black Photographs (*N* = 152) …….74

Table 6. Cronbach's α for Pilot Study 2 Prototypicality, Physical Attractiveness Measures, Means, and Standard Deviations…….77

Table 7. Sample Characteristic for Main Study (*N* = 502) ……....83

Table 8: Means, Standard Deviations, Cronbach's α for Main Study Measures (*N* = 502). …..90

Table 9: Direct and Indirect Effects of Accent (*X*) on Symbolic Threat (*Y*) Through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3) …….98

Table 10: Direct and Indirect Effects of Accent (*X*) on Realistic Threat (*Y*) Through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3) …….98

Table 11: Direct and Indirect Effects of Accent (*X*) on Intergroup Anxiety (*Y*) Through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3) …….99

Table 12: Direct and Indirect Effects of Accent (*X*) on Social Distance (*Y*) Through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3) …….101

Table 13: Direct and Indirect Effects of Race (*X*) on Symbolic Threat (*Y*) Through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3) ……102

Table 14: Direct and Indirect Effects of Race (*X*) on Realistic Threat (*Y*) Through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3) ……103

Table 15: Direct and Indirect Effects of Race (*X*) on Intergroup Anxiety (*Y*) Through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3) ……104

Table 16: Direct and Indirect Effects of Race (*X*) on Social Distance (*Y*) Through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3) ……105

Table 17: Direct and Indirect Effects of Race and Accent (*X*) on Symbolic Threat (*Y*) Through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3) ……106

Table 18: Direct and Indirect Effects of Race and Accent (*X*) on Realistic Threat (*Y*) Through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3) ……107

Table 19: Direct and Indirect Effects of Race and Accent (*X*) on Intergroup Anxiety (*Y*) Through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3) ……108

Table 20: Direct and Indirect Effects of Race and Accent (*X*) on Social Distance (*Y*) Through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3) ……109

Abstract

Relying on assumptions from social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), alongside integrated threat theory and intersectionality framework/theory, this dissertation investigated how speakers are socially categorized based on their accents (i.e., SAE [Standard American English] accent vs. Nigerian accent) and race (i.e., White vs. Black) separately and concurrently (i.e., White-SAE vs. Black-Nigerian) as well as the intergroup outcomes (i.e., symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance) of these social categorizations, as mediated by language attitudes (i.e., evaluations of status, solidarity, and dynamism). Several pilot studies were conducted to generate pretest stimuli for the main experimental study. Audio samples were first generated, and photographs were selected for use in the dissertation study. Pilot Study 1 was conducted to pre-test and examine the prototypicality of both the SAE (N = 151) and Nigerian (N = 105) accents (while controlling for vocal attractiveness). Based on results from this pilot study, six final accent samples from the initial 14 samples gathered were selected for use in the main study. Pilot Study 2 pre-tested the prototypicality of White (N = 150) and Black (N = 152) male photographs (while controlling for physical attractiveness). Based on results from this pilot study, six final photographs (from the original 24 photographs) were selected for use in the main dissertation study.

For the main study, an experiment randomly assigning participants (N = 502) to one of 18 conditions (i.e., either accent-only, race-only, or accent-race conditions) examined the direct and indirect effects of accent, race, and accent and race combined on symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance, as mediated by evaluations of status, solidarity, and dynamism. In the accent-only condition, participants were presented with an audio-recoding of either an SAE or a Nigerian accented speaker reading a passage of prose about rainbows. In the

race-only conditions, a photograph of a White or Black male accompanied by the same rainbow passage was presented. Finally, in the accent-race conditions, participants were presented with either a photograph of a White male together with an audio-recording of an SAE accented speaker reading the rainbow passage or a photograph of a Black male together with an audio-recording of a Nigerian accented speaker reading the rainbow passage. After stimuli exposure, manipulation checks were first presented to participants, then participants were asked to answer a battery of measures, namely, speech evaluation instrument, symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, social distance, exoticism, exposure to diverse individuals, attitudes toward African immigrants, and demographic questions.

Findings revealed that, for the accent-only conditions, the SAE accent was evaluated more favorably than the Nigerian accent on the dimension of status. Also, status was found to mediate the relationship between accent and symbolic threat. For the race-only conditions, results indicated that Black males were rated higher on solidarity and dynamism compared to White males. For the accent-race conditions, status mediated the relationship between the combined accent and race of a speaker and symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance. In other words, lower status evaluations for Black-Nigerian accented speaker resulted in higher feelings of symbolic threat, greater intergroup anxiety, and more social distance from Black-Nigerian accented speakers, in general. The dissertation's findings are discussed as they pertain to social categorization, stereotyping, intergroup communication outcomes, ideological beliefs about language use and racial cues, as well as the role that socio-cultural context plays in intergroup relations. Additionally, the theoretical and practical implications of the dissertation are discussed as they concern social identity markers of accent, race, and the intersectionality of

accent and race in intergroup communication. Lastly, the limitations of the dissertation study are acknowledged and directions for future research are proposed.

Keywords: Accents, race, social categorization, intersectionality, intergroup communication outcomes

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

It is not our differences that divide us. It is our inability to recognize, accept, and celebrate those differences.

– Audre Lorde

Globalization has allowed for more and more contact with individuals who speak different languages, with different accents, and has also facilitated interactions with people from a variety of cultural and racial backgrounds. In the United States (U.S., hereafter), there is a growing trend towards a more multicultural and multiracial population. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2020), since 2010, there has been an increase of about 33.8 million people (i.e., a 276% increase) who identify as multiracial (i.e., Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, and more than one race), whereas the White population has declined by 8.6%. Additionally, the Current Population Survey (2021) reported that the total immigrant population in the U.S. reached 46.2 million, the highest number ever recorded in U.S. American history (Census Bureau, 2021). In addition, the American Community Survey reported that about 66 million U.S. residents (i.e., native-born, legal immigrants, and undocumented immigrants) reported speaking a language other than English at home (Census Bureau, 2020). These statistics indicate the high likelihood of interacting with immigrants and/or individuals who speak English with different language varieties as well as those who identify with or are classified into different racial categories.

In face-to-face interactions, there is a plethora of observable information (e.g., accents, race) readily available to interlocutors (Stroessner, 1996). Individuals often rely on some of these observable features to anticipate the communication patterns and behaviors of their interaction partners (Burgoon, 1993), as well the trajectory and outcome of their communication. Interlocutors also use observable information to make sense of (Manusov & Spitzberg, 2008) and

evaluate each other's actions (Stroessner, 1996). One area of research focusing on such evaluations is rooted in language use, wherein explanations are sought for why and how individuals evaluate others based on their language variety (e.g., accents). Specifically, *language attitudes* research focuses on the ideologies and evaluative responses to language varieties and their users (Dragojevic, 2018). With origins in social psychology, the study of language attitudes is concerned with the social meanings attached to language and its users (Dragojevic et al., 2021). Research on language attitudes reports that individuals are socially categorized into different societal groups based on their language use/choices and are then ascribed language-based attributes and stereotypes (i.e., perceived status, solidarity, and dynamism) inferred from group membership (e.g., Birney et al., 2020). An area of interest to language attitudes scholars is the evaluations of so-called standard and non-standard accented speakers. Research reveals that, within the U.S., listeners often socially categorize individuals who speak with the Standard American English (SAE, hereafter) accent, an example of a standard accent, as U.S. American, and other non-U.S. accented speakers as foreign, or as having non-U.S. American identity (Dragojevic & Goatley-Soan, 2020). Similarly, the language-based stereotypes attributed to standard accented speakers are usually more favorable compared to those ascribed to non-standard accented speakers (e.g., Birney et al., 2020; Montgomery & Acheme, 2022).

Most research on language attitudes has focused on documenting how accented speakers are perceived, but there is limited research on how these language-based stereotypes impact intergroup communication outcomes (for a review, see Dragojevic et al., 2021). Specifically, research investigating how language attitudes further affect communicative outcomes (e.g., intergroup threat, anxiety, social distance) is scarce. In their comprehensive review of language attitudes research, Dragojevic and colleagues (2021) assert that language attitudes mediate the

relationship between linguistic variation and more distal outcomes, acknowledging that, "admittedly this assumption is only rarely tested explicitly" (p. 67). Indeed, scant research has examined whether language attitudes mediate the effects of accents on intergroup communicative outcomes. Accordingly, the goal of this dissertation is to examine how language-based stereotypes shape intergroup communication outcomes. I contend that simply documenting language attitudes as a "key output of interest" (Dragojevic et al., 2021, p. 67) is inadequate for providing explanations of how language-based attitudes impact communication outcomes. Thus, this dissertation seeks to provide insights into the underlying processes that shape intergroup outcomes. Additionally, I argue that attitudes toward accented speakers can function as explanatory mechanisms that shed light onto the nature of intergroup communication. In other words, language-based stereotypes explain the relationship between language use and a multitude of intergroup communicative outcomes such as symbolic and realistic threats, intergroup anxiety, and social distance.

Furthermore, a plethora of studies have investigated evaluations toward standard versus non-standard accented speakers in various contexts, including media (Dragojevic et al., 2016), educational institutions (Adebayo & Allen, 2020), job candidates (Hansen, Rakić, & Steffens, 2017) immigration and acculturation settings (Montgomery & Zhang, 2018), and religion (Rakić et al., 2020), amongst others. Within the U.S., several studies have examined the evaluations of SAE accents relative to non-standard (non-U.S.) accents, such as the Indian Tamil accent (Montgomery & Acheme, 2022), Venezuelan Spanish accent (Díaz-Campos, 2012), and Hispanic, Arabic, Mandarin, and Vietnamese accents (Dragojevic & Goatley-Soan, 2020), to mention only a few.

Although the aforementioned studies have examined attitudes toward racial minority members and non-standard accented speakers, none of these studies have investigated the role race plays in language attitudes. To the best of the author's knowledge, no study within the context of the U.S. (except Kinzler et al., 2009, who examined children's language attitudes) has investigated the independent and combined effects of accents and race on language attitudes. Therefore, it is likely that past research on language attitudes, conducted within a U.S. context, has engaged a color-blind ideological perspective (i.e., examining situations that do not explicitly acknowledge an individual's race), despite the significant history of race and racial tensions between Whites and Blacks in the U.S. (e.g., Acheme & Cionea, 2021; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005).

Because both accent and race can impact others within interactions, I assert in this dissertation assert that there is an intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989) of accent and race in the evaluation of speakers. Thus, singling out these social identities limits the understanding of their combined effects on intergroup outcomes, particularly in the U.S. where race is pervasive, playing an important role in social interactions (e.g., Acheme & Cionea, 2021; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005). Stated differently, narrowly examining the effects of accents on intergroup outcomes likely restricts insights into the effects of race, especially because individuals have multiple social identities conveyed within interactions (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

As a product of colonial encounters, race may be thought of as a particular way of viewing purported difference in humans. The notion of race assumes that humans can be divided into discrete and exclusive categories, usually based on physical differences in physiognomy, such as skin color, hair texture, nose shape, and lip thickness (Golash-Boza, 2015; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005). Within the U.S., the bases of racial differences were used as justifications for

dividing and ranking humans, and for subjugation, dominance over, and exploitation of certain racial groups such as Blacks and Native peoples. European Whites were at the top of the racial hierarchy, whereas Blacks were at the bottom of the racial hierarchy (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005). Even today, the U.S. Census includes seven racial categories in which individuals are classified, namely, White; Black or African American; American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; some other race; and two or more races (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020). These racial classifications are based on supposed physical differences. Although physical differences among human physiognomy are not "biological," there are social meanings and connotations ascribed to members of different racial groups that condition individuals to react, sometimes unconsciously, to members of different racial groups (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005; Tonry, 2011).

Of particular interest to this dissertation are the White and Black racial classifications. Blacks are the second-largest racial minority group in the U.S. (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020), and, given the history of slavery in the U.S., they have had a tumultuous past. As a way of justifying slavery—a profitable endeavor in the 19th century, White European slaveowners downgraded Africans/Blacks as permanent slaves, taking away their freedom and humanity (Allen, 1994; A. Smedley, 1999b). Soon, several connotations emerged for what being "White" signified (e.g., the so-called "pure" unmarked, and invisible category; Dryer, 1997; Hartigan, 1997; Omi & Winant, 1994) and what "Blackness" implied (e.g., "impure" marked, and visible category). The White/Black racial dichotomy has been rigidly defined, such that a drop of Black blood "adulterated" the pure White individual (Omi & Winant, 1994). Thus, being White or Black sets expectations for how individuals ought to behave, whether they are explicitly conscious of these expectations or not (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012).

There are characteristics and stereotypes of Whites and Blacks portrayed in and perpetuated by the media (Bramlett-Solomon & Carstarphen, 2018), which affect intergroup communication between Whites and Blacks. For instance, Feagin (2005) reported that 90% of Whites associated the faces of Blacks with negative words and traits. Similarly, Feagin and McKinley (2003) reported that 80% of their study's Black participants had encountered hostility in public places. Additionally, according to Hamel and colleagues (2020), about 41% of Blacks reported being stopped or detained by police because of their race. Such findings indicate racial features and cues are not only often used to socially categorize others, but often to ascribe to them characteristics and stereotypes, evaluating various outcomes (e.g., perceived threat, dissociation, hostility). Thus, the stereotypes attributed to individuals based on their racial features have detrimental consequences that affect intergroup relations (e.g., Hamel et al., 2020). Consequently, it is asserted in this dissertation that because racial cues are used to socially categorize individuals, and because race has an ugly history in the U.S., examining the effects race has on language attitudes is essential for understanding intergroup relations. Moreover, in most face-to-face interactions, people are seen *and* heard, meaning their race, *in addition* to their accent, affects evaluations. Therefore, employing a color-blind stance in language attitudes research risks ignoring the significant role race plays in social categorization.

Relying on assumptions from social identity theory (SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), alongside integrated threat theory (ITT; Stephan & Stephan, 2000) and intersectionality framework/theory (Crenshaw, 1989), the purpose of this dissertation is to examine the independent and combined effects of accent and race on intergroup communication outcomes centered on the effects of language-based stereotypes (i.e., language attitudes). Stated differently, this dissertation investigates how speakers may be categorized based on their accents (i.e., SAE

accent vs. Nigerian accent) and race (i.e., White vs. Black) separately and concurrently (i.e., White-SAE vs. Black-Nigerian), and the intergroup outcomes of these social categorizations, as mediated by language attitudes.

These aspects are important to study for several reasons. First, in most intergroup interactions, people see their interaction partners and socially categorize them (Acheme, 2021), before verbally communicating with them. Hence, both physical (i.e., race) and vocal characteristics (i.e., accents) are encountered and simultaneously processed in interactions (Paladino & Mazzurega, 2020), and may, consequently, impact the trajectory of a communication episode. Given the pervasiveness of race in the U.S., and social group markers elicited from physical and language cues, investigating the independent and combined effects of accents and race can provide important insights into social categorization processes and intergroup outcomes. Second, only a few experimental studies have directly tested the combined effects of accents and race on the evaluative responses of adult listeners (e.g., Hansen, Rakić, & Steffens, 2017; Hansen, Steffens et al., 2017; Paladino & Mazzurega, 2020; Rakić et al., 2011). These studies explored whether accents and race are cues to ingroup categorization processes. Using different social group categories, such as German and Turkish (in Hansen, Rakić, & Steffens, 2017; Hansen, Steffens et al., 2017), German and Italian (in Rakić et al., 2011), and native and non-native Italians (in Paladino & Mazzurega, 2020), the researchers investigated how listeners categorized others in terms of visual and verbal cues. It is important to note that, although these studies acknowledged and found support for the intersection of race and accent as important cues of social group membership, they did not investigate the direct and indirect effects these social categorization processes can have on intergroup communication outcomes.

It is argued in this dissertation that examining the intersection of race and accent on intergroup outcomes is important because insights may be gained into how social categorization can shape communication outcomes. For instance, investigating the combined effects of race and accents can provide explanations for the underlying processes that impact individuals' feelings of anxiety as well as social distance toward Black accented speakers. Third, only a few studies (e.g., Roessel et al., 2019) have investigated the mediating role language-based stereotypes play in the relationship between accents and race and intergroup outcomes. Thus, this dissertation seeks to add to this important line of research by shedding light on the role social identity markers play in intergroup outcomes and how marked, abstract, and socially constructed categories within society can often have detrimental consequences. Fourth, understanding the independent and combined impact of accent and race on intergroup outcomes has practical applications in areas such as employment, education, healthcare, the judiciary, and interpersonal relationships, where interventions or trainings can be developed to help mitigate stereotyped attitudes based on these characteristics. Insights into such intergroup processes can also provide an understanding of how individuals react and respond to dissimilar others and facilitate ways of decreasing the stigma, threats/apprehension, and prejudice attached to non-standard varieties and racial minority groups in the U.S., as well as improve intergroup relations.

For this dissertation, the Nigerian accent was chosen for comparison relative to the SAE accent for several reasons. First, Nigeria is the largest source of African immigrants to the U.S. (Tamir & Anderson from the Pew Research Center, 2022). Also, Nigerian immigrants are reported to be highly educated, actively engaged in the workforce, and often considered a successful ethnic group (Fosco, 2018). Second, Nigeria is the most populous African country, and a predominantly Black nation, which suggests Nigerian accented speakers are likely to be

socially categorized as Blacks, based on their phenotype (see Acheme & Cionea, 2021) and as non-U.S. Americans based on their accents. Furthermore, English is the official language in Nigeria (World Population Review, 2021), meaning that most Nigerians grew up speaking English either as a first language (L1) or second language (L2), albeit with a non-SAE accent. Thus, this dissertation experimentally uses the Nigerian accent as a comparison group to investigate attitudes toward (Black) Nigerian accented speakers relative to (White) SAE accented speakers and their effects on intergroup outcomes. This endeavor can provide insight into the evaluation of individuals who also grow up speaking English as SAE speakers, which is an understudied area as well.

Finally, language attitudes research investigating attitudes toward African accents is scarce. Past research has focused on examining accents from most other continents such as Asia, South America, Europe, North America, and Australia (e.g., Dragojevic & Goatley-Soan, 2020; Montgomery & Acheme, 2022; Paladino & Mazzurega, 2020); however, African accents have received little attention. Hence, this dissertation examines the Nigerian accent, an example of an African accent, in an effort to contribute knowledge to language attitudes research regarding the language-based stereotypes U.S. listeners have toward African accents, and to document attitudes toward one such accent.

In what follows, Chapter 2 reviews literature on language and racial ideologies, situating this study within the power dynamics that surround beliefs regarding language use and racial categories. Research questions and hypotheses are also posed in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 presents the pilot studies that guided the stimuli generation process as well as the results of these studies. Chapter 4 presents the method of the main experimental study and its results. Chapter 5 discusses the findings of the main study as they pertain to accents, race, and the intersectionality of accents

and race in intergroup communication outcomes. The theoretical and practical implications of the findings are also discussed as are limitations and directions for future research.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

I have traveled more than anyone else, and I have noticed that even the angels speak English with an accent.

– Mark Twain

Language Ideologies

Language ideologies are general beliefs, principles, or viewpoints people hold about language users and usage. Language ideologies reflect perceptions about the characteristics of language and ideas about social and linguistic relationships (Irvine, 1989). Humans create and are socialized into language ideologies as a way of explaining the basis and meaning of the association between social and linguistic phenomena (Dragojevic et al., 2013). Language ideologies characterize the framework through which individuals perceive, explain, and understand the relationship between language and society. For instance, in initial interactions with members of a different linguistic group, language ideologies serve as a lens through which individuals form impressions of the others' linguistic choice(s) and a frame for managing uncertainty and anxiety. Therefore, language ideologies provide the organizational and socio-cultural framework through which linguistic difference is "viewed, interpreted, and evaluated" in interactions (Dragojevic et al., 2013, p. 11). In the literature, language ideologies have been categorized into three main types, related to each other, based on socio-cultural beliefs individuals hold about language use and its users. These language ideologies include the nationalist ideology, nativeness as an ideology, and the standard language ideology.

The *nationalist ideology* naturalizes the association between language and nationality (Dragojevic et al., 2013). It is the belief that a specific language is a natural extension of national identity (Gal & Irvine, 1995), thereby associating a language with its people. In other words, the

nationalist ideology is the belief that language is central to its people and represents their national and cultural identity. According to the nationalist ideology, language is often viewed as the property of nation states and nationhood legitimacy issues (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). However, the proliferation of (different varieties of) English around the world (e.g., American English, Nigerian English) challenges notions of language ownership and legitimacy of any single nation (Dragojevic et al., 2013). For instance, English can be a property of the Nigerian nation, where it is the official language (World Population Review, 2021), as much as it is the property of monolingual U.S. America. Moreover, given that multiculturalism is becoming a norm in many countries (Maher et al., 2010), and the association between language and nationhood is taking on new meanings (Dragojevic et al., 2013), the traditional belief that a monolingual/ethnic nation state exists is questionable (Maher, 2005).

The second ideology, the *nativeness ideology*, stems from the nationalist ideology, which assumes a monolingual view of the world – but goes a step further, by dividing the world into two mutually exclusive linguistic categories: "us" and "them" (Giles, 2012; Giles et al., 2010a; Harwood et al., 2008). "Us" denotes native speakers of a language, whereas "them" references non-native speakers of that language. In the U.S., this linguistic categorization translates into native English speakers being perceived as U.S. born Americans and non-native English speakers being perceived as foreign-accented or foreign others (Schmidt, 2002), even in situations where these so-called foreign others' primary language is also English (Dragojevic et al., 2013; Shuck, 2004).

The nativeness ideology encapsulates beliefs that there is a natural connection between speakers and their language, according to which native speakers are classified as native and comprehensible, whereas non-native speakers are categorized as foreign and incomprehensible

(Dragojevic et al., 2013). Thus, discourse about language is often racialized such that native speakers are viewed as U.S. American, White, and accent-neutral, whereas non-native speakers are conceptualized as international, non-White, and accented (Shuck, 2004, 2006). Beliefs about nativeness result in ascribing native speakers with socially desirable attributes (e.g., competent and intelligent) and non-native speakers with socially undesirable qualities (e.g., incompetent and unintelligent). These beliefs about the so-called natural connection between language and its users become subtle weapons of dissociation and exclusion used by the masses and social institutions to control access to social rewards such as friendliness/affection and communicative attention (Dragojevic et al., 2013).

The third ideology, the *standard language ideology,* follows from the nationalist and nativeness ideologies in that it is derived based on beliefs relating to so-called ownership of a language and a monolingual view of the world. It is the belief that there is only one correct form of speaking and writing in a given language. This so-called correct form is called the *standard variety.* Although notions of correctness are ideological and are not rooted in linguistic fact, the standard variety serves as the model against which all other supposedly *non-standard varieties* of written and spoken languages (i.e., those who deviate in some form from the "correct" manner of speaking and writing) are judged (Dragojevic et al., 2013). The standard variety is an idealized form, usually drawn from the "spoken language of the upper middle class" (Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 67). Even though language is variable, and all its varieties have the potential to be equally functional (Dragojevic et al., 2013; Lippi-Green, 1997), the standard language ideology imposes an artificial uniformity on languages because it implies that speakers should adopt a "correct" and identical way of speaking and writing. Thus, the standard language ideology is a belief about what language ought to be, in terms of usage, as opposed to what language is (Irvine & Gal,

2000), thereby creating an artificially "homogenous linguistic landscape" (Dragojevic et al., 2013, p. 8) that denies the variability of language. Furthermore, standard varieties are officially recognized as legitimate forms by governments and are promoted by educational institutions and the media. However, this recognition and promotion does not imply these varieties inherently possess any superior linguistic qualities compared to non-standard varieties (J. Milroy, 2001). Standard varieties acquire prestige because they are usually associated with speakers of high socio-economic status (Dragojevic et al., 2013). The rationale behind the standardization of a language is the belief that the standard language is associated with clarity of expression and that it allows for effective communication (Dragojevic et al., 2013; Lippi-Green, 2012).

The aforementioned ideologies about language users and usage are rooted in power dynamics within societies. Language ideologies are now accepted by laypeople as a given because socio-cultural expectations and norms produced by these beliefs are ingrained in public consciousness (Dragojevic et al., 2013). Government policies, media representations, and educational practices promote such ideologies about language users and usage. Thus, these power structures condone the private and public expression of attitudes consistent with such prevailing language ideologies, which results in the derogation of individuals and groups who fail to conform linguistically to the prescribed beliefs. Therefore, language ideologies (re)produce systems of domination and subordination within society. Since ideological beliefs are not only cognitive but are also expressed through attitudes, they impact interactions between members of different speech communities in the form of language attitudes. In other words, people develop attitudes about others based on their language use. In the section below, I review language attitudes literature, discussing what language attitudes are, how they are developed, and situate the present dissertation within this interdisciplinary line of research.

Language Attitudes

Language attitudes are evaluative reactions to different language varieties (e.g., accents; Dragojevic, 2018). They consist of cognitive (i.e., people's beliefs about different varieties), affective (i.e., people's feelings toward different varieties), and behavioral (i.e., people's behavioral predispositions/intentions to different varieties) components. Attitudes toward a given language variety may include one or more of these components. Furthermore, language attitudes are developed at a young age. Children, irrespective of whether they are White or non-White, develop attitudes (e.g., prejudice) very young (Aboud & Amato, 2003). Research shows that sensitivity to language varieties begins at birth. Infants can distinguish between the maternal language and a non-maternal language (Mehler et al., 1988). Kinzler and colleagues (2007) found that, by the time infants were five months old, they looked longer at individuals who spoke with the same language variety as their primary caregivers than at those who spoke with an unfamiliar language variety. At 10 to 12 months, a clear preference for individuals who spoke in their maternal language variety was found. Infants were more likely to accept toys offered by native (as opposed to non-native) language speakers (Kinzler et al., 2007). The findings of Kinzler et al. indicate that socialization and familiarity impact language attitudes.

Language attitudes continue to develop into childhood. For instance, preschoolers prefer to have native-accented speakers as friends and tend to trust them more than non-native and foreign accented speakers (Kinzler et al., 2007, 2011). By the first few years of elementary school, most children hold the same language attitudes as adults, upholding relevant standard varieties and associating them with positive stereotypes (Dragojevic et al., 2021). From the foregoing, it can be noticed that the development of language attitudes for children is a function of socialization, in that children show a preference for individuals from their linguistic ingroup.

Language attitudes are not innate. They are acquired through overt and covert messages about language users and usage (Dragojevic et al., 2021). In schools, messages about the value of language and its users are communicated and promoted. Language varieties with high prestige serve as the medium of instruction and are prescribed as appropriate forms of speaking and writing (J. Milroy & L. Milroy, 1999). In the same vein, in interactions, overt messages about the "proper" way to speak can come from parents, peers, and the media (Dragojevic et al., 2021; Marlow & Giles, 2010). Thus, the development of language attitudes is a function of nurture as opposed to nature because it is impacted by interactions with institutions as well as individuals.

There are two hypotheses that explain why different language varieties elicit different evaluative responses, namely, the inherent value hypothesis and the social connotation hypothesis (Edwards, 1999). The *inherent value hypothesis* posits that language attitudes reflect intrinsic differences between language varieties, meaning that some languages have certain linguistic or aesthetic superiority. In explaining the inherent value hypothesis, Dragojevic (2018) exemplifies beliefs about aesthetic quality such that, "the reason variety 'A' is evaluated more favorably than variety 'B' is because variety 'A' inherently sounds better or is more correct or logical than variety 'B'" (p. 4). However, empirical studies have established that the aesthetic quality of a given language variety is not due to an inherent value but results from imposed norms within society (e.g., speakers with a high socio-economic status). The *social connotation hypothesis* suggests that language attitudes concern social perceptions about speakers of a given language variety, rather than any inherent differences between varieties. Thus, one language variety is evaluated more favorably than another because of the social meanings (e.g., more competent or intelligent) attached to members of the latter (Dragojevic, 2018). Existing research on language attitudes primarily supports the social connotation hypothesis (for a discussion see,

Dragojevic et al., 2013; Dragojevic, 2021). In the section that follows, the present study is positioned within past research regarding evaluative reactions to accented speakers and the mechanisms underlying language attitudes.

Accents: Standard vs. Non-Standard

Accents are variations in the pronunciation of a language (Fuertes et al., 2012), including the function of suprasegmentals such as pitch, stress, and speech rate (Kang, 2010). Accents are primarily classified as *standard* or *non-standard*. Standard accents (or standard language varieties) "are those that adhere to codified norms defining correct spoken and written usage" (Dragojevic, 2018, p. 9), whereas non-standard accents (or non-standard language varieties) depart from such codified norms in some manner (Dragojevic, 2018). The distinction between standard and non-standard accents is impacted by the socio-cultural context in which the communication occurs, meaning that both standard and non-standard accents are socially constructed. Thus, examples of standard accents include SAE (in the U.S.) and Received Pronunciation (in the United Kingdom). In the U.S., examples of non-standard accents include regional (e.g., Southern American English), ethnic (e.g., African American Vernacular English), and non-native national accents (e.g., Nigerian accent), which are identified based on the nationality of speakers, as opposed to specific regions within the country from which the accent emerges, as is the case for the first two examples. In this dissertation non-standard accents are used to refer to non-native national accents.

As discussed earlier, the non-native national (non-standard) accent of interest in this dissertation is the Nigerian accent. It is important to note that there are over 500 languages spoken in Nigeria (World Population Review, 2021), and each language has its phonemes and way of speaking, which impacts how English is produced by members of different

cultural/language groups in the country. Although most Nigerians grow up speaking English as their L1 or L2 as a result of colonization by the British (World Population Review, 2021), many Nigerians also grow up speaking their native language at home (Statista, 2020). This means that, compared to the U.S. where there is a *standard* U.S. American accent, in Nigeria, there is no *standard* Nigerian accent. The English language sounds differently when spoken depending on what cultural group and region a Nigerian is from, and due to the transfer of phonemes from one's native language to the English language. Thus, there are numerous Nigerian accents. For the present dissertation, the Yoruba accent was chosen for comparison relative to the SAE accent because the Yoruba language is one of the dominant languages in Nigeria (Statista, 2020). Also, in the U.S., Yoruba immigrants are one of the largest ethnic groups from Nigeria (Migration Policy Institute, 2015). In the section that follows, I discuss the social and cognitive process triggered by speaking with a (standard or non-standard) accent.

Accents: Social and Cognitive Processes

An accent can serve as a cue to an individual's social origins and is an indicator of social group membership. Speaking with an accent may constitute an important aspect of an individual's social identity, conveying significant social information in interactions (Edwards, 1999; Giles & Johnson, 1987). In intergroup interactions, when a non-standard accent is detected, certain category cues are triggered, and this activation happens unconsciously and automatically. Automatic categorizations occur because of the basic properties of the information processing system, such as attending, encoding, storing, and retrieving (Oakes, 2003). Such categorization can impact the evaluations of accented speakers.

There are at least two sequential cognitive processes that are triggered when an accent is detected: social categorization and stereotyping (Dragojevic, 2016). First, with respect to social

categorization, listeners use accents to infer a speaker's social group membership. Language-based categorization is a fast and automatic process that often occurs outside individuals' conscious awareness (Kinzler et al., 2010). Past research indicates that U.S. American listeners tend to categorize non-SAE accents as foreign or outgroup members, resulting in ascribing the SAE accent with a U.S. American identity, and non-native national accents with a non-U.S. American identity (Dragojevic & Goatley-Soan, 2020). In this dissertation, I assert that Nigerian speakers are likely to be categorized as outsiders and with a non-U.S. American identity. Second, based on social categorization, listeners attribute accented speakers with stereotypic traits associated with and inferred from group membership (i.e., stereotyping). Language-based stereotypes have been organized along three dimensions, namely, *status* (i.e., evaluations of a speaker's intelligence, competence, and social class), *dynamism* (i.e., evaluations of a speaker's level of activity and liveliness), and *solidarity* (i.e., evaluations of a speaker's attractiveness, benevolence, and trustworthiness; Dragojevic, 2018; Dragojevic & Giles, 2016; Giles & Billings, 2004). Different accents are associated with different stereotypes along the status, solidarity, and dynamism dimensions.

Evaluations of status, which is also dubbed "superiority" (e.g., Yaw & Kang, 2021), are based primarily on perceived socioeconomic status. Standard accents tend to be associated with dominant socioeconomic groups within society, whereas non-standard accents tend to be associated with subordinate socioeconomic groups (Dragojevic, 2018; Giles & Marlow, 2011). Therefore, standard accented speakers are typically evaluated higher on the status dimension than non-standard accented speakers (e.g., Birney et al., 2020; Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010a). Additionally, stereotypes associated with a group's dynamism are reflective of the group's

vivacity. Past research has reported that standard accented speakers are evaluated more favorably on the dynamism dimension than non-standard accented speakers (Acheme & Cionea, 2021).

Furthermore, solidarity has been examined in two ways in previous research. First, solidarity has been explored as the reflection of ingroup loyalty and feelings of affiliation with the ingroup. The use of ingroup speech styles enhances feelings of solidarity within one's own linguistic community, resulting in the social stigmatization of individuals who fail to use ingroup accent (Giles et al., 1977). Thus, ingroup members are likely to evaluate speakers of the same accent as them higher than they evaluate speakers with a different accent. Second, solidarity, which is also dubbed "social attractiveness" (e.g., Yaw & Kang, 2021), has been used to describe evaluations pertaining to the social attractiveness of accents. There are mixed findings regarding ratings of solidarity/social attractiveness of non-standard accents. Some studies have found non-standard accents to be evaluated less favorably than standard accents on social attractiveness (e.g., Cargile & Giles, 1998; Dragojevic, 2018). Others report non-standard accents to be rated more favorably on social attractiveness than standard accents (e.g., Acheme & Cionea, 2022; Edwards, 1982).

The present study operationalizes solidarity as social attractiveness because of its focus on the evaluation of non-standard accented speakers, who, in this case, strongly tend to be socially categorized by U.S. American listeners as non-U.S. American (i.e., outgroup members), resulting in stereotypes of how socially attractive speakers sound. Given the support found for evaluations of speakers based on status, solidarity, and dynamism, it is expected that U.S. American listeners will evaluate SAE speakers more favorably on all three dimensions relative to the Nigerian accented speakers. As a result of this reasoning, and considering empirical findings reported earlier, the following hypothesis is posed:

H1: Relative to Nigerian accented speakers, SAE accented speakers will be evaluated higher on (a) status (b) solidarity, and (c) dynamism.

Furthermore, past language attitudes research has rarely tested whether language-based stereotypes (captured by attitudes regarding status, dynamism, and solidarity) mediate the relationship between accents and intergroup outcomes (Dragojevic et al., 2021). This dissertation addresses this lacuna by proposing that such evaluations lead to communicative outcomes—that is, status, dynamism, and solidarity function as mediators of the relationship between accents (i.e., SAE and non-SAE) and intergroup outcomes, as detailed below.

Language Attitude Outcomes

Individuals' perceptions of accented speech shed light on the relationship between members of different social groups and can impact communicative outcomes. For instance, past research has reported that language attitudes affect the evaluation of personality types (Cargile & Giles, 1998), media portrayal (Dragojevic et al., 2016), stigmatization and discrimination (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010b; Roessel et al., 2019), ethnocentrism (Neuliep & Speten-Hansen, 2013), social attraction (Montgomery & Zhang, 2018), religion (Rakić et al., 2020), sexuality (Preddie & Biernat, 2021), and ethnicity (Hansen, Rakić, & Steffens 2017; Hansen, Steffens et al., 2017), amongst other variables. These studies have found support for the argument that various judgments are cued as a result of hearing someone speak with an accent. Several communicative outcomes that have been explored by past intercultural and intergroup research, focusing on attitudes toward immigrants and minority group members have been chosen for use in the present dissertation study to explore language attitudes, as discussed below.

Intergroup Threats and Anxiety. Within the intergroup communication literature, various variables such as intergroup contact (Allport, 1954) and parasocial relationships (Park,

2012; Schiappa et al., 2005), for instance, have been examined to understand the relationship between members of different social groups. Other variables have included intergroup threats and intergroup anxiety, which are also examined in the present dissertation, specifically as they pertain to language attitudes. Intergroup threats and anxiety are examined in the present dissertation due to their well-documented role in explaining communicative outcomes involving immigrant and minority group members, which relates to the present dissertation's focus on Nigerian, non-SAE speakers. ITT (Stephan & Stephan, 2000) provides a framework for understanding the role perceived threats and feelings of anxiety play in intergroup interactions. The crux of ITT is that individuals expect outgroup members to behave in ways that are detrimental to the ingroup, resulting in dissociative behaviors and negative outcomes (e.g., prejudice) toward outgroup members (Stephan et al., 2002). According to ITT, four types of threats exist namely, intergroup anxiety, symbolic threats, realistic threats, and negative stereotypes (Stephan et al., 2009).

Intergroup anxiety stems from feelings of discomfort experienced while interacting with outgroup members. These feelings arise due to concerns over or anticipation of negative intergroup outcomes such as miscommunication. *Symbolic threats* pertain to the validity of an ingroup's value system or worldview in the face of perceived threats from outgroup members such as threats to ingroups' morals, beliefs, and norms of language varieties. Central to symbolic threats are the perceived differences in worldviews between ingroup and outgroup members. *Realistic threats* are concerned with the physical, material, economic, and political welfare of the ingroup, which are perceived to be threatened by the outgroup. In other words, behaviors enacted by members of the outgroup, or the very presence of the outgroup are perceived to threaten the welfare of the ingroup. Issues of political and economic power are significant to realistic threats.

For instance, ingroup members may experience perceived realistic threats when they feel that outgroup members hold positions of power or if they feel that outgroup members have more economic resources at their disposal compared to ingroup members. *Negative stereotypes* involve the negative qualities ingroup members attribute to outgroup members (Stephan et al., 2009). For instance, ingroup members may attribute lack of competence to non-native English accented speakers. Although not directly tested within language attitudes research, ITT provides explanations regarding the mechanisms that underlie intergroup relations. The present dissertation applies ITT in the context of language and subsequently formed language attitudes. It is contended that language use could be an underlying mechanism that triggers perceived intergroup threats and anxiety. Specifically, the present dissertation examines how status, solidarity, and dynamism mediate the effects of accents and three types of threats (i.e., symbolic and realistic threats and intergroup anxiety). I examine only these three threats because the dimensions of status, solidarity, and dynamism already explore (negative) stereotypes—that is, they already capture perceived (negative) stereotypes attributed to speakers. Moreover, the operationalization of negative stereotypes (per ITT) overlaps with some of the dimensions of status, solidarity, dynamism.

It is important to note that, within language attitudes research, intergroup anxiety is dubbed *intergroup communication anxiety*—an individual-level variable defined as feelings of discomfort, unease, worry, tension, and apprehension towards communicating with members of an outgroup (Imamura et al., 2016). Although past research has examined the association between contact and intergroup attitudes as mediated by intergroup communication anxiety (e.g., Imamura et al., 2011; Imamura et al., 2012), only a few studies (e.g., Montgomery & Zhang, 2018) have explored intergroup communication anxiety as an outcome variable in language

attitude studies. Intergroup communication anxiety is beneficial to explore as an outcome variable because feelings of anxiety triggered due to interacting with an accented speaker could impede future interactions. Thus, the present dissertation contributes to the language attitude research by exploring the association between language attitudes and intergroup communication anxiety and threats.

Past research has found considerable evidence for the role anxiety plays in intergroup interactions. For instance, Stephan et al. (2000) examined the attitudes of White and Black students in relation to symbolic threats, realistic threats, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes. They found that, for both racial group members, perceived threats led to prejudice toward the outgroup. The results also showed that negative contacts, perceived intergroup conflicts and status differences, negative stereotypes, and ingroup identity affected perceived threats to varying degrees. Similarly, in a meta-analysis, Riek and colleagues (2006) examined the relationship between intergroup threat and negative outgroup attitudes. Their findings revealed that ingroup identification and negative stereotypes were antecedents of intergroup threat, such that those who identified strongly with the ingroup experienced higher levels of intergroup threat than low identifiers. Also, negative stereotypes were positively related to symbolic and realistic threats and to intergroup anxiety. Negative stereotypes had both direct and indirect effects on outgroup attitudes. These findings serve as a rationale for including threats as outcome variables in the present dissertation. Speaking with a non-standard accent not only results in evaluations but also explains the role of language in arousing threats and anxiety as intergroup outcomes. Thus, the following hypothesis is posited:

H2: Status, solidarity, and dynamism mediate the relationship between the accent of a speaker and (a) symbolic threat, (b) realistic threat, and (c) intergroup anxiety.

In addition, an important consideration in the present dissertation is the role race plays in the evaluation of speakers. Thus, in the section that follows, a discussion of the history of the term *race* as well as the origin of how humans were classified are presented.

History of the Term Race: Taxonomies of Humanity

Identifying the person who coined the modern sense of the word "race" is a difficult task. The term *race* played an important role in nobiliary thought and was associated with transmission by birth. However, the word evolved from this genealogical sense to encompass a growing trend towards "biologization" (Hoquet, 2014). The history of the term race includes a shift from lineage-based thinking to a naturalist approach. The term race was first applied to humans, and then to the rest of the animal kingdom (Hoquet, 2014). Race originated not as a scientific investigation but as a folk concept. A. Smedley and B. Smedley (2012) assert that the term race had no basis in science or naturalistic studies. Naturalists and other educated people embraced the folk idea of race (Golash-Boza, 2015) and gave credence to this so-called product of scientific investigation. Soon, scientists undertook efforts to document the existence of the difference that the European cultural worldviews demanded and had already created. In their efforts to promote a valid basis for the idea of race, scientists reflected their biases, beliefs, and conditioning of their times (Golash-Boza, 2015; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012). The rise of science in the 18th century brought about the emergence of taxonomies. Scholars sought to classify everything known to them (Golash-Boza, 2015). There were a number of taxonomists who played a role in conceptualizations of the word "race." Some of them include François Bernier (1625-1688), Carl Linnaeus (1707-1778), G. L. Leclerc de Buffon (1707-1788), and Johann Blumenbach (1752-1840).

François Bernier, a French physician and traveler, was one of the first people to classify humans. Bernier proposed a division of humanity into four groups, but his division was disproportionate (Hoquet, 2014). The first species included peoples from Europe, North Africa, the Middle East, India, and some parts of Southeast Asia; the second was peoples from Africa; the third was peoples from a part of Asia (i.e., China); the fourth was people from Lapland (i.e., in northern Scandinavia). The distinctions between these species of humanity were not based on color since two of them were "White" (the Mongols, the Chinese, and the Japanese were described as "veritably White," despite major differences in their corporal disposition), but relied on continents, although he did not strictly respect them (Hoquet, 2014). For example, in the first division of humanity, the inhabitants of Africa were included. It is important to note that Bernier did not use the term race in his taxonomy of humanity. Rather, he used the term "species," indicating that he understood his division more in terms of logic than biology (Sloan, 1987). Bernier believed that, to move from general to more specific ideas, the use of logic was essential. Hoquet (2014) asserts that Bernier recognized how logically incorrect it would be to classify humanity based on the "Whiteness" of their faces or the shapes of noses. Moreover, Bernier indicated that the true nature of the color of an individual's skin could be distorted by the sun, such that darker skin could simply be the result of a suntan (Hoquet, 2014).

G. L. Leclerc de Buffon was another taxonomist, a French naturalist, mathematician, cosmologist, and encyclopédiste. In his taxonomy, Buffon used the term race, but it referred to humans, animals, and varieties of a thing. In his writing, Buffon focused on the unity of all humanity. Buffon's work offered an anthropology in which the climate played a role in engendering variation, and perhaps degradation (Hoquet, 2014). According to Buffon, nothing is

irreversible because everything is a function of local circumstances. Buffon did not provide illustrations of what these variations of humans were.

Like Bernier and Buffon, other scholars developed additional taxonomies, but it was not until 1735 that the development of the classificatory systems (i.e., naturalist description of human species) resembling the modern concept of race emerged (Eze, 1997; Golash-Boza, 2015; Hoquet, 2014). In 1734, Carolus Linnaeus (1707-1778), a Swedish botanist, proposed that all humans could be divided into four groups namely, *Americanus*, *Asiaticus*, *Africanus*, and *Europaeanus*. Hoquet summarized Linnaeus' taxonomy of humankind as follows: (a) American, which he described as red, bilious, straight, and governed by rules, (b) European, who were characterized as White, sanguine, muscular, and governed by laws, (c) Asian, which Linnaeus regarded as basan, melancholic, stiff, and governed by opinion, and (d) African, who were described as Black, phlegmatic, relaxed, and governed by chance (Hoquet, 2014).

Linnaeus' taxonomy of humans was a clear tetrad—that is, four continental groups, four colors, four temperaments, and four types of government. Hoquet (2014) asserts that it is impossible to tell which of these characteristics "takes precedence over the others: geographical, humoral (temperament), physical (skin color), social (peoples ruled by custom, belief, conformism, and authority)" (p. 28). However, it can be noticed that Linnaeus' classification was progressive and evaluative in nature. His description of humankind went beyond the physical characterization of race to include the moral character of peoples (Hoquet, 2014). Although he did not use the term race, Linnaeus' taxonomy corresponds with the modern concept of race, which has to do with the "physical and moral categories that divide humans by color and by major continental zones and are unified by hypocritic temperaments" (Hoquet, 2014, p. 28). Likewise, Golash-Boza (2015) notes that Linnaeus' four groups are consistent with

the modern idea of race in two ways. First, he linked physical characteristics, such as phenotype (e.g., skin color), with cultural and moral traits. Second, Linnaeus' four groups correspond to four continents and are still used nowadays.

Other scholars expounded on Linnaeus' taxonomy. For instance, Johann Blumenbach, a German professor of medicine, proposed a classificatory system that divided humans into five groups. These classifications were related to geographical origins namely, *Caucasian, Mongolian, Ethiopian*, *American*, and *Mala*y. It is important to note that both Linnaeus and Blumenbach were Europeans, and, in their classificatory systems, endowed their own group with the most admirable qualities (Golash-Boza, 2015). In the same vein, the factors used by the aforementioned taxonomists to explain human variability were not standard. For instance, Linnaeus established a fixed system in which human races of varying origins did not differ. Buffon, however, presented the concept of degeneration, a system whereby humans change due to global migrations, resulting in degenerations. Finally, Blumenbach privileged explanations that were rooted in climatic and environmental differences (Hoquet, 2014). Thus, the idea of race was initiated by European men and has been used to explain and justify European superiority. European explanations of White superiority espoused by Linnaeus and Blumenbach reached the Americas and were used to explain and justify the enslavement of Africans (Eze, 1997).

Scientific and Popular Conceptions of Race

The existence of races as a popular belief has been confirmed as having some scientific basis. However, scientific record indicates the enormous ambiguity of race (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012). Among experts, there has been much confusion and little consensus on the meaning of race. From the 19th century onward, races were viewed in science as subdivisions of the human species, who differ from each other phenotypically based on ancestry, geographical

locations, and frequency of certain genetic material genes (Lewontin, 1995; Marks, 1995; A. Smedley, 1999b). This genetic conception of race appeared in the mid-20th century and is used today by many scholars (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005). But other scholars assert that there are no neutral conceptualizations of race in science. Experts in the fields of evolutionary biology and genetics have also concluded that there is no biological basis for the term "race" in science. Modern scientists assert that, "race as a biological concept cannot be supported by the facts we have learned about human biophysical variations and their genetic basis" (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012, p. 3). Doubts about genetic differences emerged particularly when geneticists emphasized similarities among races (i.e., human beings are 99.9% identical; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005), with only small real genetic differences among them (i.e., 0.01 percent; see Littlefield et al., 1982).

In the 20th century, there were two conceptions of race that existed (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012): one that focused exclusively on human biogenetic variation, and the other—a popular conception that focused on cultural explanation, and that dominated individuals' thinking and understanding of and about human differences, fused by both physical characteristics and behavior. The popular conception of race was a cultural and modern invention that became dominant after World War II and is still the original meaning of race that scholars in the fields of anthropology and sociology, amongst other fields, turned their attention to in the latter part of the 20th century and in the early 21st century (Golash-Boza, 2015; A. Smedley, 1999b, 2002a; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005). Consequently, the focus of the present dissertation is on the popular/cultural understandings of race as they pertain to the evaluation of individuals in the U.S., particularly given that the scientific conceptions of race (i.e., genetic

differences among humans) have been debunked. In the section that follows, how race emerged in the Americas is detailed.

Emergence of Race in the Americas

Before the conquest of the Americas, there was no worldview or way of structuring society that separated all of humanity into distinct races (Golash-Boza, 2015; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005). The construction of a new type of categorization for humanity was needed because the leaders of the American colonies had deliberately selected Africans to be permanent slaves at the turn of the 18th century (Allen, 1994, 1997; Fredrickson, 1988, 2002; A. Smedley, 1999b; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005). The main way in which Christian slave owners could justify slavery was to demote Africans to a nonhuman status, particularly in an era when the dominant political philosophy was equality, civil rights, democracy, justice, and freedom for all human beings (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005).

It is important to note that slavery was not new or particular to the Americas. Slavery existed in Africa, Europe, and the Middle East. Slavery existed both within and across societies. Some people became slaves in the aftermath of war. Others became slaves because they lacked familial support, because they were used to pay off debt, or as a punishment for crime (Golash-Boza, 2015). Until the 18th century, though, there was no society that categorically denied the humanity of slaves or attributed racial inferiority or nonhumanness to slaves. Golash-Boza (2015) asserts that slaves had rights to education. They could marry, own property, and even obtain their freedom after years of service. Moreover, long before Columbus set sail in search of the Indies, Spain and Portugal were slaveholding societies. Many of the slaves in Spain in the 15th century were Africans. After the ban on the enslavement of Indigenous peoples, the Spaniards turned to Africa in search for slaves to help them harvest sugarcane, which, at the

time, brought immense wealth. Between the 16th and 19th century, millions of African slaves were brought to Spain's colonies in the Americas (Golash-Boza, 2015). Unlike the English who settled in North America and who only had contact with the 20 Africans (i.e., the first enslaved Africans to arrive in the U.S.) in Jamestown in 1619, the Spaniards already had several centuries of contact with Africans.

The humanity of Africans was a continual debate throughout the 19th century because many slaveholders believed that Africans were created separately from other humans (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005). The enslavement of Africans was very profitable to European slaveholders partly because Africans brought with them their agricultural and craftsmanship experience (Golash-Boza, 2015). Initially, the justification for bringing Africans to the colonies was not racial in nature because, at that time, slavery was not illegal but was accepted in societies. When a justification of slavery was offered, it was that Africans were heathens and enslaving them was a way of ensuring their salvation (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005). But, as time progressed, the racial justification for the enslavement of Africans emerged (Golash-Boza, 2015). These justification for enslaving Africans impacted the ideologies that surround racial group membership in North America, which is discussed in detail in the section that follows.

Racial Ideologies in North America

A *racial ideology* is a set of principles and ideas that classifies humans into different racial groups and serves the interest of one group (Golash-Boza, 2015). Racial ideologies are "beliefs, values, and assumptions, held on faith alone and generally unrelated to empirical facts, that act as guidelines or prescriptions for individual and group behavior" (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012, p. 16). Both ideologies and worldviews (i.e., "a culturally structured way of looking at, perceiving, and interpreting various world realities"; A. Smedley & B. Smedley,

2012, p. 16) can be used interchangeably because they capture beliefs, values, and principles about a social category. Thus, racial ideologies and worldviews are beliefs about racial categories.

The ideologies surrounding race in the U.S. progressed as a justification for enslaving Africans. Golash-Boza (2015) asserts that the forms of slavery that emerged in the colonies of Spain in North America were unique in several ways. First, slaves had no human or legal rights because they were viewed as property and not as humans, could not own their own property, and could not even get married. Second, being a slave was a permanent status. The slave status was also inherited. Third, slaves were prohibited to receive and denied any form of education. They could not read or write or learn, which ensured their inferior socio-economic status was perpetuated. Lastly, the only group that were and could be enslaved were Africans and their descendants. This unique system of exploitation and oppression laid the foundation for a new ideology about human difference (Golash-Boza, 2015), one based on heritage and in which the humanity of Africans was denied.

Similarly, A. Smedley and B. Smedley (2012) state that the concept of race in North America contained at least five ascertainable ideological elements, which they consider indicative of race in the U.S. The first and most basic element pertained to the universal categorization of human groups into so-called exclusive and discrete biological entities. These racial classifications were not based on any objective variations but rather included superficial evaluations and judgments of phenotypic and behavioral variations. These racial categories were subjective and arbitrary in nature. The second element had to do with the imposition of an inegalitarian philosophy, which required that these groups be ranked relative to one another. The third element concerned the belief that external physical characteristics of human groups were

outer manifestations of inner traits. Physical characteristics were associated with intellectual, temperamental, and moral characteristics, amongst other things. The fourth element had to do with the idea that all characteristics of human populations were inheritable; that is, the biophysical, cultural, and behavioral capabilities were inheritable as was the social rank assigned to each group by the racial ideological system itself. The fifth and last element, which A. Smedley & B. Smedley (2012) believe was the most critical, pertained to the belief that each (exclusive) racial group was distinct by nature so that imputed differences were believed to be fixed, permanent, and could never be transcended. It is important to note that the synthesis of all these ideological elements constituted the popular conception of race in the U.S. By the 19th century, all human groups could be subsumed arbitrarily into some racial category (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012).

By the end of the Revolution, race was widely used, and its meaning was solidified as a reference for social categories (Allen, 1994, 1997; A. Smedley, 1999b; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005). Every individual and social group was assigned to a racial category namely, White, Yellow, Brown, and Black. These color/racial categories have been the most basic and recognizable labels in U.S. history (Omi & Winant, 1997). The idea of racial differences was used as a justification to divide, separate, and rank European Whites at the top of the racial hierarchy as well as justify the dominance and exploitation of certain groups (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012), especially Blacks, who were at the bottom of the racial pyramid. Unfortunately, the legacy of race and the ideologies surrounding racial groups in the U.S. have been retained in the 21st century folk understandings of differences and inequality between humans classified as so-called separate and exclusive races.

Racial ideologies and worldviews continue to persist and are used as mechanisms for identifying who should (not) have access to wealth, privilege, loyalty, and power groups (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012). It is important to note from the discussion presented thus far, that racial ideologies, like language ideologies, are hinged in the power dynamics of the U.S. social order. These ideologies and power dynamics are a function of years of enslavement of Africans and other minority groups. The modern-day discourse surrounding race is impacted by the racial ideologies discussed above as well as the conceptualization of race. Additionally, and as it pertains to this dissertation, ideologies surrounding racial group membership could impact evaluations of racial ingroup and outgroup members and, in turn, intergroup communication outcomes. But first, how is race defined?

What is Race?

From the foregoing discussion, one can notice that race is a modern social construction. Race is not based on biological differences among people but rather is a social construction, endowed with meaning through daily interactions. Thinking about humans in terms of their specific racial categories is not "natural" but rather a cultural and social construction (Golash-Boza, 2015). Race is an example of a cultural representation in that it is not universal and essentialist but rather it only makes sense to members of a culture (i.e., as a set of observable and patterned beliefs, values, attitudes, norms, behaviors, language, and history transmitted from one generation to another, and that set apart one group from another) because similar meanings of what constitutes race exist between them. Since culture depends on giving things meanings by assigning them to different positions within a classificatory system (Hall, 1997), race makes sense within a culture that has racial classification such as the U.S. Race is a particular way of viewing human differences, which is a product of colonial encounters (Golash-Boza, 2015), as

discussed in previous sections. The idea of race implies that people of the world can be divided into so-called discrete and exclusive groups based on physical and cultural traits. Race is linked to notions of White or European superiority that became concertized during the colonization of the Americas (Golash-Boza, 2015). The idea of race classifies humans into distinct groups. By classifying and assigning cultural and moral characteristics to each group, Europeans and their descendants used race to justify dissociative behaviors, exploitation, slavery, colonialism, and genocide.

Race emerged after the populations of individuals from different continents encountered one another (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005). Race was created at a particular time and place in history, specifically, the era of colonialism (i.e., the practice of acquiring political control over another country by occupying it and exploiting it economically; Golash-Boza, 2015). As a socio-historical construction, race is neither objective nor static (Omi & Winant, 2014) as can be observed in the continuous shifts in the boundaries of the "White" racial category (see Waterson, 2006). For instance, Irish, Jewish, and Italian immigrants were not previously regarded as Whites in the U.S. but are now considered Whites (Bramlett-Solomon & Carstarphen, 2018). Furthermore, race-making or racial formation (i.e., the process by which racial identities are constructed, reproduced, transformed, and destroyed) is a process of othering (Omi & Winant, 2014), and a major form of social differentiation in U.S. society (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012). The concept of race is a marker of difference, which permeated and continues to permeate all forms of social relations, especially in the U.S. where race is pervasive. Race takes priority over class, education, occupation, gender, age, religion, and is structured into social institutions (e.g., Omi & Winant, 2014; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012).

In the present dissertation, *race* is defined as a historically driven, social and cultural construction derived figuratively from the ranking of phenotypic differences of humans (such as skin color, hair texture, nose width, lip thickness, and body type) and by ascribing human groups with attributes and features that conform to a ranking system within a particular culture (American Anthropological Association, 1998; Goodman et al., 2012; Ifekwunigwe et al., 2017; Mukhopadhyay et al., 2013; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012). For instance, Whites are characterized as having an oval shaped face, straight hair, and a straight nose (Cuvier, 1817 as cited in Hoad, 2005), whereas Blacks are characterized as having "black complexion, crisped of wooly hair, compressed cranium and a flat nose […] and thick lips" (Cuvier, 1831, n. p.). As explained, the U.S. Census included seven racial categories, namely, a) White, b) Black or African American, c) American Indian or Alaska Native, d) Asian, e) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, f) some other race, and g) two or more races (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020). The focus of this dissertation is on the White and Black racial categories given the connotations surrounding Whiteness (e.g., the so-called "pure" unmarked, and invisible category) and Blackness (e.g., "impure" marked, and visible category; Dryer, 1997; Hartigan, 1997; Omi & Winant, 1994), discussed in more detail in the next section. A *White* person is one having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa. A *Black* person is one having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa (U.S. Census Bureau, 1997). From the definitions provided by the U.S. Census Bureau, it can be noted that race is regarded as a product of individuals' origins, indicating that people are not born "White" or "Black," but are labeled as such according to social conventions (Golash-Boza, 2015). The role phenotype and physical differences (which are not related to genetic differences, see section above) play in the understanding of race should also be noted. In the section that follows, the role physical

differences play in race relations is discussed, followed by the connotations attached to Whiteness and Blackness in the U.S.

The Role of Physical Differences in Racial Understandings

There is a visual dimension to the definition and understanding of racial groups. Bodies are read visually and narrated in ways that draw upon the symbolic associations of race (Omi & Winant, 2014). Perceived differences in skin color, hair texture, nose width, lip thickness, structure of cheek bones, physical build, and the presence/absence of epicanthic fold have remained markers of racial identity in the U.S. as well as supposed manifestations of differences between humans (Omi & Winant, 2014; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2002). Although physical variations among humans are not "biological," they have social meanings. These social meanings are viewed by individuals as the concrete evidence of race, thereby conditioning individuals to respond unconsciously to the presence of varying physical markers of race and the difference it denotes (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005).

Physical variations played a role in the origin and persistence of race in the U.S. Race originated as an imposition of an arbitrary value system in the form of phenotypic variations in humans (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012), cultural inventions of the arbitrary meanings applied to what seemed like natural divisions. Race had cultural and social value but no intrinsic association with biology because it was a creation of the human mind and not a reflection of objective truths, as already discussed in preceding sections. However, physical differences in humans became the major tool constructed and used by White Europeans to maintain social status and dominance while exploiting and oppressing (dark-skinned) Blacks. White European slaveholders deliberately manipulated the social system. Thus, race was consciously used to

create social stratification based on visible (but not genetic) differences (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012).

Although one can identify as a member of a particular race, irrespective of physical features, in the U.S., color and physiognomy remain symbols of racial difference and identity (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012). Thus, in the present dissertation, race is operationalized as physical differences cued by phenotype—skin color, hair texture, nose width, and lip thickness. In interactions and relations with members of a different racial group, the notions of Whiteness and Blackness can impact the trajectory of such interactions between individuals, particularly due to the connotations surrounding Whiteness and Blackness, concepts detailed below.

Whiteness and Blackness

In the U.S., Whiteness and Blackness are relational concepts in that one does not have meaning without the other. Blackness was a social construction developed in the 1650s by White lawmakers in the Southern states as a legal pathway to enslave Africans (Blackmon, 2008; Davis, 1991). By establishing that Blacks, or anyone having Black heritage, were inferior, White lawmakers could legally create a slave economy (Blackmon, 2008; Mandishona, 2018). The notion that the White race was superior to other races served as the cornerstone for the mistreatment of Blacks (Mandishona, 2018) and led to the connotations surrounding Blackness and Whiteness. White or Whiteness is perceived as a so-called "pure" category (Omi & Winant, 1994). Dryer (1997) notes that there is an association of White with light, and, by extension, safety. Black or Blackness is associated with dark and danger, and, by extension, is an "impure" category. In terms of racial categorization, Blackness is always marked as a color and particularized, whereas Whiteness is not anything. Whiteness is not viewed as an identity, not a particularizing entity because it is everything and nothing (Dryer, 1997). White is not a color

because it is all the colors. Relative to Blackness, Whiteness is viewed as invisible, and it is subsumed into other identities (Dryer, 1997). As one can notice, then, Blackness serves as the primary form of otherness by which Whiteness is constructed. Whites benefit from being the "invisible" racial category. As an analytical concept, Whiteness identifies how unmarked and normative the positionality of Whites is (Hartigan, 1997), whereas Blackness is the marked, visible, and nonnormative category.

The Black/White color dichotomy has been rigidly defined and enforced historically in the U.S. (Omi & Winant, 1997). Since White is considered the so-called pure category, any individuals who had a drop of Black blood in them were and are Black. In other words, having a Black parent made an individual Black. Any racial intermixtures made one "non-White" (Omi & Winant, 1994), or, as it is used today—"people of color," thereby collapsing different groups of people into one homogenous racial group. It is important to note that Africans, whose specific identity was Ibo, Yoruba, Dahomeyan, and so on, were rendered "Black" based on the ideology of exploitation hinged in racial logic (Omi & Winant, 1997), ignoring the diversity of people of African descent (Creese, 2019). Even today, when African immigrants arrive in the U.S., they are racialized as Blacks, based on their phenotype, even though they may not identify as such given that, in most Sub-Saharan African countries, race is not a salient category (Acheme & Cionea, 2021). A. Smedley & B. Smedley (2005) assert that, in the U.S., it is difficult to escape the process of racialization because it is such a basic element of the social system and customs, and it is deeply embedded in the consciousness of its people. The racialization of Africans as Blacks speaks to the nature of racial categories not only in othering individuals but also in ascribing them with identities that they may not avow for themselves. Thus, Africans and Blacks are steeped in the "rules," expectations, and connotations (e.g., how to speak or dress) guiding

interpersonal and intergroup relations (Golash-Boza, 2015), whether they like it or not (Omi & Winant, 1997; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012). These expectations impact the stereotypes attributed to racial group membership. Detailed below is past literature on stereotypes of Whites and Blacks in the U.S.

Stereotypes of Blacks & Whites in the U.S.

The connotation of Whiteness and Blackness essentializes and stereotypes people, their social statuses/ranking, and their social behaviors (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2005) because the perceived race of another impacts the way they are treated, as well as the expectations of their communication and behavior (Golash-Boza, 2015), resulting in stereotypes. In intergroup interactions, being White or Black sets standards and rules for conduct, whether individuals are conscious of this fact or not (A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2012). The content of stereotypes reveals unsubstantiated beliefs regarding who members of different racial groups are and what they are perceived to be (Omi & Winant, 1994). For instance, Clarke (1997) asserts that, in the U.S., there is an enormous appetite for Black men misbehaving, and these behaviors are portrayed in and perpetuated by the media, impacting daily interactions between Whites and Blacks. Clarke (1997) notes that beginning with D.W. Griffin's *Birth of a Nation* to Tom Wolfe's *Bonfire of the Vanities* or Spike Lee's *Do the Right Thing*, the media hawk eroticized images of Black men. The perceived threat of Blacks was one reason why White artists acted in blackface in minstrel shows in the 19th century (Bramlett-Solomon & Carstarphen, 2018). The racial frame (i.e., "an organized set of racialized ideas, stereotypes, emotions, and inclinations to discriminate"; Feagin, 2006, p. 25) of most Whites includes positive views of Whites and negative stereotypes, images, and metaphors of Blacks and other racial minority groups (Feagin, 2006). Lawrence (1987 as cited in Feagin, 2006), asserts that old racist perceptions, images,

understandings, and emotions sometimes become part of White individuals' consciousness at an early age and occur at an unconscious level. Given the foregoing discussion, the focus of the present dissertation will be on the evaluations of Black males relative to White males. Moreover, Eagly and Kite (1987) acknowledge that stereotypes of nationalities apply more to men than women. Additionally, past research reports that prescriptive stereotypes (i.e., beliefs about what men and women should do; Fiske & Steven, 1993) were higher for men compared to women (Koenig, 2018).

Past research reports several stereotypes of White and Black men. Some studies have indicated that stereotypically Black looking individuals are often associated with crime and violence (e.g., Blair et al., 2004). For instance, Okantah (2016) reported that Black men were portrayed in the media as gangsters and criminals. In the same vein, Kleider et al. (2012) examined whether there was a bias toward the face type of Blacks (i.e., stereotypical, or non-stereotypical), how face type affected stereotype consistent categorization, and if categorization influenced memory accuracy and errors. The findings of their study revealed that stereotypical faces were more often associated with stereotype-consistent labels, they were remembered and recategorized correctly as criminals, and, when memory failed, stereotypical Black faces were miscategorized as criminals. Similarly, Tonry (2011) reported perceptions of Whites and Blacks as it concerns criminal justice. The study revealed that 38% of Whites and 89% of Blacks often perceived the criminal justice system as being prejudiced toward Blacks, while 56% of Whites and 8% of Blacks viewed the criminal justice system as being nondiscriminatory toward Blacks. These findings (Kleider et al., 2012; Tonry, 2011) indicate the detrimental consequences of racial stereotypes.

Furthermore, other studies have reported implicit stereotypes toward Whites and Blacks. For instance, Feagin (2006) reported findings of a test that implicitly associated faces of Whites and Blacks and noted that about 90% of Whites who completed the test associated the faces of Blacks with negative words and traits, indicating the difficulty some Whites had in associating the faces of Blacks with pleasant attributes relative to the faces of Whites. Additionally, when Whites were shown photographs of Black faces, for only 30 milliseconds, key areas of their brains, designed to respond to perceived threats, were automatically triggered. Thus, the more implicit stereotyping Whites scored on the psychological tests, the greater the threat response in their brains when shown photographs of Blacks (Feagin, 2006; Vedantam, 2005). The findings of the aforementioned studies indicate that, compared to White (faces), Black (faces) are attributed more negative stereotypes, which is perpetuated by the media. In light of these past findings as well as the rationale for choosing males as opposed to females, the following hypothesis is posited:

H3: The race of a speaker affects evaluations in that White males are evaluated higher on (a) status, (b) solidarity, and (c) dynamism than Black males.

The following section reviews past literature on how (racial) stereotypes influence intergroup communication.

Intergroup Communicative Outcomes

Stereotypes toward Whites and Blacks can affect intergroup relations and outcomes. Although race does not exist in and of itself (given that it is a social construct), the connotations surrounding Whiteness and Blackness have consequences for individuals in the lower rungs of the racial hierarchy. Past studies report that racial stereotypes impact several outcomes in various sectors of the U.S. society including healthcare (Johnson, 2013; Showers, 2015), housing

segregation (D. Massey, 2001), employment (Fix et al., 1993; Hansen, Rakić, & Steffens, 2017), and the criminal justice system (Golash-Boza, 2015). At the grassroot levels, racial stereotypes also influence intergroup outcomes. For instance, Feagin and McKinley (2003) reported that 80% of their Black participants had encountered hostility in public places, with some of them suffering health issues as a result of these racial attitudes against them. Given that race is entrenched in the U.S. society, many normalize and accept these stereotypes of Blacks (Acheme & Cionea, 2021), which has ripple effects in intergroup communication. Specifically, past studies have shown that, relative to Whites, Blacks are more likely to be victims of negative racial outcomes such as brutality (Walker, 2011). Blacks have also triggered feelings of identity (in)security (Kim, 2005; Z. Massey & Cionea, 2020), intergroup threats and anxiety (Gans, 2017) and social distance (Ortiz & Harwood, 2007) in their interaction partners, amongst other communication outcomes. The intergroup communicative outcomes that are of particular interest in the present dissertation are intergroup threats and anxiety (as previously discussed) as well as social distance and contact. These outcomes are of interest because they have been explored in past research investigating relations between Whites and Blacks (e.g., Hoffner & Cohen, 2012) as well as interactions with racial minority immigrant group members (e.g., Gans, 2017), similar to the group examined in the present dissertation (i.e., Nigerians).

Social Distance and Contact

Social distance measures behavioral intentions through voluntary associations and dissociations with members of the outgroup (Z. Massey et al., 2018). In other words, social distance captures individuals' willingness or likelihood to interact with outgroup members in the future as fellow citizens, coworkers, family members, and significant other(s). Z. Massey and colleagues assert that, as a measure of prejudice, voluntary association is more reliable in

eliciting individuals' attitudes toward outgroup members compared to directly asking participants about their attitudes. This is because participants may be more likely to rely on stereotypes when completing survey instruments, thus expressing social desirability biases (Esses & Dovidio, 2002). Social distance toward dissimilar others, such as members of different racial, sexual, religious, or cultural groups, has been used in past studies as an indicator of prejudicial attitudes.

Past research has used social distance as a dependent variable (Hoffner & Cohen, 2012; Ortiz & Harwood, 2007)—that is, as the outcome of some process (e.g., parasocial relationship, mediated contact). Given that social distance measures willingness to interact or engage with outgroup members, an important variable affecting social distance is intergroup contact. There is a considerable amount of evidence indicating that intergroup contact (such as face-to-face, imagined, mediated, or parasocial contact) impacts perceptions of social distance. Specifically, negative contact increases social distance or prejudicial attitudes, whereas positive contact reduces social distance or prejudicial attitudes (e.g., Bond, 2021; Z. Massey et al., 2018; Schiappa et al., 2005, 2006). For instance, Z. Massey et al. (2018) examined the role of parasocial contact with fictional characters on prejudicial attitudes. The results of their study indicated that positive parasocial contact with a Muslim fictional character resulted in lower prejudice toward Muslims, in general. Also, stronger parasocial relationships predicted less social distance. In the same vein, Ortiz and Harwood (2007) examined the role of emotions, stereotypes, and symbolic beliefs about the willingness of Whites to engage in contact with Blacks, and Whites' endorsement of social policies for Blacks. Results indicated that exposure to gay and Black characters on television led to lowered levels of prejudice and decreased endorsement of stereotypes toward gays and Blacks, in general. The study's findings also

revealed that exposure to the sitcom *Will & Grace* and the reality show *The Real World* was associated with less social distance toward gay individuals and Blacks, as expressed by straight and White viewers.

Besides the effects of intergroup contact on social distance, past literature on racial attitudes indicates that individuals are more comfortable interacting with members from their own racial group than members of a different racial group. For instance, Smith and colleagues (2007) investigated attitudes of Asians and White European Americans towards other racial outgroups, including African Americans/Blacks and Hispanic Americans/Latinos. Findings revealed several racial attitudes and outcomes. Specifically, Asians were more likely to feel comfortable socializing with Whites than Whites were socializing with Asians. Also, Asian participants indicated the highest levels of social distance (i.e., prejudice) toward Blacks. From the foregoing, it can be noted that social distance and contact impact intergroup outcomes. Thus, in the present dissertation, social distance, like in other studies, will be used as a dependent variable to measure prejudicial attitudes towards individuals' language use as well as their race. The following hypothesis is posed:

H4: (a) Status, (b) solidarity, and (c) dynamism mediate the relationship between the accent of a speaker and social distance.

Additionally, the present dissertation examines the role of race in mediating the relationship between language attitudes (i.e., status, solidarity, and dynamism) and intergroup communication outcomes. However, considering the lack of research in this area and the explanatory nature of this aspect of the dissertation, the following research questions is posed:

RQ1: Do status, solidarity, and dynamism mediate the relationship between the race of a speaker and (a) symbolic threat, (b) realistic threat, (c) intergroup anxiety, and (d) social distance?

Furthermore, the crux of the present dissertation study rests on the notion that both language use (i.e., accents) and race (i.e., White/Black) are cues to social group identity and membership. Therefore, in the section that follows, SIT assumptions are used to develop a theoretical argument about the relationship and intersection of accents and race as social group markers. SIT was developed to provide explanations about the dynamics of intergroup relations as well as the potential outcomes of interacting with members of different social groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Thus, it can offer useful theoretical explanations that can help examine how language and racial cues impact listeners' evaluations of speakers and how these evaluations, in turn, affect intergroup communicative outcomes.

Social Identity Theory (SIT)

SIT, a theory of intergroup relations, was first developed by Tajfel in the 1970s to understand prejudice, discrimination, and intergroup conflict in society. SIT employs a social psychological analysis of the role that one's self-concept has in being a member of a social group, including group processes, and intergroup relations (Hogg, 2006). The theory was established to address social psychological aspects of intergroup behavior, particularly the individual, and social processes in the psychology of intergroup behavior. Previous social psychological theories employed empirical relationships, which focused on the individual conceived as external to any social context (for review see, Tajfel, 1974). Thus, SIT was developed to emphasize the role of groups in social psychological processes (Tajfel, 1974). Tajfel (1974) argued that an adequate social psychological theory of intergroup behavior must

consider ingroup processes and outgroup behaviors and attitudes, because an individual's ingroup and outgroup behaviors and attitudes are determined by a continuing process of self-definition.

Social identity is defined as an individual's self-concept derived from knowledge of their membership to a social group(s) and the emotional significance attached to said group membership (Tajfel, 1974). A *social group* constitutes two or more people who share similar characteristics and who evaluate themselves in the same way (Hogg, 2006) or perceive themselves as belonging to the same social category (Johnson, 2013). The essential criterion for group membership is that the specific individuals have to define themselves and be defined by others as members of a specific group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Thus, social group membership is a function of avowal and ascription. Furthermore, social groups also emphasize ingroup similarities and outgroup differences. Social identity theorists believe that identification captures the notion of "groupness" and so, as long as people do not identify, define, or evaluate themselves in terms of the properties or characteristics of the group, they are unlikely to act as group members (Hogg, 2006). Johnson (2013) notes that it is within social groups that meanings of language, symbols, and events are constructed, helping members make sense of their social situations.

SIT has three main assumptions (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). First, individuals strive for and maintain/enhance a positive self-concept or self-esteem. Second, social groups or memberships in social group are often associated with positive or negative connotations. Therefore, social identity can be positive or negative, depending on the evaluations of the social groups that contribute to an individual's social identity. Third, evaluations of one's ingroup are determined with specific reference to other outgroups through social comparisons. Thus, positive discrepant

comparisons between ingroup and outgroup members can result in low prestige. Based on these three assumptions, three theoretical principles of SIT were derived: (1) Individuals strive to maintain positive social identities, (2) Positive social identity is based on favorable comparisons to a relevant outgroup, and (3) Individuals strive to leave their existing group or join a more positive group when social identity is unsatisfactory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

In sum, the assumptions and principles of SIT indicate that individuals strive to maintain positive social identities, which they obtain through social group membership. Individuals evaluate themselves and others in terms of social group membership and these social groups help to create positive social identities and cognitions (Johnson, 2013), leading to the formation and distinction of ingroup (i.e., the group with which one identifies) and outgroup (i.e., the comparison group; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). The assumptions and principles of SIT have been empirically tested extensively. For instance, Gagnon and Bourhis (1996) examined positive feelings about belonging to a social group and how much individuals liked being members of their own group. Findings revealed that individuals who strongly identified with their ingroup discriminated against outgroup members compared to individuals who identified weakly with their ingroup. Based on the findings of this study, amongst others that have tested the principles of SIT (e.g., Fraser & Brown, 2002; Giles et al., 1995), one can conclude that individuals tend to differentiate between ingroup and outgroup characteristics, such that group comparisons are favorable toward the ingroup and negative toward the outgroup, particularly when social categorization is salient (Bresnahan et al., 2002), which is discussed in more detail in the section that follows. In the present dissertation, it is contended that U.S. American listeners will evaluate White SAE accented speakers more favorably compared to Black Nigerian accented speakers because of listeners' shared social identity and group markers, discussed next.

Social Categorization and Social Identity Markers

As mentioned earlier, when social categorization is salient, social group comparison tends to favor ingroup members. Social categorizations are cognitive tools based on which individuals segment, classify, and order their social environment to enable them to undertake many forms of social action. Individuals categorize their environment socially to provide a system of orientation for self-reference with which they create and define their place in society (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). According to SIT, social categorization makes people view others as members of a group rather than as idiosyncratic individuals (Hogg, 2006). It is important to note that categorization is a basic mental process (Operario & Fiske, 2003) used for information processing. In interactions, individuals form impressions of others through a process that assigns people into various categories (e.g., race). These categories are based on different attributes (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990), which are triggered by certain features (e.g., skin color) that are dominant in the perceiver's mind about said categories and which may be evaluated positively or negatively (Ohama et al., 2000). Categorization aims at maximizing perceived similarity within and difference between social categories (Operario & Fiske, 2003), thus producing divisions into social groups.

It is important to note that certain aspects of an individual's identity pertain to their membership in social groups. Markers of social identity such as language use (e.g., accents) and race (e.g., White or Black) reflect one's group identity and membership because identity does not only entail an individual's understandings of themselves but also their social positions, statuses, roles (Jenkins, 1996) as well as others' perceptions of them. Therefore, social identity is a function of categorization and classification. Finke and Sökefeld (2018) assert that people's perceptions of one another tend to be fixed labels, serving mutual ascriptions, although the

strictness of social categories varies. The classification of individuals based on social categories, such as race and language use, forms the basis of how people understand the world (Finke & Sökefeld, 2018). For example, a person's accent can indicate that they are a member of the ingroup or the outgroup (Acheme, 2018). Similarly, one's phenotype can signal their racial group identity or membership. Therefore, the present dissertation study examines the role social categorization plays in the evaluation of speakers and how these evaluations lead to intergroup communication outcomes. Specifically, the study investigates how categorizing speakers socially based on social identity markers of accents and race affects the evaluation of such speakers (i.e., status, solidarity, and dynamism) and, in turn, impacts intergroup outcomes (i.e., symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance). It is contended that accents and race, as markers of social identity and group membership, intersect with each other such that the effect of one can exacerbate the effect of the other. One theoretical framework that provides an understanding of how social identities are interconnected with one another is intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989), discussed below.

Intersectionality

Intersectionality is a theoretical or analytical approach that provides a lens for simultaneously considering multiple categories of identity, difference, and inequality (Cole, 2009; Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016) such as race, ability, accent, and class, amongst other social identity markers. Intersectionality foregrounds individuals' and groups' multiple positionality both at the micro (i.e., individual) and macro (i.e., socio-structural) levels (Atewologun, 2018). Intersectionality is a critical framework that examines interconnections and interdependence between social categories and systems. In other words, intersectionality is conceived as a critical theory (Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016), as it acknowledges that power relations play a fundamental

role in the construction of social identities, knowledge, and experiences (Atewologun, 2018). Thus, an intersectional approach acknowledges that knowledge is contextual and reflective of the political and economic power within a society (De Vries, 2015).

Cole (2009) defines intersectionality as "analytic approaches that simultaneously consider the meaning and consequences of multiple categories of identity, difference, and disadvantage" (p. 170). Within the social sciences, an intersection signifies the "crossing, juxtaposition, or meeting point, of two or more social categories and axes, or systems of power, dominance, or oppression" (Atewologun, 2018, p. 2). These social categories include social identities (e.g., Black, immigrant) and social systems (e.g., racism), to name a few. Furthermore, intersectionality provides a lens for conceptualizing that between-group differences emerge from multiple, parallel social factors, thus providing a means to examine nuanced and complex group comparisons (Atewologun, 2018).

Intersectionality has its roots in the racialized experiences of minority women in the U.S. The term intersectionality was derived from the work of Kimberley Crenshaw (1989), a critical legal scholar, who sought to draw attention to the treatment of African American women within the legal system. Crenshaw acknowledged and advocated the need to interpret, analyze, and understand the treatment of African American women through the dual lenses of gender and racial discrimination (Atewologun, 2018). Crenshaw did not provide a formal definition of intersectionality but applied the term to the consideration of race and gender simultaneously and to show how the effect of one exacerbated the effects of the other. In other words, analyzing gender by itself, or race by itself, typically excluded women of color (Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016). Crenshaw (1989) argued that it was only by considering race and gender *simultaneously* that the voices and experiences of Black and other minority women could be fully understood. Thus,

intersectionality addresses the role of difference, inequalities, and inequities that are associated with social categories beyond race or gender alone (e.g., accentedness).

Although, historically, intersectionality tends to be associated with qualitative research, some researchers (e.g., Atewologun, 2018; Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016) have advocated for the application of intersectionality within quantitative research, a call to which the present dissertation study responds. Else-Quest and Hyde (2016) assert that studying the intersectionality of social identities from a quantitative perspective is important because quantitative designs can provide insights into the intersectional effects (including additive and multiplicative effects) of various social identities and categories. Stated differently, using a quantitative approach in examining the intersectionality of social identities/categories sheds light onto the combined effects of various social identities/categories within a given context. Thus, in the present dissertation, a quantitative approach is employed to examine the effects of accent and race on intergroup outcomes through evaluations of status, solidarity, and dynamism. In the section that follows, the intersectionality of accent and race is explicated and operationalized.

Intersectionality of Accent and Race

As discussed, both accents and race (i.e., Whiteness or Blackness) are markers of social identity and can intersect with one another because, in interactions, people must deal with the language use (e.g., accents) as well as the physical appearance (e.g., race) of interlocutors, at the same time. In everyday interactions, individuals rapidly glean a variety of information (Freeman & Ambady, 2011), such as categories like race and accent. Besides, the human brain tends to categorize stimuli in order to simplify them and make sense of a constantly changing social world (Allport, 1954). Therefore, it is contended in the present dissertation that, although singling out various aspects of socially constructed identity markers is important (such as

investigating the effects of race and accents separately), examining their intersectionality provides a more in-depth, complex understanding of how social identities relate to one another in intergroup communication. This is because social categorization is a dynamic and integrative process (Freeman & Ambady, 2011). Moreover, adopting an intersectional approach lowers the risk of essentialism (Atewologun, 2011), which is the belief that every entity has a set of attributes and characteristics that are fundamental to its identity and function (Fischer, 1999). Essentialism assumes that members of a social group have attributes that are essential to them alone, thereby reducing their experiences to already created categories. Using an intersectional approach reduces the likelihood of essentializing speakers based on their accents and/or race because examining the intersection of individuals' multiple social identities, simultaneously, debunks the notion that certain attributes constitute the make-up and essence of members of certain social groups.

In conceptualizing intersectionality, Else-Quest and Hyde (2016) proposed three fundamental elements/assumptions that undergird intersectional research. These elements are highlighted and discussed in relation to how the present dissertation study fits as intersectional research. The first element posits that intersectional research must examine the simultaneous belonging to multiple, interrelated social categories/groups (Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016). It is proposed in the current dissertation that both accent and race (Whiteness or Blackness), as simultaneous social identity markers, intersect such that the evaluation of one can impact the evaluation of the other. In interactions, individuals are socially categorized based on their accent and race (as discussed earlier). Second, for research to be intersectional, Else-Quest and Hyde (2016) assert that it must attend to and acknowledge the role of power and inequality within society. In other words, research should theorize and analyze how social identities are rooted in

and perpetuated by power dynamics. As explicated earlier, ideologies, connotations, attitudes toward language users (and usage), and racial categories are rooted in power dynamics within society. For instance, what counts as an "appropriate" or "standard" accent is hinged in power relations and perpetuated by the media and educational institutions (Giles et al., 2010). Similarly, connotations surrounding Whiteness and Blackness are rooted in power relations (Hartigan, 1997). Third, intersectional research should examine social categories as features of the individual as well as the social context. In the present dissertation, it is argued that both language and racial cues not only signal one's social identity but also an individual's personal identity because identity is a function of avowal and ascription (Acheme & Cionea, 2021). For instance, speaking with an accent can reflect an individual's idiosyncratic features (e.g., timbral) as well as their group membership (e.g., Nigerian). In the same vein, an individual's race can be avowed (e.g., I am Black) and ascribed by others based on their phenotype (see Acheme & Cionea, 2021).

Although research on language attitudes has examined the evaluation of non-standard (i.e., non-U.S. American) accented speakers, such as Indian Tamil accent (Montgomery & Acheme, 2022), Venezuelan Spanish accent (Díaz-Campos & Killam, 2012), Hispanic, Arabic, Mandarin, Vietnamese accents (Dragojevic & Goatley-Soan, 2020), Nigerian accents (Acheme & Cionea, 2022), amongst other accents, to the best of the author's knowledge, no study, within the U.S. context, has explored the effects of a speaker's race in the evaluation of that speaker's accent, using adult participants. It is arguable that past language attitudes research, which overlooks the role race plays in the evaluation of accents, employs a color-blind ideology in which an individual's race is not explicitly acknowledged (Golash-Boza, 2015). Although past studies have examined the accents spoken by racial minority (immigrant) group members, the

role of race, a significant cue to group membership, has been ignored. Because we live in a society in which one's race (i.e., White or Black) matters (Golah-Boza, 2015), given the history of race and the pervasiveness of racial categories in the U.S., examining the effects of race in language attitudes is pivotal for several reasons. First, one's Whiteness or Blackness is (visibly) present in interactions with racially dissimilar others. Second, in interactions, individuals are not only heard (i.e., accent/language use), but they are also seen (i.e., race). Third, social identities intersect (Crenshaw, 1989) to impact communication (e.g., Hansen, Rakić, & Steffens, 2017). It is contended that employing a color-blind approach to language attitudes does not provide a full picture of the role of social categorization. In other words, speakers are socially categorized not only based on their accents but also based on their race.

Past research has examined intersectionality as it pertains to language use (e.g., voice, accent) or race and ethnicity/appearance, in various contexts. For instance, Rakić and colleagues (2011) investigated whether appearance/looks and accent, separately and concurrently, indicated ethnicity (i.e., German vs. Italian), and whether appearance/looks and accent were used to socially categorize speakers. Results revealed a similar degree of ethnic categorization by accent and appearance. In other words, speakers were socially categorized based on their (ethnic group) appearance and accent. However, participants relied mainly on the accent of a speaker (as compared with appearance) in their social categorization. Similarly, Hansen, Rakić, and Steffens (2017) investigated how native German participants evaluated the competence and warmth of job candidates who spoke with an accent that was congruent or incongruent with their appearance (i.e., German or Turkish). Results indicated a strong preference for accent, in that Turkish-looking German accented speakers were rated as more competent and warmer compared to German-looking Turkish accented speakers. In the same vein, using Italian participants, Paladino

and Mazzurega (2020) examined the combined effect of accent (i.e., native vs. non-native) and race (i.e., European native or White vs. non-native or Black) in real-time categorization (i.e., using a mouse-tracker task). In the early stages of person perception, presenting speakers with mixed cues (i.e., White speakers with a non-native accent and Black speakers with a native accent) led to simultaneous and parallel activation of ingroup and outgroup representation. This means that both accent and race were initially processed. However, in later stages of person perception, when accent and race did not match, accent played a major role in the construal of the accented speaker, such that listeners categorized native speakers as ingroup members. In a different study, Gaither and colleagues (2015) examined how priming an individual's racial identity impacted whether they sounded more Black or more White. Findings showed that Black-primed participants were rated as sounding significantly more Black, less informed, and less confident than White-primed participants.

The findings of these studies suggest several conclusions. First, visual and audio cues are often (automatically) activated in interactions. Second, perceivers categorize others based on their voice and race/ethnicity. Third, individuals evaluate audio and visual stimuli in interactions, which, in turn, influence assessments and stereotypes (of intelligibility, confidence, competence, and warmth). In light of these empirical findings and based on the logic behind the intersectionality (of accent and race), it is contended in the present dissertation that U.S. American listeners will socially categorize speakers based on their accents (i.e., SAE or Nigerian) and race (i.e., White or Black), which will affect intergroup outcomes through evaluations of speakers' status, solidarity, and dynamism.

In the present dissertation, the intersectionality of social identities focuses on two aspects of the socially constructed markers of social group membership, namely, accent and race. The

intersectionality of accent and race is operationalized by combining the social markers of accents (i.e., audio-recording of the SAE accent vs. audio-recording of the Nigerian accent) together with race (i.e., photograph of a phenotypically looking White male vs. photograph of a phenotypically looking Black male). In other words, the combined effect of accent and race is assessed by presenting participants with either an audio-recording of an SAE accented speaker along with a photograph of a phenotypically looking White male (i.e., White-SAE accented speaker) or an audio-recording of a Nigerian accented speaker along with a photograph of a phenotypically looking Black male (i.e., Black-Nigerian accented speaker).

It is important to note that this operationalization will not include a fully crossed factorial experimental design for several reasons. First, given that Nigerian accented speakers are predominantly Black, it would be far-fetched and unrealistic to present participants with photographs of a phenotypically looking White male speaking with a Nigerian accent. Doing this could threaten the ecological validity of the dissertation study, which is of utmost importance. Second, presenting participants with photographs of a phenotypically looking White man speaking with a Nigerian accent assesses questions of cognitive dissonance and incongruency in information processing and communication outcomes, which is not one of the purposes of the present dissertation. Besides, accents can be racialized (Gaither et al., 2015) such that an individual can sound more or less Black or White. Thus, the author acknowledges that she is creating a dichotomy, wherein the SAE accent is associated with White speakers, whereas the Nigerian accent is associated with Black speakers. The dichotomy adopted for this dissertation does not imply that Black or minority groups cannot speak with an SAE accent, especially given that both accent and race are socially constructed. Since standard varieties tend to be associated with the upper middle class (Lippi-Green, 1997) and dominant social groups within society

(Giles et al., 2010), it is contended in the present dissertation that the SAE accent is likely to be associated with phenotypically looking White as opposed to Black speakers. Moreover, past research indicates that perceptions about what constitutes a Black sounding voice persist (e.g., Gaither et al., 2015). Hence, the contrast effects of the intersectionality of accent and race are captured in the evaluations of status, solidarity, and dynamism of White-SAE accented speakers relative to Black-Nigerian accented speakers. The dissertation further examines how these evaluations impact intergroup communication outcomes (i.e., feelings of threat, anxiety, and social distance). Thus, the following hypotheses are posited:

H5: Relative to Black-Nigerian accented speakers, White-SAE accented speakers will be evaluated higher on (a) status, (b) solidarity, and (c) dynamism.

H6: Status, solidarity, and dynamism mediate the relationship between the combined accent and race of a speaker and (a) symbolic threat, (b) realistic threat, (c) intergroup anxiety, and (d) social distance.

CHAPTER 3: MATERIAL GENERATION AND PILOT STUDIES

Stimulus Generation Process

The dissertation studies entailed stimuli generation and piloting to assess the proposed stimuli for the main study. First, for the stimulus material preparation, participants (i.e., SAE and Nigerian accented speakers) were recruited to produce audio speech samples. In addition, the researcher located and collected multiple photographs of White and Black individuals. Next, two pilot studies were conducted to determine the final materials (i.e., photographs of Black and White individuals and audio samples of SAE and Nigerian accented speakers) to be used in the main study. The first pilot study pre-tested the audio stimuli for the main study by examining the prototypicality (i.e., the degree to which an individual was perceived to be representative of the group) of accents (i.e., SAE and Nigerian accents) as captured by audio samples of SAE and Nigerian accented speakers. The second pilot study pre-tested the visual stimuli for the dissertation by examining the prototypicality of race (operationalized as Black and White) as captured by individual photographs of Black and White males. Below is a detailed description of the stimulus generation process and pilot studies.

Part 1: Audio Sample Development

Fourteen speakers (i.e., seven per accent group) were recruited to produce SAE and Nigerian speech stimuli that were further used in the dissertation studies. The desired number of speakers for the dissertation study was three per accent group, based on review of past research (Acheme & Cionea, 2022) and recommendations from the editor of the *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* at the time when the dissertation research was conducted (H. Giles, personal communication, September 9, 2021). These sources suggest using at least three accented speakers per accent group if the study utilizes the verbal guise technique (VGT; Lambert et al.,

1960), a technique in which different speakers produce different accents, to ascertain that variations in accent group conditions are, indeed, the result of the speakers' accents. The author recruited and recorded slightly more than twice this recommended sample size, planning on then selecting the final three accents to be used in the main study, based on further pilot testing.

Participants. Seven White U.S. American and seven Black Nigerian male accented speakers between the ages of 26 and 39 years (M = 31.71, SD = 3.93) were recruited to record audio stimulus materials for this research. All fourteen participants (i.e., message sample providers) were matched on some demographics to ensure as much consistency across speakers as possible. Specifically, their age—to ensure control over any variations that may arise due to generational differences in voice—and education level were similar. They reported having a bachelor's (n = 5), master's (n = 8), or a doctorate degree (n = 1).

All U.S. American participants were from the Mid-Western region of the U.S. because this region is often considered SAE (L. Milroy, 2001) and lacks stigmatization (Maye et al., 2007). Participants emanated from Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Nebraska, and Ohio. To produce the Nigerian speech samples, Nigerians who originated from the South-Western region of Nigeria were recruited. Generally, most individuals that emanate from this region of Nigeria speak Yoruba—a native language. The Nigerian accented speakers' state of origin in Nigeria included Ogun, Ondo, and Oyo states. Nigerian accented speakers had lived in the U.S. for varied lengths of time, ranging from 7 months to 60 months (M = 34.86, SD = 24.42 months).

Procedures. Following determination by the Institutional Review Board regarding the stimulus generation process, participants who met the demographic criteria discussed above were recruited via snowball sampling (i.e., recommendations by individuals in the researcher's social networks) through text messages, emails, phone calls, and/or word of mouth. The recruitment

message informed participants about the purpose of the overall dissertation research (i.e., the evaluation of individuals based on their race and accent) and what they would be asked to do for the audio sample recordings. The message also contained information about the characteristics of speakers' voices needed (i.e., individuals who spoke clearly, without any speech impairment, and with an even pace, even-pitched voice, and good enunciation).

Participants met with the researcher once via an online platform (i.e., Zoom) to practice and record the speech samples. Before the online meeting, participants completed and signed a voice release form, which contained information about the study and permission to use their audio recordings in future research. Then, sessions began with participants practicing a paragraph from the *rainbow passage* (Fairbanks, 1960; see Appendix A). The rainbow passage is an innocuous segment of prose that describes how rainbows are formed and legends about rainbows. The goal of the practice session was to ensure that participants produced the speech samples effortlessly, without reading errors and/or weird pauses. The practice sessions ended when participants demonstrated fluency in reading the passage. Each practice session took an approximately 10-15 minutes. Next, audio recordings of the speakers reading the passage were created. The recording session took approximately15-25 minutes. Audio samples were of comparable lengths, between 59 seconds and a minute and 15 seconds. Participants were thanked for their participation and compensated $50 for their time and effort.

Part 2a: Pilot Study 1: Audio Samples Selection

To determine the final materials for the main study, Pilot Study 1 was conducted to assess the prototypicality of the audio stimuli (i.e., speech samples from SAE and Nigerian accented speakers), as evaluated by ingroup members given that group perceptions differ depending on group membership (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). That is, U.S. Americans evaluated SAE accented

speakers, whereas Nigerians living in the U.S. evaluated Nigerian accented speakers. G*Power 3.1 was used to conduct a power analysis to determine the appropriate sample size for detecting small to medium effects (η^2p = .20; Cohen, 1992) for two groups with α set at .05 and power at .80. The suggested sample size was 100 participants per group, so, a total of 200 participants.

Participants. A total of 250 participants were recruited, above the recommended sample to account for potential invalid responses. There were two groups of participants for Pilot Study 1. The first group of participants (n = 150) were recruited using Prolific – a crowdsource platform that offers recruitment services to researchers and is suited for recruiting participants for social and economic science experiments (Palan & Schitter, 2018). Prolific participants listened to/evaluated the SAE accented speakers. The selection criteria for Prolific workers included individuals who had (a) completed between 50 to 5000 Prolific studies (this number is smaller as this crowdsource platform is somewhat new) and (b) a 90% or higher approval rating for their previous Prolific work, as a way of ensuring high data quality (recommended by Peer et al., 2014 for MTurk crowdsource data collection). In addition, selection criteria were restricted to individuals between the ages of 18 and 100, who self-identified (a) as a U.S. American national, (b) resided in the U.S., (c) were monolingual English speakers, and (d) were raised speaking their native language only. The sample was balanced based on participants' sex (i.e., 50% males and 50% females).

A total of 203 participants consented to participate in the study. Responses from 52 participants were deleted because they dropped out of the study (i.e., they "returned" the study in the language of Prolific, meaning that they chose not to finish the task of completing the survey), leaving responses from 151 participants for analysis. Participants' age ranged from 20 to 79 years (M = 42.26, SD = 14.14). Participants were primarily White and were mostly from Florida

(*n* = 14), Texas (*n* = 14), North Carolina (*n* = 10), New York (*n* = 8), California (*n* = 8), and Illinois (*n* = 8). Detailed demographics are reported in Table 1.

Table 1

Sample Characteristics for Pilot Study 1: Prolific Sample Evaluating SAE Accents (N = 151)

Measures	*N*	(%)
Sex		
Male	74	(49.0%)
Female	77	(51.0%)
Prefer not to answer	0	(0%)
Ethnicity		
Asian	1	(0.7%)
Black or African American	13	(8.6%)
Hispanic or Latino/Latina	2	(1.3%)
White	130	(86.1%)
A combination of some of the above	1	(0.7%)
Another ethnicity/race	1	(0.7%)
Prefer not to answer	3	(2.0%)
Education		
High school degree or less	18	(11.9%)
Some college	27	(17.9%)
2-year college degree	24	(15.9%)
4-year college degree	62	(41.1%)
Professional degree	4	(2.6%)
Graduate degree (e.g., M.A., Ph.D.)	16	(10.6%)
Prefer not to answer	0	(0%)
Employment	55	(36.4%)
Employed full time (paid)	15	(9.9%)
Employed part-time (paid)	29	(19.2%)
Self-employed	44	(29.1%)
Not working	8	(5.3%)
Prefer not to answer		
Annual Income	46	(30.5%)
Under $25,000	39	(25.8%)
$25,000 – $49,999	30	(19.9%)
$50,000 - $74,999	14	(9.3%)
$75,000 - $99,999	18	(11.9%)
Over $100,000	4	(2.6%)
Prefer not to answer	0	(0%)

The second group of participants – a very specific sample who listened to/evaluated the Nigerian accented speakers, were individuals who self-identified as Nigerian and who resided in the U.S. given that the dissertation study was conducted within the U.S. context. Participants were recruited using snowball sampling (i.e., the use of social media, emails, or text message). A total of 437 participants consented to participate in the study. Responses from individuals who failed attention verification questions (n = 177), provided serial answers (n = 43), who dropped out of the study (n = 112), and who were ineligible (n = 1) were deleted, leaving responses from 105 participants for analysis. Participants' age ranged from 19 to 63 years (M = 31.20, SD = 8.04). Participants' state of origin in Nigeria were primarily Ondo (n = 15), Oyo (n = 9), Lagos (n = 8), and Ogun (n = 6). In the U.S., most of them lived in California (n = 11), New York (n = 9), Texas (n = 9), Maryland (n = 8), and Oklahoma (n = 8). Detailed demographics are reported in Table 2.

Table 2

Sample Characteristics for Pilot Study 1: Nigerian Sample Evaluating Nigerian Accents (N = 105)

Measures	*N*	(%)
Sex		
Male	47	(44.8%)
Female	55	(52.4%)
Other	1	(1.0%)
Prefer not to answer	2	(2.0%)
Education		
High school degree or less	2	(1.9%)
Some college	6	(5.7%)
2-year college degree	6	(5.7%)
4-year college degree	23	(21.9%)
Professional degree	15	(14.3%)
Graduate degree (e.g., M.A., Ph.D.)	47	(44.8%)
Other	2	(1.9%)
Prefer not to answer	4	(3.9%)
Employment		

Employed full time (paid)	51	(48.6%)
Employed part-time (paid)	30	(28.6%)
Self-employed	7	(6.7%)
Not working	9	(8.6%)
Prefer not to answer	8	(7.7%)
Annual Income		
Under $25,000	31	(29.5%)
$25,000 – $49,999	18	(17.1%)
$50,000 - $74,999	24	(22.9%)
$75,000 - $99,999	8	(7.6%)
Over $100,000	10	(9.5%)
Prefer not to answer	14	(13.4%)

Procedures. All participants read a description of the recruitment message either on Prolific (SAE listeners/evaluators) or via social media, email, or text message (Nigerian listeners/evaluators). The recruitment message informed participants about the purpose of the study, which was to listen to audio recordings of various speakers and answer questions about the audio samples. Interested Prolific workers who met the selection criteria were able to accept the task on Prolific and accessed an online questionnaire hosted on Qualtrics to complete the study. The first page of the questionnaire contained consent information and those who consented proceeded to complete the study. Interested Nigerian participants who met the selection criteria were able to access the link included in their recruitment message and completed a second online questionnaire hosted on Qualtrics. On the first page of the survey, Nigerian participants were asked the following eligibility questions, “Are you over 18 years of age?”, “Do you self-identify as Nigerian?”, and “Do you currently reside in the U.S.?”. The answer choices for these questions were “Yes” or “No”. Individuals who chose “No” for any of these questions were redirected to the end of the survey and not permitted to complete the study. Participants who passed the eligibility check questions then read information about the study and provided their consent to participate. Those who consented proceeded to complete the study.

All participants (SAE or Nigerians listeners/evaluators) were asked to listen to seven audio samples of either SAE accented male speakers (SAE listeners/evaluators) or Nigerian accented male speakers (Nigerian listeners/evaluators). In other words, each SAE listener/evaluator listened to all seven SAE accented audio samples, presented in random order. Similarly, each Nigerian listener/evaluator listened to all seven Nigerian accented audio stimuli, also presented in random order. After listening to each audio sample, participants were asked to rate the prototypicality as well as the vocal attractiveness of the SAE or Nigerian accents, respectively. In addition, to ensure that participants were paying attention and not providing serial responses, three attention verification questions were included in the survey. Questions asked participants to select a particular answer choice (e.g., "mark 'seventy' for your answer"). Prolific participants were compensated $5.00 for completing the study, whereas Nigerian participants received an electronic $10.00 digital Amazon gift card via email. This difference in compensation was due to the different recruitment methods and the fact that Nigerians were a highly specialized and difficult to reach sample compared to Prolific workers. The Prolific sample evaluating SAE accents took an average of 22.12 minutes (*SD* = 16.37) minutes to complete the study, whereas the Nigerian individuals evaluating Nigerian accents took an average of 22.50 minutes (*SD* = 23.64) to complete the study. The research was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the author's university.

Measures

Accent Prototypicality. To assess the degree to which individuals in the audio stimuli were perceived to be prototypical of their ingroup (i.e., SAE/Yoruba), seven items adapted from B. Van Knippenberg and D. Van Knippenberg (2005) and Montgomery (2019) were used. Sample items include, "The accent of the individual in the audio clip is a typical SAE/Yoruba

accent", "The accent of the individual in the audio clip is similar to the SAE/Yoruba accent, overall," and "The accent of the individual in the audio clip is representative of the accent of SAE/Yoruba speakers" (see Appendix B for all items). Responses to scale items were measured using a sliding 0-100 scale, ranging from 0 = *strongly disagree* to 100 = *strongly agree*. Cronbach reliability scores for the prototypicality of each speaker (i.e., SAE and Nigerian) are provided in Table 3.

Table 3

Cronbach's α for Pilot Study 1 Prototypicality, Vocal Attractiveness Measures, Means and Standard Deviations

Measures	Prototypicality Cronbach's α	Vocal attractiveness Cronbach's α	Prototypicality *M*	Prototypicality *SD*
SAE speaker 1	.98	.96	85.69	15.09
SAE speaker 2	.98	.96	86.81	14.61
SAE speaker 3	.99	.96	81.04	19.78
SAE speaker 4	.99	.95	70.79	23.79
SAE speaker 5	.99	.96	78.80	20.09
SAE speaker 6	.99	.95	77.59	20.09
SAE speaker 7	.99	.96	78.95	20.62
Nigerian speaker 1	.98	.95	85.69	15.09
Nigerian speaker 2	.98	.96	86.81	14.61
Nigerian speaker 3	.98	.97	81.04	19.78
Nigerian speaker 4	.97	.93	70.79	23.79
Nigerian speaker 5	.98	.96	78.80	20.09
Nigerian speaker 6	.98	.96	77.59	20.09
Nigerian speaker 7	.98	.94	78.95	20.65

In addition to the scale, two open-ended questions asking, "In your opinion, what makes the accent typical of SAE/Yoruba English accent?" and "In your opinion, what makes the accent typical of SAE/Yoruba English accent?" were presented to participants. A textbox was provided for participants to type in their responses. The goal of asking these open-ended questions was to

determine if participants considered any other characteristics typical or not typical of SAE/Yoruba English accent beyond the aspects captured by the scale items.

Vocal Attractiveness. To measure and control for perceived vocal attractiveness, three questions were created by the author for this dissertation study. Items tapped into how attractive the vocal features of speakers sounded. Sample items include, "How attractive does the voice of the individual in the audio clip sound?" and "How attractive do you find the vocal features (e.g., pitch, tone, timbral/quality of sound) of the individual in the audio clip?". Responses to scale items were measured using a sliding 0-100 scale, ranging from 0 = *strongly disagree* to 100 = *strongly agree* (see Appendix B). The reliability scores for the vocal attractiveness of each speaker (i.e., SAE and Nigerian) are detailed in Table 3.

Results

A repeated measures analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to assess the prototypicality of the SAE and Nigerian accented speakers. For the SAE accents, the prototypicality evaluations for all seven SAE accented speakers were entered as a within-subjects factor, the seven SAE accent samples were entered as the between-group factors, and vocal attractiveness ratings for all seven SAE accented speakers were entered as covariates in the repeated measures analysis. The multivariate test was significant, Wilks' Lambda = .87, $F(6, 138) = 3.52$, $p < .005$, $\eta^2 p = .13$, indicating that there was a difference between the seven SAE audio samples. To select the three most prototypical SAE accented speakers (as evaluated by study participants), while controlling for vocal attractiveness, the top three means were first identified. These were for audio samples produced by SAE speakers 2, 1, and 3 (see Table 3 for all means and standard deviations). Note that, in terms of vocal attractiveness, of the three selected SAE speakers samples, only SAE speaker 1 audio sample was significant, $F(1, 143) =$

15.58, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 p = .10$. However, this stimulus was still selected for use in the main dissertation study given the overall results on prototypicality (i.e., SAE speaker 1 sample had the second highest prototypicality score while controlling for vocal attractiveness) as well as the qualitative responses for this audio sample (e.g., several comments indicated this audio sample was "similar to" or "typical of" SAE speakers). Furthermore, scores on the variables of interest would be averaged in the main dissertation study across all three SAE speakers audio samples—i.e., there would be two other audio samples for which vocal attractiveness was not significant that participants would listen to and then provide their evaluations. Thus, the top means for SAE speakers 2, 1, and 3 were then compared to each of the remaining four SAE accents' evaluations (i.e., SAE speakers 7, 5, 6, and 4) to examine whether they were significantly different. For example, SAE speaker 2 mean was compared to SAE 4 speaker mean, SAE speaker 5 mean, SAE speaker 6 mean, and SAE speaker 7 mean. All comparisons revealed significant differences, indicating SAE speaker 2 mean was statistically higher than the means with which it was compared. The same process was repeated for SAE speakers 1 and 3 audio samples. The pairwise comparisons revealed that SAE speakers 2 and 1 were rated as the highest prototypical SAE accented speakers compared to the mean prototypicality scores for SAE speakers 4, 5, and 6. SAE speaker 3 mean was significantly different from SAE speaker 4, 6, and 5 means, but not from the mean of SAE Speaker 7. Therefore, for SAE speaker 3 mean and SAE speaker 7 mean, qualitative responses were also analyzed to supplement the quantitative pairwise comparison in order to choose the more prototypical audio sample.

First, all qualitative responses asking participants what made SAE speakers 3 and 7 (a)typical of the SAE accent were read. Then, using Owen's (1984) criteria of forcefulness (i.e., use of strong emotion/tone of voice), recurrence (i.e., use of different words reflecting

underlying meaning), and repetition (i.e., use of repeated words and phrases), an analysis of the answers was conducted with the goal of identifying recurring attributes that participants provided when evaluating these two speakers. Based on the qualitative responses, SAE speaker 7 was deemed to be more prototypical than SAE speaker 3. For instance, qualitative responses for SAE speaker 3 was that the speaker "has a bit of an accent", compared to SAE speaker 7 who was more "expressive, proper, and sharp". Thus, SAE speakers 2, 1, and 7 were chosen as audio stimuli for the main experimental study.

A similar procedure was followed for the Nigerian audio samples: the prototypicality evaluations for all seven Nigerian accented speakers were entered as a within-subjects factor, the seven Nigerian accent samples were entered as the between-group factors, and vocal attractiveness ratings for all seven Nigerian accented speakers were entered as covariates in a repeated measures ANCOVA. The multivariate test was not significant, Wilks' Lambda = .90, $F(6, 84) = 1.49$, $p = .19$, $\eta^2 p = .10$, indicating that there was no significant difference between the seven Nigerian accents. To select the most prototypical Nigerian accents, while controlling for vocal attractiveness, the top three means for prototypicality (i.e., Nigerian speakers 2, 3, and 5) were first selected (see Table 3 for means and standard deviations) and were used in pairwise comparisons with the remaining four audio samples (i.e., Nigerian speakers 1, 4, 6, and 7). For example, Nigerian speaker 2 mean was compared to Nigerian speaker 1 mean, Nigerian speaker 4 mean, Nigerian speaker 6 mean, and Nigerian speaker 7 mean. If the pairwise comparison indicated non-significance, then the next highest mean was used for comparison. In addition, qualitative responses were relied on to select the most prototypical Nigerian accents.

First, all the qualitative responses asking participants what made the speakers (a)typical of the Yoruba accent were read. The same criteria from Owen's (1984) of forcefulness,

recurrence, and repetition used for the SAE speakers were used for the Nigerian speakers as well to identify recurring themes about the Nigerian audio samples. Based on the similar qualitative responses, Speaker 4 was found to be the most prototypical Yoruba speaker (example comments/phrases included, "educated" and "eloquence"). Nigerian speakers 3 (example comments/phrases included, "fluent" and "clear") and Nigerian speaker 5 (example comments/phrases included "sounds educated" and "educated") were also found to be more prototypical compared to the other speakers. Thus, given that the quantitative ratings did not produce significant differences between the mean scores for prototypicality, qualitative responses were essential in determining the most prototypical Nigerian audio samples, which were the ones produced by speakers 3, 5, and 4. It is important to note that, in terms of vocal attractiveness, of these three Nigerian speakers, only Nigerian speaker 4 was significant, $F(1, 95) = 4.43$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 p = .01$. However, Nigerian speaker 4 was still selected given the overall results of the qualitative responses (e.g., "similar" to other Yoruba speakers). As for SAE speakers, these three most prototypical Nigerian speakers would be averaged in the main study across other two audio and/or visual stimuli that were not significant. Therefore, these three Nigerian accents were chosen as audio stimuli for the main experimental study.

Part 2b: Pilot Study 2: Photographs Selection

To determine the final materials for the main study, Pilot Study 2 examined the prototypicality of the visual stimuli (i.e., photographs of White and Black individuals). Visual stimuli were evaluated by ingroup members (i.e., Whites evaluated White photographs and Blacks evaluated Black photographs). Similar to Pilot Study 1, G*Power 3.1 was used to conduct a power analysis to determine the appropriate sample size for detecting small to medium effects

(η^2p = .20; Cohen, 1992) for two groups with α set at .05 and power set at .80. The suggested sample size was 200 participants, that is 100 participants per group.

To test the prototypicality of visual stimuli, a total of 24 photographs of White or Black males were presented to participants. Photographs were obtained from the Chicago Face Database (CFD; https://www.chicagofaces.org/), an image repository developed at the University of Chicago meant for use in scientific research. The CFD provides high-resolution standardized photographs (i.e., 2444 pixels wide; 1718 pixels high) of males and females of different ethnicities (i.e., individuals who self-identified as White, Black, Asian, and Latino) in the U.S. between the ages of 17-65 (for more information see Ma et al., 2015). For this dissertation, the first author, in consultation with the dissertation advisor, selected White (n = 12) and Black (n = 12) male photographs based on (a) the operationalization of race (i.e., perceived differences in skin color, hair texture, nose size, and lip thickness; Omi & Winant, 2014; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2002) and (b) neutral facial expressions. In other words, White males in the photographs were perceived as having so-called "white" skin color, straight hair and nose, thin lips, and a neutral facial expression, whereas Black males in the photographs were perceived as having so-called "black" skin color, kinky hair, flat nose, thicker lips, and a neutral facial expression. Also, all White or Black males in the photographs wore similar clothing (i.e., heather grey t-shirt) and stood against a white background.

Participants. Two group of participants were recruited—the first group self-identified as White and the second group self-identified as Black or African American. All participants were Prolific workers who (a) had completed between 50 and 5000 Prolific tasks, and (b) had a 90% or higher approval rating for their previous Prolific work as a way of ensuring high data quality. Additionally, eligibility was restricted to individuals between the ages of 18 and 100, who self-

identified as (a) U.S. American White (or Caucasian as used in the U.S. Census) or Black (or African American as used in the U.S. Census), (b) a U.S. American national, and who (c) resided in the U.S. These two separate groups of participants (i.e., Whites and Blacks) were recruited via two separate web postings on Prolific. The sample for each of the groups was balanced based on participants' sex (i.e., 50% males and 50% females).

For the first group of participants, Whites, a total of 233 participants consented to participate in the study. Responses from 83 participants were deleted because they dropped out (i.e., they "returned" the study), leaving responses from 150 participants for analysis. Participants' age ranged from 18 to 80 years (M = 46.49, SD = 14.76). Participants were primarily White and were mostly from Florida (n = 14), California (n = 13), New York (n = 10), Pennsylvania (n = 12), and Ohio (n = 12). Detailed demographics are reported in Table 4.

Table 4

Sample Characteristics for Pilot Study 2: White Prolific Sample Evaluating White Photographs (N = 150)

Measures	*N* (%)
Sex	
Male	75 (50.0%)
Female	75 (50.0%)
Prefer not to answer	0 (0%)
Ethnicity	
White	148 (98.7%)
Another ethnicity/race	2 (1.3%)
Prefer not to answer	0 (0%)
Education	
High school degree or less	15 (10.0%)
Some college	23 (15.3%)
2-year college degree	22 (14.7%)
4-year college degree	59 (39.3%)
Professional degree	7 (4.7%)
Graduate degree (e.g., M.A., Ph.D.)	24 (16%)
Prefer not to answer	0 (0%)
Employment	62 (41.3%)

Employed full time (paid)	13	(8.7%)
Employed part-time (paid)	31	(20.7%)
Self-employed	41	(27.3%)
Not working	3	(2.0%)
Prefer not to answer	0	(0%)
Annual Income	34	(22.7%)
Under $25,000	42	(28.0%)
$25,000 – $49,999	27	(18.0%)
$50,000 - $74,999	17	(11.3%)
$75,000 - $99,999	26	(17.3%)
Over $100,000	4	(2.7%)
Prefer not to answer	0	(0%)

For the second group of participants, Blacks, a total of 221 individuals consented to participate in the study. Responses from 69 participants were deleted because they dropped out of the study (i.e., they "returned" the study), leaving responses from 152 participants for analysis. Participants' age ranged from 18 to 77 years (M = 37.37, SD = 13.71). Participants were primarily Black, and were mostly from Florida (n = 15), Texas, (n = 14), North Carolina (n = 13), Georgia (n = 11), and New York (n = 10). Detailed demographics are reported in Table 5.

Table 5

Sample Characteristics for Pilot Study 2: Black Prolific Sample Evaluating Black Photographs (N = 152)

Measures	*N*	(%)
Sex		
Male	66	(43.4%)
Female	81	(53.3%)
Other	1	(0.7%)
Prefer not to answer	4	(2.7%)
Ethnicity		
Black/African-American	148	(97.4%)
White	1	(0.7%)
A combination of some of the above	1	(0.7%)
Prefer not to answer	2	(1.7%)
Education		
High school degree or less	21	(13.8%)
Some college	32	(21.1%)

2 year college degree	21	(13.8%)
4 year college degree	53	(34.9%)
Graduate degree (e.g., M.A., Ph.D.)	22	(14.5%)
Prefer not to answer	3	(3.0%)
Employment		
Employed full time (paid)	61	(49.1%)
Employed part-time (paid)	23	(15.1%)
Self-employed	25	(16.4%)
Not working	31	(20.4%)
Prefer not to answer	12	(7.9%)
Annual Income		
Under $25,000	46	(30.3%)
$25,000 – $49,999	51	(33.6%)
$50,000 - $74,999	24	(15.8%)
$75,000 - $99,999	14	(9.2%)
Over $100,000	12	(7.9%)
Prefer not to answer	5	(3.3%)

Procedures. Eligible participants read a description of the study on Prolific, under each of their respective postings. The recruitment message informed participants about the purpose of the study, which was to look at multiple photographs and answer basic questions about the individuals in the photographs. Interested participants were able to accept the task and accessed an online questionnaire hosted on Qualtrics to complete the study.

On the first page of the questionnaire for each of the two samples (i.e., Whites and Blacks) participants read information about the study and provided their consent to participate. In each survey, those who consented were then randomly assigned to view 12 photographs: the White Prolific sample was presented with 12 photographs of White males, whereas the Black Prolific sample was presented with 12 photographs of Black males, all displayed in random order. Participants who self-identified as White rated how prototypically White-looking the individuals in the photographs were. Participants who self-identified as Black rated how prototypically Black-looking the individuals in the photographs were.

Next, participants completed a measure of physical attractiveness. At the end of the survey, the demographic information (i.e., age, sex, education, state, ethnicity, annual income, and employment) of all participants was also collected. Participants evaluating White photographs took an average of 21.22 minutes (*SD* = 18.37) to complete the study. They were paid $3.00 for their participation. Participants evaluating the Black photographs took an average of 28.42 minutes (*SD* = 20.24) to complete the study. They were compensated $3.22 for their participation. The IRB at the author's university approved the study.

Measures

Race Prototypicality. To assess the degree to which individuals in the visual stimuli were perceived to be prototypical of their ingroup (i.e., Black/White), seven items adapted from B. Van Knippenberg and D. Van Knippenberg (2005) and Montgomery (2019) were used. Sample items include, "The individual in the photograph looks like a typical White/Black male", "The individual in the photograph looks similar to Black/White males, overall," and "The individual in the photograph resembles the phenotype (i.e., skin color, lip and nose size, and hair texture) of other White/Black males" (see Appendix B for all items). Responses to scale items were measured using a sliding 0-100 scale, with 0 = *strongly disagree* to 100 = *strongly agree*. Cronbach reliability scores for the prototypicality for each photo (i.e., White and Black) are detailed in Table 6.

To ensure that participants were paying attention and not providing serial responses, six attention verification questions were included in the survey. Questions asked participants to select a particular answer choice (e.g., "mark 'seventy' for your answer"). In addition, two open-ended questions asking, "In your opinion, what makes the individual in the photograph typical of White males/Black males?" and "In your opinion, what makes the individual in the photograph

typical of White males/Black males?" were presented to participants. A textbox was provided for participants to type in their responses. The goal of asking these open-ended questions was to determine if participants considered any other characteristics typical or not typical of Whites/Blacks, besides what the scale items already captured.

Table 6

Cronbach's α for Pilot Study 2 Prototypicality, Physical Attractiveness Measures, Means and Standard Deviations

Measures	Prototypicality Cronbach's α	Physical Attractiveness Cronbach's α	Prototypicality *M*	Prototypicality *SD*
White photo 1	.99	.98	70.16	20.53
White photo 2	.99	.97	81.26	16.78
White photo 3	.99	.97	82.49	16.16
White photo 4	.99	.98	75.93	20.62
White photo 5	.99	.96	82.23	16.69
White photo 6	.99	.97	75.07	19.50
White photo 7	.99	.98	75.77	20.82
White photo 8	.99	.97	81.64	16.22
White photo 9	.99	.98	83.75	15.55
White photo 10	.99	.98	71.85	19.57
White photo 11	.99	.98	79.98	17.35
White photo 12	.98	.98	78.87	17.93
Black photo 1	.98	.96	68.86	25.43
Black photo 2	.98	.96	72.82	22.48
Black photo 3	.98	.98	72.31	22.85
Black photo 4	.98	.98	72.80	22.13
Black photo 5	.99	.98	66.28	26.97
Black photo 6	.98	.96	73.51	22.34
Black Photo 7	.98	97	73.19	22.29
Black Photo 8	.98	.96	74.12	22.79
Black Photo 9	.98	.97	73.66	22.74
Black Photo 10	.98	.96	76.19	21.32
Black Photo 11	.99	.98	75.51	22.88
Black Photo 12	.98	.97	72.82	22.48

Physical Attractiveness. To control for perceived physical attractiveness, three questions were created for the purpose of this dissertation study. Participants were asked, "To what extent

do you consider the individual in the photograph to be physically attractive?", "Overall, how good looking would you say the individual in the photograph is?", and "How attractive do you find the physical/facial features of the individual in the photograph?" (See Appendix B). Responses to these scale items were also measured using a sliding 0-100 scale, with 0 = *not at all attractive/good looking* to 100 = *extremely attractive/good looking*. Reliabilities for physical attractiveness for each photo (i.e., White and Black) are detailed in Table 6.

Results

A repeated measures ANCOVA was conducted to assess the prototypicality of the White and Black male photographs. For photographs of Whites, the prototypicality measures for all 12 White males were entered as a within-subjects factor, White male photos were entered as the between-subject factor, and physical attractiveness ratings for all 12 White males were entered as covariates. The multivariate test was significant, Wilks' Lambda = .80, $F(11, 126) = 2.80$, $p < .005$, $\eta^2 p = .20$, indicating that there was a difference between the 12 photographs of White males. To select the most prototypically looking White males, while controlling for physical attractiveness, the highest three means were first selected (i.e., White photos 9, 3, and 5, see Table 6 for means and standard deviations). These means were used to conduct pairwise comparisons with each of the other nine White male photographs (i.e., White photos 8, 2, 11, 12, 4, 7, 6, 10, and 1). For example, White photo 9 mean was compared to White photo 2 mean, White photo 4 mean, White photo 6 mean, White photo 7 mean, White photo 8 mean, White photo 10 mean, White photo 11 mean, and White photo 12 mean. If the pairwise comparison indicated non-significance, then the next highest mean was used for the comparison, until the highest three means were statistically different. Based on pairwise comparisons results, White photos 9, 5, and 2 were selected for further investigation. Photo 3, although it had a higher mean

for prototypicality than photo 2, was not statistically different from the rest of the photos. Note that not all pairwise comparisons between these three photographs were significantly different (i.e., photos 2 and 9 were significant, $p < .05$ but photos 2 and 5 were not). Note that none of these three photographs were significant in terms of physical attractiveness. Therefore, qualitative responses were also analyzed to supplement the quantitative pairwise comparison in order to choose the highest rated prototypical visual stimuli.

As discussed in Pilot Study 1, first, all the qualitative responses asking participants what made the photographs (a)typical of White males were read. Then, Owen's (1984) same three criteria of forcefulness, recurrence, and repetition were employed to find common themes among participants' responses for photographs 2, 9, and 5. Based on the qualitative responses, White photo 9 was deemed to be the most prototypically looking White male. For instance, the White male in photo 9 was described as such: "his skin color, eye color, hair color and hair texture are very typical of white males". Similar comments were made for White photo 5: "everything about the above individual resembles what a typical white male looks like". Likewise, comments such as, "the individual looked like a typical white male due to the color of his skin, hair, eye color and overall appearance" were also made for White photo 2, compared to comments like "a little darker skintone" or "he looks angry" for White photo 3. So, even though the mean for White photo 3 was higher, qualitative comments about his skin tone and angry facial expression resulted in the selection of photo 2. Thus, White photos 9, 5, and 2 were chosen as visual stimuli for the main experimental study.

A similar process was followed for the Black photographs: the prototypicality measures for all 12 Black males were entered as a within-subjects factor, Black male photos were entered as the between-subject factor, and physical attractiveness ratings for all 12 Black males were

entered as covariates in a repeated measures ANCOVA. The multivariate test was significant, Wilks' Lambda = .80, $F(10, 128) = 3.28$, $p < .005$, $\eta^2p = .03$, indicating that there was a difference between the 12 photographs of Black males. To select the highest prototypically-looking Black males, while controlling for physical attractiveness, the highest three means were first selected (i.e., Black photo 10, 11, and 8, see Table 6 for means and standard deviations) and were used to conduct pairwise comparisons with each of the other nine photographs (i.e., Black photos 9, 6, 7, 2, 12, 4, 3, 1, and 5) to see if they were significantly different. It is important to note that in terms of physical attractiveness, of the top three photos, only Black photo 10 was significant, $F(1, 137) = 4.93$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2p = .04$. However, Black photo 10 was retained for possible use in the main study given the qualitative responses for this photo (e.g., "skin color and hair texture are [sic] similar to other Black males"). Furthermore, all three Black photos would also be averaged in the main study across other two audio and/or visual stimuli that were not significant. Thus, for comparisons, Black photo 10 prototypicality mean was compared to Black photo 2 mean, Black photo 3 mean, Black photo 4 mean, Black photo 5 mean, Black photo 6 mean, Black photo 7 mean, Black photo 9 mean, and Black photo 12 mean. If the pairwise comparison indicated non-significance, then the next highest mean was used for comparison, until the highest three means were statistically different. The pairwise comparison prompted the retention of Black photos 10, 11, and for further investigation. Black photo 8 was not significantly different from the rest of the photos. Not all pairwise comparisons between the three retained photographs were significantly different (i.e., photos 3 and 10 were significantly different from each other at $p < .05$, but photos 10 and 11 were not). Therefore, qualitative responses for photos 10 and 11 were also analyzed to supplement the quantitative pairwise comparisons in order to choose the highest rated prototypical visual stimuli.

Again, all qualitative responses asking participants what made the photographs (a)typical of Black males were read and, once again, Owen's (1984) criteria of forcefulness, recurrence, and repetition were employed to analyze the open-ended responses about Black photos 10 and 11. Qualitative responses for photo 10 included, "He has the distinctive features that African Americans have such as the melanin and the coarse hair". Similar comments were made for Black photo 11 such as, "His skin color, nose shape and hair texture." Likewise, comments such as "his wide nose, coarse hair, and dark complexion" were made for Black photo 3 compared to comments like, "Maybe the shape of his eyes might not be as most typical black males" and "The shape of the individual's ears are not a typical feature of black men" made for Black photo 8. So, even though the mean for Black photo 8 was higher, qualitative comments about the facial features resulted photo 3 being considered more prototypical. Thus, Black photo 10, 11, and 3 were chosen as visual stimuli for the main experimental study.

In conclusion, both pilot studies were conducted to determine prototypical accents (i.e., SAE and Nigerian audio samples) and race (i.e., photographs of Whites and Blacks) stimuli to be used in the main experimental study, while controlling for vocal (for accent) and physical (for race) attractiveness. Based on these pilot studies' results, six most prototypical audio stimuli (three SAE and three Nigerian accented speaker recordings) and six visual stimuli (three White and three Black male photographs) were selected for use in the main experimental study, which is detailed next.

CHAPTER 4: MAIN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

One goal of scientific work is to establish relationships between variables.

– Edward Fink

Main Experimental Study Method

The goal of the main dissertation study was to examine the independent and combined effects of accents and race on intergroup communication outcomes. The study manipulated two independent variables (i.e., accent and race), examining their main effects [(Accent: SAE/Nigerian) and (Race: White/Black)] and their combined-matched effects (Race-Accent: White-SAE/Black-Nigerian) using a between-subjects experimental design. In other words, the main experimental study manipulated accent (i.e., SAE/Nigerian) for the audio-only conditions, race (i.e., White/Black) for the visual-only conditions, and accent and race (i.e., White-SAE/Black-Nigerian) for the race-accent conditions. For the accent-only conditions, there were three audio-recordings of SAE accented speakers and three audio-recordings of Nigerian accented speakers. For the race-only conditions, there were three photographs of White males together with the rainbow passage and three photographs of Black males together with the rainbow passage. Finally, for the accent-race conditions, there were three audio-recordings of SAE accented speakers accompanied by three photographs of White males and three audio-recordings of Nigerian accented speakers accompanied by three photographs of Black males. Thus, there were 18 conditions in total. As discussed in the literature review, recall that the experimental design was not a fully crossed design. G*Power 3.1 was used to conduct a power analysis to determine the appropriate sample size for detecting small to medium effects (η^2p = .20; Cohen, 1992) for 18 groups with α set at .05 and power at .80. The suggested sample size was 416. Therefore, a total of 500 participants were recruited to account for invalid responses.

Participants

A total of 519 participants consented to participate in the study. Responses from 17 participants were deleted because they dropped out of the study (i.e., they "returned" the study), leaving responses from 502 participants for analyses. Participants' age ranged from 18 to 93 years (M = 39.89, SD = 13.68). They were primarily White and were mostly from Texas (n = 45), California (n = 38), Florida (n = 33), Ohio (n = 32), and Pennsylvania (n = 31). Detailed demographics are reported in Table 7.

Participants were Prolific workers. The same recruitment criteria used in Pilot Study 1 for Prolific participants were applied to select main study Prolific workers, except that those participants who completed Pilot Study 1 and 2 were not be eligible to participate in the main study. The selection criteria for Prolific workers included individuals who (a) had completed between 50 to 5000 Prolific studies, and (b) had a 90% or higher approval rating for their previous Prolific work, as a way of ensuring high data quality. In addition, selection criteria were restricted to individuals between the ages of 18 and 100, who self-identified (a) as a U.S. American national, (b) resided in the U.S., (c) were monolingual English speakers, (d) were raised speaking their native language only, (e) were speakers of English as a first language, (f) were not bilingual, and (g) their primary language was English. The sample was also balanced based on their sex (i.e., 50% males and 50% females).

Table 7

Sample Characteristics for Main Study (N = 502)

Measures	*N*	(%)
Sex		
Male	248	(49.4%)
Female	245	(48.8%)
Other	2	(0.4%)
Prefer not to answer	7	(1.4%)

Ethnicity	
American-Indian/Alaska native	3 (0.6%)
Asian	7 (1.4%)
Black/African-American	20 (4.0%)
Hispanic/Latino/a	7 (1.4%)
White	431 (85.9%)
A combination of some of the above	21 (4.2%)
Another ethnicity	9 (1.8%)
Prefer not to answer	4 (0.8%)
Education	
High school degree or less	93 (18.5%)
Some college	115 (22.9%)
2 year college degree	42 (8.4%)
4 year college degree	181 (36.1%)
Graduate degree (e.g., M.A., Ph.D.)	58 (11.6%)
Professional degree	7 (1.4%)
Other	3 (0.6%)
Prefer not to answer	3 (0.6%)
Employment	
Employed full time (paid)	217 (43.2%)
Employed part-time (paid)	59 (11.8%)
Self-employed	77 (15.3%)
Not working	125 (24.9%)
Prefer not to answer	24 (4.8%)
Annual Income	
Under $25,000	169 (33.7%)
$25,000 – $49,999	134 (26.7%)
$50,000 - $74,999	91 (18.1%)
$75,000 - $99,999	56 (11.2%)
Over $100,000	41 (8.2%)
Prefer not to answer	11 (2.2%)

Experimental Stimuli

Audio Stimuli. To ensure external validity, the study utilized the verbal guise technique. Six speech samples (i.e., three SAE and three Nigerian) selected based on results about prototypicality from Pilot Study 1 were used for the main study (i.e., SAE speakers 2, 1, and 7; Nigerian speakers 3, 5, and 4). Recordings were comparable in length (range: 0:59 – 1:14 minutes) across accent groups.

To ensure that participants in the accent-only conditions (see Procedures for more details) correctly identified speakers based on their accents, a multiple-choice question asked them, "What accent did the speaker you just listened to have?" with answer choices of "Standard American English Accent," "A non-U.S. American Accent," or "I do not know" (adapted from Acheme & Cionea, 2022). The rationale for utilizing these general answer choices (i.e., "a non-U.S. American Accent," as opposed to "Nigerian Accent," for example) was due to previous research that has indicated U.S. Americans are frequently unable to correctly identify the accents of some non-native English speakers (Lindemann, 2005). Thus, it would have been unrealistic to expect participants to identify correctly the exact accent of non-SAE speakers in this study as a Nigerian, Yoruba accent. However, based on the literature on social categorization, participants were expected to socially categorize the Nigerian accent correctly as a non-U.S. accent.

Visual Stimuli. Six photographs (i.e., three photographs of White males and three photographs of Black males) selected based on results from Pilot Study 2 were used. The selected photographs were the ones rated as the most prototypically looking Whites and Blacks (i.e., White photographs 9, 5, and 2; Black photographs 10, 11, and 12). To ensure that participants in the race-only conditions (see Procedure for more details) correctly identified individuals in these photographs based on their race (i.e., perceived differences in skin color, hair texture, nose size, and lip thickness; Omi & Winant, 2014; A. Smedley & B. Smedley, 2002), a multiple-choice question asked participants, "What race do you think the individual in the photograph is?" with answer choices of "White," "Black," or "I do not know." The author speculated that a vast majority of participants in the White photo (i.e., race-only) conditions would correctly socially categorize the individual as White and that those in the Black photo

(i.e., race-only) conditions would correctly categorize the individual as Black because of the associations of phenotypic markers to race.

Audio-Visual Stimuli. Combined audio-visual stimuli were created using the highest rated SAE and Nigerian accents, and the highest rated photographs of Whites and Blacks, paired via a random draw, as follows: SAE accent 2 and White photograph 9 became White-SAE1; SAE accent 1 and White photograph 2 became White-SAE2; SAE accent 7 and White photograph 5 became White-SAE3; Nigerian accent 3 and Black photograph 10 became Black-Nigerian1; Nigerian accent 5 and Black photograph 2 became Black-Nigerian2; and Nigerian accent 4 and Black photograph 3 became Black-Nigerian3. Thus, six audio-visual stimuli were used in the main study. To ensure that participants in the race-accent conditions (see Procedures for more details) correctly identify speakers based on their accent and race, a multiple-choice question asked participants, "What accent and race do you think the speaker you have just listened to and seen is?" with answer choices of "Standard American English accent and White," "A non-U.S. American accent and Black," or "I do not know." Given general associations of phenotypic markers as indicative of one's race as well as social categorization based on accent cues, the author speculated that a vast majority of participants in the White-SAE accent conditions would correctly socially categorize them as a Standard American English accent and White. Similarly, it was expected that a vast majority of participants in the Black-Nigerian accent conditions would correctly categorize them as a non-U.S. American accent and Black.

Study Design and Procedures

Participants read a description of the study on Prolific. The recruitment message informed participants about the purpose of the study, which was to examine attitudes toward various individuals based on their accents and race and evaluate the target individuals. Interested

Prolific workers who met the selection criteria were able to accept the task on Prolific and access an online questionnaire hosted on Qualtrics to complete the study. On the first page of the survey, participants read information about the study and provided their consent to participate.

Participants who consented were then randomly assigned to one of the 18 study conditions (i.e., six accent-only conditions; six race-only conditions; six race-accent conditions). In the accent-only conditions, participants listened to either an SAE or a Nigerian accented speaker reading the rainbow passage (i.e., audio samples from Pilot Study 1). In the race-only conditions, participants were presented with a photograph of either a White or a Black male (i.e., photographs from Pilot Study 2) along with the rainbow passage displayed on the screen, underneath the photograph, for participants to read. Participants were instructed to look closely at the individual on the screen and imagine them reading the passage. In the race-accent conditions, participants were either presented with a photograph of a White male along with an audio recording of the SAE accented speaker reading the rainbow passage or with a photograph of a Black male along with an audio recording of a Nigerian accented speaker reading the rainbow passage.

After each message was presented, participants were directed to complete a battery of scale items assessing, first, the social categorizations of stimuli (i.e., manipulation checks) and then evaluations of status, solidarity, and dynamism. Next followed scales measuring symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance. Finally, measures of exposure to/familiarity with diverse others, attitudes toward immigrants, and exoticism were presented. These scales were included since these items could also confound the effects of accents in language attitudes and intergroup communication outcomes. Each variable was contained in its own block and items in the same block were presented in random order.

To ensure that participants were paying attention and not providing serial responses, five attention verification questions were included in the survey, one in each block. Questions asked participants to click a particular answer choice (e.g., "Choose strongly agree for your answer"). Finally, demographic information (i.e., age, sex, education, state, occupation, ethnicity, annual income, and employment) was collected, after which participants were thanked and redirected to Prolific to complete their submission. Participants took an average of 15.68 minutes (*SD* = 8.40) to complete the study and participants were compensated $4.00 for their participation. The university's IRB approved the study.

Measures

Speech Evaluation Instrument. A 30-item scale was used to assess evaluations of each target presented on status, solidarity, and dynamism (Kang & Yaw, 2021; Zahn & Hopper, 1985; see Appendix D). Status was measured with 12 items, including items such as, "uneducated-educated" and "disfluent-fluent." Solidarity was measured with 11 items such as, "unfriendly-friendly" and "awful-nice." Finally, dynamism was measured with seven items, including "passive- active" and "shy-talkative." All items were measured on a 7-point semantic differential scale. Higher scores indicate higher evaluations of perceived status, solidarity, and dynamism (see Table 8 for means, standard deviations, and Cronbach alpha reliability scores for all study variables).

Symbolic Threat. Symbolic threat was measured using Stephan et al.'s (2002) 12-item scale, adapted by replacing "Whites" with "SAE speakers," and "Blacks" with "Nigerian accented speakers." Sample items for the accent-only conditions include, "SAE and Nigerian accented speakers have very different values," and "Nigerian accented speakers have no right to think they have better values than SAE accented speakers." For the race-only conditions, the

original Stephan et al. (2002) scale wording was employed. Example items include, “Whites and Blacks have very different values,” and “Blacks have no right to think they have better values than Whites.” Finally, for the race-accent conditions, wording from the accent and race conditions was combined. Sample items include, “White-SAE accented speakers and Black-Nigerian accented speakers have very different values,” and “Black-Nigerian accented speakers have no right to think they have better values than White-SAE accented speakers” (See Appendix D). Items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree.* Higher scores indicate higher perceived symbolic threat.

Realistic Threat. Realistic threat was also measured using Stephan et al.’s (2002) 12-item scale, adapted by replacing “Whites” with “SAE speakers,” and “Blacks” with “Nigerian accented speakers.” Sample items for the accent-only conditions include, “Nigerian accented speakers hold too many positions of power and responsibility in this country,” and “Nigerian accented speakers have more economic power than they deserve in this country.” For the race-only conditions, the original Stephan et al. (2002) scale was used. Examples include, “Blacks hold too many positions of power and responsibility in this country,” and “Blacks have more economic power than they deserve in this country.” Finally, for the race-accent conditions, wording from the accent and race conditions was combined. Sample items include, “White-SAE/Black-Nigerian accented speakers hold too many positions of power and responsibility in this country,” and “White-SAE/Black-Nigerian accented speakers have more economic power than they deserve in this country.” Items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree* (see Appendix D). Higher scores indicate higher perceived realistic threat.

Table 8

Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach's α for Study Measures (N = 502)

	M	*SD*	*Cronbach's α*
Status	5.38	0.89	.91
Solidarity	5.31	1.05	.97
Dynamism	5.04	0.88	.86
Symbolic threat	3.04	1.08	.88
Realistic threat	1.96	1.06	.96
Intergroup anxiety	5.38	1.15	.95
Social distance	6.12	0.90	.88
Exposure to diverse individuals	3.94	0.75	.85
Attitudes towards African immigrants[a]	5.66	1.14	.95
Exoticism	5.23	1.05	.96

Note. All means and standard deviations are composites across the three conditions for each stimulus (i.e., accent, race, and accent-race).

[a] Two items deleted from this scale.

Intergroup Anxiety. Stephan et al.'s (2002) 12-item adapted scale was used to measure intergroup anxiety. The original scale items ask how one feels "interacting with Blacks." These scale items were adapted by asking participants to indicate how they felt interacting with "Nigerian accented speakers" for the accent-only conditions. The original scale wording was used for the race-only conditions (i.e., "interacting with Blacks"), and "Black-Nigerian accented speakers" was used as wording for the race-accent conditions. Participants rated items on a 7-point semantic differential scale whose stem was, "I feel…" with answer choices ranging from 1 = *not at all* to 7 = *extremely*. Example items include, "not at all friendly" – "extremely friendly" and "not at all nervous" – "extremely nervous" (see Appendix D). Higher scores on this measure indicate higher intergroup anxiety.

Social Distance. Social distance was assessed by adapting Esses and Dovidio's (2002) 12-item scale and replacing "Blacks" with "Nigerian accented speakers" for the accent-only conditions. Sample items include, "I would be willing to marry a person who speaks with a Nigerian accent" for the accent-only conditions, or "I would be willing to marry a Black-

Nigerian accented speaker" for the race-accent conditions. For the race-only conditions the original scale wording was retained -- "I would be willing to marry a person who is Black." Another example is, "I would be willing to have a person who speaks with a Nigerian accent as a close friend" for the accent-only conditions, and "I would be willing to have a Black-Nigerian accented speaker as a close friend" for the race-accent conditions. In the race-only conditions the original wording was retained "I would be willing to have a person who is Black as a close friend" (see Appendix D). Items were measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = *not at all willing* to 7 = *extremely willing.* Higher scores on this measure indicate less social distance, meaning more willingness to interact with the target group.

Exposure to Diverse Individuals. To control if needed for exposure to/familiarity with diverse individuals such as non-SAE accented speakers, Nigerian accented speakers, and racial minority group members, 12 items measured participants' exposure to non-SAE accents, Nigerian accents, racial minority individuals, Blacks, racial minority non-SAE accented speakers, and Black-Nigerian accented speakers. For non-SAE accents, a sample item includes, "How often do you hear people who speak with an accent that is not the SAE accent in the media (T.V., movies, etc.)?". For Nigerian accents, an example item includes, "How frequently have you been exposed to people who speak with the Nigerian accent?". For racial minority individuals, a sample item includes, "How often do you see non-Whites/racial minorities in the media (T.V., movies, etc.)?". For Blacks, sample items include, "How often do you see Blacks in the media (T.V., movies, etc.)?" For racial minority non-SAE accented speakers, a sample item includes, "How frequently have you been exposed to non-White/racial minority-non-SAE speakers in everyday interactions?". Lastly, for Black-Nigerian accented speakers, an example item includes, "How frequently have you been exposed to Black-Nigerian accented speakers in

everyday interactions?" (see Appendix B). Items were measured on a 7-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1 = *never* to 7 = *always*. Higher scores on this variable indicate more exposure to diverse individuals.

Attitudes toward African Immigrants. To control if needed for attitudes toward immigration, nine items were adapted from Montgomery (2019) to target African immigrants, specifically. Examples of items include, "I have warm feelings toward African immigrants" and "I feel friendly toward African immigrants." Items were measured on a 7-point Likert type scale, with 1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*. Higher scores on this variable indicate more positive attitudes toward African immigrants. Two items were deleted from the scale to improve its reliability. Hence, only seven items were used in the final analyses.

Exoticism. To control if needed for how exotic participants found African accents, 14 items were created by the first author for this dissertation. Participants rated items on a 7-point semantic differential type scale whose stem was, "I find African accents…" and answer choices ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*. Example items include, "ugly/beautiful," "unlovely/lovely," "unappealing/appealing," and "repulsive/alluring" (see Appendix C). Higher scores on this measure indicate more exotic perceptions of African accents.

Main Experimental Study Results

The current experimental study examined how speakers are categorized based on their accents (i.e., SAE accent vs. Nigerian accent) and race (i.e., White vs. Black) separately or accent and race (i.e., White-SAE vs. Black-Nigerian) concurrently as well as the intergroup outcomes of these social categorizations, as mediated by language attitudes (i.e., status, solidarity, and dynamism).

Analytic Strategies

Prior to testing the hypotheses and answering the study's research questions, cross-tabulation analyses to check the manipulations were performed. Each of the independent variables manipulated was matched with their respective manipulation check question. For example, all accent only conditions were coded as SAE or non-SAE. This coded variable was entered as a row in the cross-tabulation analysis, whereas the manipulation check question for accent (multiple choice question with answer choices of SAE, non-SAE, or I do not know, described in the previous method sub-section) was entered as a column in the same analysis. The resulting chi-square statistic as well as row and column percentage statistics were then examined to determine participants' accuracy in correctly recognizing the independent variables and the condition to which they had been assigned. For accent (i.e., the audio-only conditions), [χ^2 (4) = 175.02, $p < .001$)], 98.8% of those in the SAE accent conditions correctly recognized them as such, socially categorizing the speakers as being SAE; 96.5% in the Nigerian accent conditions correctly recognized and socially categorized the speaker as non-SAE. For race (i.e., the visual-only conditions), [χ^2 (4) = 168.48, $p < .001$)], 100% of those in the White photograph conditions correctly recognized and socially categorized the person as a White male, and 100% of those in the Black photograph conditions correctly recognized and socially categorized the person as a Black male. For accent and race combined (i.e., the audio-visual conditions), [χ^2 (4) = 169.49, $p < .001$)], 100% of those in the White-SAE accented speaker conditions correctly recognized and socially categorized the person as a White male, SAE speaker; 100% of those in the Black-Nigerian accented speaker conditions correctly recognized and socially categorized the person as a Black male, non-SAE speaker. Thus, the independent variables were manipulated successfully.

Following the manipulation checks, reliabilities for each scale were calculated based on Cronbach alpha. Scores for all scales were above .85, indicating good internal reliability (see Table 8). Then, aggregate variables were created by computing the mathematical average of all retained items for each scale. To create aggregate dependent variables, responses across each of the three conditions for each level of an independent variable were averaged to form an aggregate score. Specifically, for accent, responses for the dependent variables of all three SAE accented speakers conditions were combined, forming one aggregate score for each dependent variable in the SAE accent condition. Similarly, responses for all three Nigerian accented speakers conditions were combined, forming an aggregate score of each dependent variable in the Nigerian accent condition. For race, responses for all three White male photographs conditions were combined, forming an aggregate score for each dependent variable representing the White male conditions. Also, responses for all three Black male photographs conditions were combined, forming an aggregate score for each dependent variable representing the Black male conditions. Lastly, responses for all three White-SAE accented speakers conditions were combined, forming an aggregate score for each dependent variable representing White-SAE accented speakers conditions. Similarly, responses for all three Black-Nigerian accented speakers conditions were combined, forming an aggregate score for each dependent variable representing Black-Nigerian accented speakers conditions.

Finally, one preliminary multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine if participants' responses differed between groups (i.e., accent; race; accent and race) or demographics (i.e., sex, ethnicity, education, income, state, and occupation) and the main variables and covariates (i.e., exposure to diverse individuals, attitudes towards African immigrants, and exoticism). The groups and demographics were entered as the independent

variables, whereas the main measures and the covariates were entered as the dependent variables. The multivariate tests were significant for accent, Wilks' Lambda = .95, $F(9, 440) = 2.43$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2p = .05$; and for accent and race, Wilks' Lambda = .94, $F(9, 440) = 3.21$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2p = .06$; but not significant for race, Wilks' Lambda = .93, $F(9, 440) = 1.18$, $p = .31$, $\eta^2p = .02$; sex, Wilks' Lambda = .94, $F(27, 1326) = 1.01$, $p = .45$, $\eta^2p = .02$; ethnicity, Wilks' Lambda = .84, $F(63, 2482) = 1.25$, $p = .09$, $\eta^2p = .03$; education level, Wilks' Lambda = .80, $F(70, 2304) = 1.26$, $p = .07$, $\eta^2p = .03$; income, Wilks' Lambda = .86, $F(50, 1800) = 1.23$, $p = .13$, $\eta^2p = .03$; state in which participants lived, Wilks' Lambda = 0.00, $F(174, 380) = .69$, $p = .99$, $\eta^2p = .59$; or their occupation, Wilks' Lambda = 0.00, $F(240, 3320) = .74$, $p = .99$, $\eta^2p = .94$. Note that only the results for the covariates were of interest in this preliminary analysis, to ascertain whether groups differed based on these variables. Given the results were not significant, no covariates were included in any subsequent analyses.

Tests for Hypotheses and Research Questions

H1 predicted that, compared to the Nigerian accent, the SAE accent would be rated higher on status (H1a), solidarity (H1b), and dynamism (H1c). The hypothesis was tested using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), with accent entered as the independent variable and status, solidarity, and dynamism entered as the dependent variables. Results provided partial support for H1. The multivariate test was significant, Wilks' Lambda = .63, $F(3, 165) = 32.09$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2p = .37$. There was a significant main effect of accent on status, in that evaluations of the SAE accent ($M = 5.82$, $SD = 0.59$) were, indeed, significantly higher on status than evaluations of the Nigerian accent ($M = 4.97$, $SD = 0.90$), $F(1, 167) = 53.27$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2p = .24$. Thus, H1a was supported. There was no significant difference based on accent on solidarity [SAE accent: $M = 5.42$, $SD = 0.97$; Nigerian accent: $M = 5.49$, $SD = 1.04$; $F(1, 167) = 0.19$, $p =$

.68, η^2p = .00] or dynamism [SAE accent: *M* = 5.05, *SD* = 0.89; Nigerian accent: *M* = 5.08, *SD* = 0.97; $F(1, 167) = 0.05$, $p = .82$, η^2p = .00]. Hence, H1b and H1c were not supported.

H2 predicted that status, solidarity, and dynamism would mediate the relationship between the accent of a speaker and symbolic threat (H2a), realistic threat (H2b), and intergroup anxiety (H2c). H2 was tested using Model 4 (with 10,000 bootstrap iterations, bias-corrected, and accelerated 95% confidence intervals) of Hayes' (2022) regression-based PROCESS macro for SPSS (version 4.1). Prior to data analysis, experimental conditions were dummy coded—SAE accent was coded as the reference group, with a value of 0, and the Nigerian accent was coded as the comparison group, with a value of 1. The dummy coded experimental conditions for accent were entered as the independent variable (*X*), status was entered as the first parallel mediator (M_1), solidarity was entered as the second parallel mediator (M_2), and dynamism was entered as the third parallel mediator (M_3). In the first analysis, for H2a, symbolic threat was entered as the dependent variable (*Y*). In the second analysis, for H2b, realistic threat was entered as the dependent variable (*Y*), and in the third analysis, for H2c, intergroup anxiety was entered as the dependent variable (*Y*).

There are multiple approaches in the literature for establishing mediation. For instance, Baron and Kenny (1986), Judd and Kenny (1981), and James and Brett (1984), as cited in Kenny (2021), proposed four steps in determining mediation. These steps include showing that, (a) the independent variable (*X*) is correlated with the outcome variable (*Y*), (b) *X* is correlated with the mediator (*M*), (c) *M* affects *Y*, and (d) *M* completely mediates the relationship between *X* and *Y*. Similarly, the Sobel test—which requires the standard error of *a* and the standard error of *b*, has also been used to establish mediation. The Sobel test provides an estimate of the standard error of *ab* which equals the square root of $b^2s_a^2 + a^2s_b^2$ (Kenny, 2021). In the present dissertation,

Kenny and colleagues' (1998) recommendation, as cited in Kenny (2021)— similar to Hayes' (2018), was used to establish mediation. Thus, mediation was considered to occur when (a) the independent variable (*X*) significantly predicted the mediator (*M*), (b) the mediator (*M*) significantly predicted the outcome variable (*Y*), and (c) the indirect effect of *X* on *Y* through *M* was statistically significant. Indirect effects were considered significant when the 95% bias-corrected and accelerated confidence interval (95% BCa CI) did not contain zero, indicating the indirect effect differed significantly from zero (Hayes, 2018).

For H2a, results indicated a significant model predicting symbolic threat, $F(4, 164) = 7.09$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .15$. The mediation was significant only for status, indicating that status mediated the relationship between accent and symbolic threat. There were no significant indirect effects of accent on symbolic threat through solidarity or dynamism. Thus, H2a was partially supported. Values for all direct and indirect paths are reported in Table 9.

Table 9

Direct and Indirect Effects of Accent (X) on Symbolic Threat (Y) through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3)

Path	Effect	*BootSE*	95% BCa CI
Accent → Status	-.85***	.12	-1.08; -0.62
Accent → Solidarity	.07	.15	-0.24; 0.37
Accent → Dynamism	.03	.14	-0.25; 0.32
Accent → Symbolic Threat	-.48**	.17	-0.82; -0.13
Status → Symbolic Threat	-.35**	.12	-0.59; -0.12
Solidarity → Symbolic Threat	-.25**	.09	-0.43; -0.07
Dynamism → Symbolic Threat	.16	.11	-0.05; 0.38
Accent → Status→ Symbolic Threat	.30*	.12	0.07; 0.54
Accent → Solidarity → Symbolic Threat	-.02	.04	-0.10; 0.07
Accent → Dynamism → Symbolic Threat	.01	.03	-0.05; 0.08

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.
SAE Accent = 0, Nigerian Accent = 1 (i.e., Accent represents the Nigerian accent compared to the SAE accent)
Effect (*b*) is the unstandardized beta coefficient.
Model predicting status (*X* on M_1): $F(1, 167) = 53.27$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .24$.
Model predicting solidarity (*X* on M_2): $F(1, 167) = 1.18$, $p = .68$, $R^2 = .00$.
Model predicting dynamism (*X* on M_3): $F(1, 167) = 0.05$, $p = .82$, $R^2 = .00$.

Total effect of accent on symbolic threat was not significant, b = -.18, t(167) = -1.26, p = .21.

For H2b, results indicated a significant model predicting realistic threat, F(4, 164) = 4.61, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .10$. However, none of the indirect effects of accent through status, solidarity, or dynamism were significant, indicating that H2b was not supported. Values for all direct and indirect paths are reported in Table 10.

Table 10

Direct and Indirect Effects of Accent (X) on Realistic Threat (Y) through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3)

Path	Effect	*BootSE*	95% BCa CI
Accent → Status	-.85***	.12	-1.08; -0.62
Accent → Solidarity	.07	.15	-0.24; 0.37
Accent → Dynamism	.03	.14	-0.25; 0.32
Accent → Realistic Threat	-.09	.17	-0.43; 0.25
Status → Realistic Threat	-.15	.12	-0.38; 0.09
Solidarity → Realistic Threat	-.33	.09	-0.51; -0.15
Dynamism → Realistic Threat	.21	.11	-0.00; 0.42
Accent → Status→ Realistic Threat	.12	.10	-0.07; 0.32
Accent → Solidarity → Realistic Threat	-.02	.05	-0.13; 0.09
Accent → Dynamism → Realistic Threat	.01	.03	-0.05; 0.09

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.
SAE Accent = 0, Nigerian Accent = 1 (i.e., Accent represents the Nigerian accent compared to the SAE accent).
Effect (b) is the unstandardized beta coefficient.
Model predicting status (X on M_1): F(1, 167) = 53.27, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .24$.
Model predicting solidarity (X on M_2): F(1, 167) = 0.19, $p = .67$, $R^2 = .00$.
Model predicting dynamism (X on M_3): F(1, 167) = 0.05, $p = .82$, $R^2 = .00$.
Total effect of accent on realistic threat was not significant, b = .02, t(167) = .11, p = .91.

For H2c, results indicated a model that significantly predicted intergroup anxiety, F(4, 164) = 6.68, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .14$. However, there were no significant indirect effects of accent on intergroup anxiety, through status, solidarity, and dynamism. Thus, H2c was not supported. Values for all direct and indirect paths are reported in Table 11.

In summary, H2 was partially supported. Status was found to significantly mediate the relationship between accent and symbolic threat. However, status was not found to mediate the relationship between accent and realistic threat or between accent and intergroup anxiety. There

was also no significant difference found for solidarity and dynamism in mediating the relationship between accent and symbolic threat, realistic threat, and intergroup anxiety.

Table 11

Direct and Indirect Effects of Accent (X) on Intergroup Anxiety (Y) through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3)

Path	Effect	*BootSE*	95% BCa CI
Accent → Status	-.85***	.12	-1.08; -0.62
Accent → Solidarity	.07	.15	-0.24; 0.37
Accent → Dynamism	.03	.14	-0.25; 0.32
Accent → Intergroup Anxiety	-.24	.20	-0.63; 0.15
Status → Intergroup Anxiety	-.20	.14	-0.47; 0.07
Solidarity → Intergroup Anxiety	-.11	.11	-0.32; 0.10
Dynamism → Intergroup Anxiety	-.22	.12	-0.46; 0.03
Accent → Status→ Intergroup Anxiety	.17	.12	-0.06; 0.42
Accent → Solidarity → Intergroup Anxiety	-.01	.03	-0.07; 0.05
Accent → Dynamism → Intergroup Anxiety	-.01	.04	-0.08; 0.07

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.
SAE Accent = 0, Nigerian Accent = 1 (i.e., Accent represents the Nigerian accent compared to the SAE accent).
Effect (*b*) is the unstandardized beta coefficient.
Model predicting status (*X* on M_1): $F(1, 167) = 53.27$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .24$.
Model predicting solidarity (*X* on M_2): $F(1, 167) = 0.19$, $p = .67$, $R^2 = .00$.
Model predicting dynamism (*X* on M_3): $F(1, 167) = 0.05$, $p = .82$, $R^2 = .00$.
Total effect of accent on intergroup anxiety was not significant, $b = -.08$, $t(167) = -.50$, $p = .62$.

H3 predicted that, compared to Black males, White males would be rated higher on status (H3a), solidarity (H3b), and dynamism (H3c). H3 was also tested using MANOVA. Race was entered as the independent variable and status, solidarity, and dynamism were entered as the dependent variables. The multivariate test was significant, Wilks' Lambda = 0.85, $F(3, 162) = 9.81$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2p = .15$. There was a significant main effect of race on solidarity and dynamism but not on status [Whites: $M = 5.23$, $SD = 0.89$; Blacks: $M = 5.19$, $SD = 0.92$, $F(1, 164) = 0.10$, $p = .75$, $\eta^2p = .00$]. Thus, H5a was not supported. For solidarity, results revealed that evaluations of Black males ($M = 5.41$, $SD = 1.06$) were significantly higher than evaluations of White males ($M = 4.76$, $SD = 1.12$), $F(1, 164) = 14.73$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2p = .08$. For dynamism, evaluations of Black males ($M = 5.17$, $SD = 0.86$) were also significantly higher than evaluations of White

males (M = 4.84, SD = 0.86), $F(1, 164) = 6.08$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2p = .04$. Thus, contrary to prediction, Black males were rated higher on solidarity and dynamism compared to White males, indicating that H3a and H3b were not supported as initially formulated.

H4 predicted that status, solidarity, and dynamism would mediate the relationship between the accent of a speaker and social distance. H4 was tested using Model 4 (with 10,000 bootstrap iterations, bias-corrected, and accelerated 95% confidence intervals) of Hayes' (2022) regression-based PROCESS macro for SPSS (version 4.1). The same experimental conditions dummy codes as for H2 were used—SAE accent as the reference group and the Nigerian accent as the comparison group. The dummy coded experimental conditions for accent were entered as the independent variable (X), status was entered as the first parallel mediator (M_1), solidarity was entered as the second parallel mediator (M_2), and dynamism was entered as the third parallel mediator (M_3). Social distance was entered as the dependent variable (Y).

Results indicated a model that significantly predicted social distance, $F(4, 164) = 7.29$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .15$. However, there were no significant indirect effects of accent on social distance through status, solidarity, and dynamism. Hence, H4 was not supported. Values for all direct and indirect paths are reported in Table 12. Note, however, that, although not significant, higher status and solidarity evaluations resulted in greater social distance from the Nigerian accented speakers.

Table 12

Direct and Indirect Effects of Accent (X) on Social Distance (Y) through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3)

Path	Effect	*BootSE*	95% BCa CI
Accent → Status	-.85***	.12	-1.08; -0.62
Accent → Solidarity	.07	.15	-0.24; 0.37
Accent → Dynamism	.03	.14	-0.25; 0.32

Accent → Social Distance	.10	.16	-0.21; 0.43
Status → Social Distance	.24*	.11	0.02; 0.46
Solidarity → Social Distance	.31***	.09	0.14; 0.49
Dynamism → Social Distance	-.15	.10	-0.35; 0.05
Accent → Status → Social Distance	-.20	.11	-0.43; 0.00
Accent → Solidarity → Social Distance	.02	.05	-0.09; 0.13
Accent → Dynamism → Social Distance	-.01	.03	-0.07; 0.04

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.
SAE Accent = 0, Nigerian Accent = 1 (i.e., Accent represents the Nigerian accent compared to the SAE accent).
Effect (*b*) is the unstandardized beta coefficient.
Model predicting status (*X* on M_1): $F(1, 167) = 53.27$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .24$.
Model predicting solidarity (*X* on M_2): $F(1, 167) = 0.19$, $p = .67$, $R^2 = .00$.
Model predicting dynamism (*X* on M_3): $F(1, 167) = 0.05$, $p = .82$, $R^2 = .00$.
Total effect of accent on social distance was not significant, $b = -.08$, $t(167) = -.57$, $p = .57$.

RQ1 asked if status, solidarity, and dynamism mediated the relationship between the race of a speaker and symbolic threat (RQ1a), realistic threat (RQ1b), intergroup anxiety (RQ1c), and social distance (RQ1d). The research question was examined using Model 4 (with 10,000 bootstrap iterations, bias-corrected, and accelerated 95% confidence intervals) of Hayes' (2022) regression-based PROCESS macro for SPSS (version 4.1). Prior to data analysis, experimental conditions were dummy coded—White was coded as the reference group, with a value of 0, and Black was coded as the comparison group, with a value of 1. The dummy coded experimental conditions for race were entered as the independent variable (*X*), status was entered as the first parallel mediator (M_1), solidarity was entered as the second parallel mediator (M_2), and dynamism was entered as the third parallel mediator (M_3). In the first analysis, for RQ1a, symbolic threat was entered as the dependent variable (*Y*). In the second analysis, for RQ1b, realistic threat was entered as the dependent variable (*Y*). In the third analysis, for RQ1c, intergroup anxiety was entered as the dependent variable (*Y*), and, in the fourth analysis, for RQ1d, social distance was entered as the dependent variable (*Y*).

For RQ1a, results indicated a model that did not significantly predict symbolic threat, $F(4, 161) = 1.17$, $p = .32$, $R^2 = .02$. Thus, there were no significant indirect effects of race

through status, solidarity, and dynamism. Values for all direct and indirect paths are reported in Table 13.

Table 13

Direct and Indirect Effects of Race (X) on Symbolic Threat (Y) through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3)

Path	Effect	*BootSE*	95% BCa CI
Race → Status	-.04	.14	-0.32; 0.23
Race → Solidarity	.65***	.17	0.32; 0.98
Race → Dynamism	.33**	.13	0.07; 0.59
Race → Symbolic Threat	-.00	.21	-0.42; 0.42
Status → Symbolic Threat	-.13	.16	-0.45; 0.20
Solidarity → Symbolic Threat	-.07	.13	-0.34; 0.19
Dynamism → Symbolic Threat	-.05	.19	-0.42; 0.33
Race → Status → Symbolic Threat	.01	.03	-0.05; 0.09
Race → Solidarity → Symbolic Threat	-.05	.08	-0.20; 0.11
Race → Dynamism → Symbolic Threat	.02	.07	-0.17; 0.12

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.
White = 0, Black = 1 (i.e., Race represents Black males compared to White males).
Effect (*b*) is the unstandardized beta coefficient.
Model predicting status (*X* on M_1): $F(1, 164) = 0.10$, $p = .75$, $R^2 = .00$.
Model predicting solidarity (*X* on M_2): $F(1, 164) = 14, .73$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .08$.
Model predicting dynamism (*X* on M_3): $F(1, 164) = 6.08$, $p = .01$, $R^2 = .04$.
Total effect of race on symbolic threat was not significant, $b = -.06$, $t(164) = -.30$, $p = .77$.

For RQ1b, results also indicated a model that did not significantly predict realistic threat, $F(4, 161) = 1.10$, $p = .36$, $R^2 = .03$. Thus, there were no significant indirect effects of race through status, solidarity, and dynamism. Values for all direct and indirect paths are reported in Table 14.

Table 14

Direct and Indirect Effects of Race (X) on Realist Threat (Y) through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3)

Path	Effect	*BootSE*	95% BCa CI
Race → Status	-.04	.14	-0.32; 0.23
Race → Solidarity	.65***	.17	0.32; 0.98
Race → Dynamism	.33**	.13	0.07; 0.59
Race → Realistic Threat	-.03	.19	-0.40; 0.35

Status → Realistic Threat	-.17	.15	-0.46; 0.12
Solidarity → Realistic Threat	-.00	.12	-0.24; 0.24
Dynamism → Realistic Threat	-.05	.17	-0.38; 0.29
Race → Status → Realistic Threat	.01	.03	-0.06; 0.09
Race → Solidarity → Realistic Threat	.00	.06	-0.12; 0.14
Race → Dynamism → Realistic Threat	-.02	.06	-0.14; 0.09

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.
White = 0, Black = 1 (i.e., Race represents Black males compared to White males).
Effect (*b*) is the unstandardized beta coefficient.
Model predicting status (*X* on M_1): $F(1, 164) = 0.10$, $p = .75$, $R^2 = .00$.
Model predicting solidarity (*X* on M_2): $F(1, 164) = 14, .73$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .08$.
Model predicting dynamism (*X* on M_3): $F(1, 164) = 6.08$, $p = .01$, $R^2 = .04$.
Total effect of race on realistic threat was not significant, $b = -.03$, $t(164) = -.20$, $p = .84$.

For RQ1c, results indicated a model that marginally predicted intergroup anxiety, $F(4, 161) = 2.30$, $p = .06$, $R^2 = .08$. However, there were no significant indirect effects of race through status, solidarity, and dynamism. Values for all direct and indirect paths are reported in Table 15.

Table 15

Direct and Indirect Effects of Race (X) on Intergroup Anxiety (Y) through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3)

Path	Effect	*BootSE*	95% BCa CI
Race → Status	-.04	.14	-0.32; 0.23
Race → Solidarity	.65***	.17	0.32; 0.98
Race → Dynamism	.33**	.13	0.07; 0.59
Race → Intergroup Anxiety	.18	.21	-0.23; 0.60
Status → Intergroup Anxiety	-.14	.16	-0.45; 0.18
Solidarity → Intergroup Anxiety	-.13	.13	-0.44; 0.30
Dynamism → Intergroup Anxiety	-.07	.19	-0.50; 0.24
Race → Status → Intergroup Anxiety	.01	.03	-0.05; 0.10
Race → Solidarity → Intergroup Anxiety	-.09	.08	-0.26; 0.06
Race → Dynamism → Intergroup Anxiety	-.02	.07	-0.18; 0.11

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.
White = 0, Black = 1 (i.e., Race represents Black males compared to White males).
Effect (*b*) is the unstandardized beta coefficient.
Model predicting status (*X* on M_1): $F(1, 164) = 0.10$, $p = .75$, $R^2 = .00$.
Model predicting solidarity (*X* on M_2): $F(1, 164) = 14, .73$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .08$.
Model predicting dynamism (*X* on M_3): $F(1, 164) = 6.08$, $p = .01$, $R^2 = .04$.
Total effect of race on intergroup anxiety was not significant, $b = .18$, $t(164) = .41$, $p = .67$.

For RQ1d, results indicated a model that significantly predicted social distance, $F(4, 161) = 2.60$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .06$. However, there were no significant indirect effects of race through status, solidarity, and dynamism. Values for all direct and indirect paths are reported in Table 16.

In summary, results revealed that status, solidarity, and dynamism did not mediate the relationship between race and symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, or social distance.

Table 16

Direct and Indirect Effects of Race (X) on Social Distance (Y) through Status (M_1), Solidarity(M_2), and Dynamism (M_3)

Path	Effect	*BootSE*	95% BCa CI
Race → Status	-.04	.14	-0.32; 0.23
Race → Solidarity	.65***	.17	0.32; 0.98
Race → Dynamism	.33**	.13	0.07; 0.59
Race → Social Distance	-.08	.13	-0.34; 0.19
Status → Social Distance	.21	.10	-0.00; 0.41
Solidarity → Social Distance	-.00	.08	-0.16; 0.17
Dynamism → Social Distance	.01	.12	-0.22; 0.25
Race → Status → Social Distance	-.01	.03	-0.08; 0.06
Race → Solidarity → Social Distance	.00	.05	-0.10; 0.10
Race → Dynamism → Social Distance	.00	.04	-0.08; 0.09

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.
White = 0, Black = 1 (i.e., Race represents Black males compared to White males).
Effect (*b*) is the unstandardized beta coefficient.
Model predicting status (*X* on M_1): $F(1, 164) = 0.10$, $p = .75$, $R^2 = .00$.
Model predicting solidarity (*X* on M_2): $F(1, 164) = 14, .73$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .08$.
Model predicting dynamism (*X* on M_3): $F(1, 164) = 6.08$, $p = .01$, $R^2 = .04$.
Total effect of race on social distance was not significant, $b = -.08$ $t(164) = -.63$ $p = .53$.

H5 predicted that, compared to the Black-Nigerian accented speakers, White-SAE accented speakers would be rated higher on status (H5a), solidarity (H5b), and dynamism (H5c). H5 was tested using MANOVA as well. The combined accent and race experimental condition was entered as the independent variable and status, solidarity, and dynamism were the dependent variables. Results provided partial support for H5. The multivariate test was significant, Wilks' Lambda = .63, $F(3, 163) = 31.69$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 p = .37$. There was a significant main effect of

combined accent and race of a speaker on status, in that evaluations of White-SAE accented speakers (M = 5.66, SD = 0.66) were, indeed, significantly higher than evaluations of Black-Nigerian accented speakers (M = 4.84, SD = 0.93), $F(1, 165) = 43.12$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2p = .21$. Thus, H5a was supported. There was also a significant main effect of combined accent and race of a speaker on solidarity, but in the opposite direction than predicted. Black-Nigerian accented speakers (M = 5.61, SD = 0.92) were evaluated higher than White-SAE accented speakers (M = 5.14, SD = 0.96) on solidarity, $F(1, 165) = 10.55$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2p = .06$. Thus, H5b was not supported as originally phrased. Finally, there was no significant difference based on combined accent and race of a speaker on dynamism between White-SAE (M = 4.95, SD = 0.83) and Black-Nigerian accented (M = 5.16, SD = 0.83) speakers, $F(1, 165) = 2.66$, $p = .11$, $\eta^2p = .02$. So, H5c was not supported.

H6 predicted that status, solidarity, and dynamism would mediate the relationship between the combined accent and race of a speaker and symbolic threat (H6a), realistic threat (H6b), intergroup anxiety (H6c), and social distance (H6d). H6 was tested using Model 4 (with 10,000 bootstrap iterations, bias-corrected, and accelerated 95% confidence intervals) of Hayes' (2022) regression-based PROCESS macro for SPSS (version 4.1). Prior to data analysis, experimental conditions were dummy coded—White-SAE was coded as the reference group, 0, and Black-Nigerian was coded as the comparison group, 1. The dummy coded experimental conditions were entered as the independent variable (X), status was entered as the first parallel mediator (M_1), solidarity was entered as the second parallel mediator (M_2), and dynamism was entered as the third parallel mediator (M_3). In the first analysis, for H6a, symbolic threat was entered as the dependent variable (Y). In the second analysis, for H6b, realistic threat was entered as the dependent variable (Y). In the third analysis, for H6c, intergroup anxiety was entered as

the dependent variable (*Y*) and, in the fourth analysis, for H6d, social distance was entered as the dependent variable (*Y*).

For H6a, results indicated a model that significantly predicted symbolic threat, $F(4, 162) = 3.08$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .07$. There was a significant indirect effect of combined accent and race of a speaker but only through status, and no significant indirect effects through solidarity or dynamism. Values for all direct and indirect paths are reported in Table 17.

Table 17

Direct and Indirect Effects of Race and Accent (X) on Symbolic Threat (Y) through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3)

Path	Effect	*BootSE*	95% BCa CI
RaceAccent → Status	-.82***	.12	-1.07; -0.57
RaceAccent → Solidarity	.47**	.15	0.18; 0.76
RaceAccent → Dynamism	.21	.13	-0.04; 0.46
RaceAccent → Symbolic Threat	-.26	.18	-0.62; 0.10
Status → Symbolic Threat	-.28**	.10	-0.49; -0.08
Solidarity → Symbolic Threat	-.07	.10	-0.01; 0.38
Dynamism → Symbolic Threat	.18	.10	-0.05; 0.33
RaceAccent → Status → Symbolic Threat	.23*	.08	0.09; 0.40
RaceAccent → Solidarity → Symbolic Threat	-.04	.05	-0.14; 0.05
RaceAccent → Dynamism → Symbolic Threat	.04	.03	-0.01; 0.10

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.
White-SAE Accent = 0, Black-Nigerian Accent = 1 (i.e., RaceAccent represents Black-Nigerian accented speakers compared to White-SAE accented speakers).
Effect (*b*) is the unstandardized beta coefficient.
Model predicting status (*X* on M_1): $F(1, 165) = 43.11$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .21$.
Model predicting solidarity (*X* on M_2): $F(1, 165) = 10.55$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .06$.
Model predicting dynamism (*X* on M_3): $F(1, 165) = 2.66$, $p = .10$, $R^2 = .02$.
Total effect of RaceAccent on symbolic threat was not significant, $b = -.02$, $t(165) = -.16$, $p = .89$.

For H6b, results indicated a model that did not significantly predict realistic threat, $F(4, 162) = 0.65$, $p = .63$, $R^2 = .02$. Thus, there were no significant indirect effects of combined race and accent of a speaker through status, solidarity, and dynamism. Values for all direct and indirect paths are reported in Table 18.

Table 18

Direct and Indirect Effects of Race and Accent (X) on Realistic Threat (Y) through Status (M_1), Solidarity (M_2), and Dynamism (M_3)

Path	Effect	*BootSE*	95% BCa CI
RaceAccent → Status	-.82***	.12	-1.07; -0.57
RaceAccent → Solidarity	.47**	.15	0.18; 0.76
RaceAccent → Dynamism	.21	.13	-0.04; 0.46
RaceAccent → Realistic Threat	-.27	.22	-0.71; 0.16
Status → Realistic Threat	-.19	.12	-0.44; 0.06
Solidarity → Realistic Threat	.05	.11	-0.17; 0.28
Dynamism → Realistic Threat	.06	.12	-0.18; 0.30
RaceAccent → Status → Realistic Threat	.16	.09	0.02; 0.34
RaceAccent → Solidarity → Realistic Threat	.03	.06	-0.09; 0.16
RaceAccent → Dynamism → Realistic Threat	.01	.03	-0.05; 0.07

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.
White-SAE Accent = 0, Black-Nigerian Accent = 1 (i.e., RaceAccent represents Black-Nigerian accented speakers compared to White-SAE accented speakers).
Effect (*b*) is the unstandardized beta coefficient.
Model predicting status (*X* on M_1): $F(1, 165) = 43.11$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .21$.
Model predicting solidarity (*X* on M_2): $F(1, 165) = 10.55$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .06$.
Model predicting dynamism (*X* on M_3): $F(1, 165) = 2.66$, $p = .10$, $R^2 = .02$.
Total effect of RaceAccent on realistic threat was not significant, $b = -.08$, $t(165) = -.45$, $p = .66$.

For H6c, results indicated a model that significantly predicted intergroup anxiety, $F(4, 162) = 6.85$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .14$. There was an indirect effect of combined accent and race of a speaker but only through status, with no significant indirect effects through solidarity or dynamism. Values for all direct and indirect paths are reported in Table 19.

Table 19

Direct and Indirect Effects of Race and Accent (X) on Intergroup Anxiety (Y) through Status (M_1), Solidarity(M_2), and Dynamism (M_3)

Path	Effect	*BootSE*	95% BCa CI
RaceAccent → Status	-.82***	.12	-1.07; -0.57
RaceAccent → Solidarity	.47**	.15	0.18; 0.76
RaceAccent → Dynamism	.21	.13	-0.04; 0.46
RaceAccent → Intergroup Anxiety	-.18	.20	-0.58; 0.22
Status → Intergroup Anxiety	-.36**	.11	0.58; 0.13
Solidarity → Intergroup Anxiety	-.18	.11	-0.39; 0.02
Dynamism → Intergroup Anxiety	-.05	.11	-0.27; 0.17

RaceAccent → Status → Intergroup Anxiety	.29*	.11	0.11; 0.52
RaceAccent → Solidarity → Intergroup Anxiety	-.09	.06	-0.23; 0.02
RaceAccent → Dynamism → Intergroup Anxiety	-.01	.03	-0.08; 0.03

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.
White-SAE Accent = 0, Black-Nigerian Accent = 1 (i.e., RaceAccent represents Black-Nigerian accented speakers compared to White-SAE accented speakers).
Effect (*b*) is the unstandardized beta coefficient.
Model predicting status (*X* on M_1): $F(1, 165) = 43.11$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .21$.
Model predicting solidarity (*X* on M_2): $F(1, 165) = 10.55$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .06$.
Model predicting dynamism (*X* on M_3): $F(1, 165) = 2.66$, $p = .10$, $R^2 = .02$.
Total effect of RaceAccent on intergroup anxiety was not significant, $b = .02$, $t(165) = .10$, $p = .92$.

For H6d, results indicated a model that did not significantly predict social distance, $F(4, 162) = 1.76$, $p = .14$, $R^2 = .04$. However, there was an indirect effect of combined accent and race of a speaker but only through status; the indirect effects of combined accent and race of a speaker on social distance through solidarity or dynamism were not significant. Values for all direct and indirect paths are reported in Table 20.

In sum, H6 was partially supported. Status mediated the relationship between the combined accent and race of a speaker and symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance, but status did not mediate the relationship between the combined accent and race of a speaker and realistic threat. There were no significant effects found for solidarity and dynamism in mediating the relationship between the combined accent and race of a speaker and symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, or social distance.

Table 20

Direct and Indirect Effects of Race and Accent (X) on Social Distance (Y) through Status (M_1), Solidarity(M_2), and Dynamism (M_3)

Path	Effect	*BootSE*	95% BCa CI
RaceAccent → Status	-.82***	.12	-1.07; -0.57
RaceAccent → Solidarity	.47**	.15	0.18; 0.76
RaceAccent → Dynamism	.21	.13	-0.30; 0.41
RaceAccent → Social Distance	.05	.18	-0.29; 0.40
Status → Social Distance	.21*	.10	0.00; 0.41
Solidarity → Social Distance	.05	.09	-0.14; 0.23
Dynamism → Social Distance	-.03	.10	-0.22; 0.17

RaceAccent → Status → Social Distance	-.17*	.07	-0.33; -0.04
RaceAccent → Solidarity → Social Distance	.02	.06	-0.09; 0.14
RaceAccent → Dynamism → Social Distance	.01	.02	-0.05; 0.05

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.
White-SAE Accent = 0, Black-Nigerian Accent = 1 (i.e., RaceAccent represents Black-Nigerian accented speakers compared to White-SAE accented speakers).
Effect (*b*) is the unstandardized beta coefficient.
Model predicting status (*X* on M_1): $F(1, 165) = 43.11$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .21$.
Model predicting solidarity (*X* on M_2): $F(1, 165) = 10.55$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .06$.
Model predicting dynamism (*X* on M_3): $F(1, 165) = 2.66$, $p = .10$, $R^2 = .02$.
Total effect of RaceAccent on social distance was not significant, $b = -.10$, $t(165) = -.69$, $p = .49$.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Difference should not be feared as it is the primary resource for social change.

– Audre Lorde

Increased immigration of and interaction with immigrants to the U.S. continues to facilitate contact between host nationals and racially diverse non-SAE accented speakers (Current Population Survey, 2021; U.S. Census, 2020, 2021) and, in turn, impacts intergroup communication outcomes (Stephan et al., 2009). Since individuals are socially categorized based on their accent (e.g., Birney et al., 2020; Montgomery & Acheme, 2022) and race (Kleider et al., 2012; Paladino & Mazzurega, 2020), it was argued in this dissertation that accents and race function independently and concurrently in the process of social categorization and stereotyping and, in turn, impact communicative outcomes. Hence, the purpose of the present dissertation was to examine (a) evaluations of the SAE accent relative to the Nigerian accent on the dimensions of status, solidarity, and dynamism, (b) the relationship between accent and intergroup communication outcomes (i.e., symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance) as mediated by language attitudes (i.e., evaluations of status, solidarity, and dynamism), (c) the effects of race in the evaluation of status, solidarity, and dynamism and on intergroup outcomes as mediated by language attitudes, and (d) the combined effects (or intersectionality) of a speaker's accent and race on intergroup outcomes, as mediated by language attitudes.

This chapter begins by summarizing and explaining the main findings of the dissertation as they pertain to accent, race, and the intersectionality of accent and race on language attitudes and intergroup communication outcomes. The chapter also discusses the theoretical as well as

the practical implications of these findings. The chapter concludes with acknowledging the limitations of the studies conducted in this dissertation and proposes areas for future research.

Accent

The findings of the experiment undertaken in the dissertation's main study revealed that the SAE accent was rated higher on status compared to the Nigerian accent. Results support and replicate empirical evidence from past research indicating that standard accents are evaluated more favorably than non-standard accents on the dimension of status (e.g., Birney et al., 2020; Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010a). As discussed, status evaluations are associated with perceived socio-economic status (Yaw & Kang, 2021), and tend to be affiliated with dominant socioeconomic groups within society (Giles & Marlow, 2011). In the U.S., immigrant groups are part of the minority, and usually have lower socioeconomic status and dominance compared to the White majority dominant group. Immigrants have been shown to have lower economic status because they fill and perform jobs that U.S. Americans will not take (Krogstak and colleagues from the Pew Research Center, 2020). Thus, lower status evaluations of Nigerian accents may have triggered beliefs about the socioeconomic status of immigrant groups compared to the status of SAE accented speakers.

Additionally, evaluations of status are hinged on ideological beliefs about standard accents as being the "correct" and "acceptable" form of speaking (Dragojevic et al., 2013). Thus, favorable ratings for the SAE accent, relative to the Nigerian accent, provide empirical evidence about beliefs and language-based stereotypes regarding competence, superiority, and intelligence. These findings are plausible given the socio-cultural context in the U.S., in which immigrants are expected to speak English in order to be accepted in the society (Khazano, 2021), and also in order to become U.S. citizens (i.e., according to the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration

Services, Form N-400). Furthermore, participants' preference for the so-called standard (SAE) accent compared to the non-standard (Nigerian) accent signals popular beliefs about standard varieties being officially promoted and recognized by the government, educational institutions, and the media as the legitimate form of speaking English (Dragojevic et al., 2013). Moreover, considering that the non-SAE comparison group was the Nigerian accent, ideologies and beliefs about Africa may have also played a role in the evaluations of status. Even though participants were not explicitly told that the non-SAE accent in the study was Nigerian, it is plausible that they might have identified it as an African accent. Negative stereotypes about Africa (e.g., Nigeria) are constantly perpetuated in the media (e.g., Adegbola et al., 2018). Compared to the so-called "civilized West", Africa and Africans have been portrayed as uncivilized and barbaric (Langmia & Durham, 2007), signaling unintelligence, incompetence, and lower class. These popular opinions about non-SAE accents may have impacted evaluations of status for the Nigerian accented speakers.

Furthermore, one of the goals of the present dissertation was to investigate the underlying mechanisms that impact intergroup communication outcomes. Specifically, the dissertation examined the relationship between accent and symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance as mediated by evaluations of status, solidarity, and dynamism. Findings indicated that status mediated the relationship between accent and symbolic threat. Compared to the SAE accent, U.S. American listeners rated Nigerian accented speakers lower on status, which, in turn, resulted in higher perceptions of symbolic threat towards Nigerian accented speakers, in general. As discussed, symbolic threat concerns challenges to a social group's system of meaning, such as their values, morals, customs, and language (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Hence, high values for symbolic threat measures indicate greater feelings of

threat. Thus, lower status evaluations for Nigerian accented speakers resulted in increased perceptions of symbolic threat about such speakers, endangering the U.S. American worldview, meaning that U.S. American listeners perceived the lower status of Nigerian accented speakers as being a challenge to U.S. American values, morals, customs, and social order. In other words, U.S. American participants felt that the lower status of Nigerian accented speakers would change or alter the U.S. American core values and worldview. These findings provide empirical evidence that language-based stereotypes about status have consequences for intergroup outcomes (in this case, threats of the symbolic type).

Thus, participants' ideological beliefs about standard accents are reflected in the lower status evaluations of Nigerian accented speakers, resulting in feelings of symbolic threat. Symbolic threat stemming from immigrants is commonplace in popular media (e.g., Atwell Seate & Mastro, 2016). For instance, Conway and colleagues (2007) reported that Bill O'Reilly framed his news segments around foreign governments and foreign citizens/immigrants as being a danger to the U.S. American morals and values as well as violating social norms. The study also found that undocumented immigrants were predominantly portrayed as threats to the U.S. value system (i.e., liberty, democracy, and safety; Conway et al., 2007). Popular views surrounding immigrants impact perceptions of threat from immigrants (Vallejo-Martín et al., 2021). It is plausible that anti-immigrant discourses may have played a role in participants' feelings that the presence as well as the low status of Nigerian accented speakers puts the U.S. American core values/worldview in jeopardy. Popular opinions surrounding how immigrants shape the culture of the U.S. influence attitudes, stereotypes and feelings of threat towards immigrant groups. The findings of this dissertation reveal that language-based stereotypes serve as underlying mechanisms that impact feelings of symbolic threat. Specifically, the results

indicate that status evaluations are an underlying mechanism that affects feelings of symbolic threat toward accented speakers.

Results of this dissertation confirm the cognitive processes underlying language attitudes and also extend language attitudes research by providing empirical evidence that language-based stereotypes impact communication outcomes. As discussed, social categorization and stereotyping are the two cognitive processes underlying language attitudes (Dragojevic, 2018). In other words, listeners first categorize a speaker into a social group and then assign them with stereotypes inferred from that social categorization. As observed, U.S. American listeners socially categorized Nigerian accented speakers as belonging to a non-SAE accent group and then, assigned stereotypes of lower status to Nigerian accented speakers compared to the SAE accented speakers. However, attitudes towards the accented speakers did not end in stereotyping but also affected perceptions of symbolic threat from Nigerian accented speakers, as a group. It is surmised that the socio-cultural context and ideologies surrounding language use and users impact the evaluations/stereotypes attributed to speakers, which, in turn, impact perceived threat to the U.S. American worldview. General ideologies and beliefs about a speaker's status do, indeed, shape perceptions of symbolic threat. In the next section, the findings of the dissertation pertaining to race are discussed.

Race

Due to the history of racial relations leading to the rifeness of race in the U.S., another goal of the present dissertation was to investigate the impact of social categorizations based on race on language attitudes. Contrary to prediction, Blacks were evaluated higher on solidarity and dynamism compared to Whites. In other words, compared to photographs of White males, photographs of Black males were rated more favorably in terms of their social attractiveness as

well as level of liveliness and activity. These findings support past research that posits that not all stereotypes are negative (e.g., Acheme, 2021; Acheme & Cionea, 2022). Rather, stereotypes contain ambivalent beliefs (i.e., not only negative but also positive attributes) reflecting relationships between groups (Fiske at al., 2002). Participants' favorable evaluations of Black males may be explained by several socio-cultural factors in recent times in the U.S.

First, it is plausible that participants may have been more sensitive to normative concerns against prejudice and discrimination. Although not tested in the dissertation experiment, it is possible that sensitivity to norms against prejudice and discrimination against Black people may have generated a social desirability bias. In an environment where there is a greater awareness about prejudice and discrimination against Blacks (Sawyer & Gampa, 2018), perhaps evaluations of Black male photographs triggered participants to respond in socially and politically correct ways. The rise in advocacy for and allyship with Blacks may have activated favorable evaluations towards Black males compared to White males. Besides, past research suggests that awareness of bias and norms triggers cautious responding (Roessel et al., 2020), meaning that consciousness about bias as well as societal expectations regarding the treatment of Blacks may have resulted in the tendency for participants to report more desirable attitudes towards Black males. Also, preference for minority group members can function as a deliberate cognitive process (Mendes and Koslov, 2013) that seeks to correct perceived lack of historical advantages for minority group members (Axt et al., 2016). In other words, individuals can intentionally show preference for minority group members as a way of making amends for the marginalization of minority or historically disadvantaged groups in society. Participants may have shown preference for Blacks males on the dimensions of solidarity and dynamism compared to White males as a way of correcting historical and systemic disadvantages suffered by Blacks in the U.S.

society. Additionally, given that the dissertation relied on self-reports, perhaps evaluating photographs of Black males may have triggered cautious responding in the ratings of social attractiveness and dynamism but not status. Participants may have been more careful/cautious and self-aware in their evaluation of Black males. In other words, Black males were found to be more socially attractive, friendly, energetic, strong, talkative/expressive, and confident compared to White males, but were not found to be more competent, intelligent, or experienced compared to White males. These findings are reflective of past research reporting the directness, vocal expressiveness, and energy levels of Blacks (Harvard Law Review, 1991; Lavan et al., 2019) as well as stereotypes about Blacks being unintelligent and lazy (e.g., Oliver, 2003), which has also been found to affect their socioeconomic status (Taylor et al., 2019). Self-cautious responding and normative concerns about the treatment of Blacks may have impacted the positive evaluations of Black males compared to White males on the dimensions of solidarity and dynamism.

Another possible explanation is that participants in the main study may have experienced a positive expectancy violation when evaluating Black males. Expectancy violations theory (EVT; Burgoon 1993; 2015) posits that, when others behave differently than expected during interactions, individuals engage in an evaluative process to determine how to interpret the behavior. The result is a positive (i.e., the violation of expectations is evaluated positively) or negative (i.e., the violation is evaluated negatively) valence assigned to the behavior that has violated their expectations. According to EVT, positive violations of expectancies can produce desirable results (Burgoon, 2015). In terms of the current dissertation's findings, higher evaluations of Blacks on the dimensions of solidarity and dynamism may have been due to a positive violation of participants' expectations vis-à-vis Blacks. Given that participants in the

race-only conditions were presented with photographs of Black males along with a text of prose about rainbows and were instructed to imagine the individual reading the passage, it is a possible that the prose passage may have been perceived by participants as complex and intellectually sophisticated. Participants may have held predictive expectancies about Black males (i.e., expectancies about what typical behaviors Black males would engage in), such as (lack of) intellectual ability or reading style. Imagining a Black person reading that passage eloquently may have been surprising, in a good way, given the complexity of the reading. Participants were not told that the individuals did not generate the passage themselves, so they may have also been surprised by the relative ease with which Black males presented the rainbow passage. Thus, higher evaluations of social attractiveness and dynamism could reflect positive expectancy violations.

Third, public discourse surrounding race, and particularly Blacks in the U.S., may have resulted in pro-Black attitudes. The Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement was established to create awareness about issues experienced by Black people such as racial profiling, policing in Black communities, police brutality, and mass incarceration (Orbe, 2015). As a social movement, BLM repeatedly associates Black people with positive words, images, and traits, which can change the underlying valence of associations individuals make with Black people (Sawyer & Gampa, 2018). In recent years, BLM allies have included members of different racial, ethnic, and cultural groups (Dave et al., 2020). BLM allies protest, show support, and identification with the movement, which can create new perceptions of Blacks. By advocating and supporting a movement that promotes the humanity of Blacks, BLM allies speak up for the fair and humane treatment of Blacks, which can result in more identification and solidarity with Blacks as group, in general. These new associations can produce positive evaluations of Blacks

(Sawyer & Gampa, 2018; Walther & Trasselli, 2003), such as changing the stereotypes of Blacks from being second-class citizens to equal citizens in their own country; saying the names of Black individuals killed by White people, which humanizes Blacks; and the constant chant that "Black Lives Matter." All these are examples of how Blacks may be ascribed more positive attributes. Additionally, the racial climate in the U.S. (Altman, 2020), especially after the murders of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor (BBC, 2021) in 2020, may have increased people's sense of efficacy to reduce racial bias, which is associated with more positive explicit intergroup attitudes toward Blacks (Stewart et al., 2010). By advocating for Blacks during a tense racial climate, people signal their agency in supporting a cause that changes the narrative of how Blacks are perceived, with the goal of reducing unjust treatment and bias against Blacks. Thus, the racial climate in the U.S. may be an explanation for the positive evaluations of social attractiveness and dynamism for Black males. Awareness of the racial climate as it pertains to the treatment of Blacks may have triggered positive associations of social attractiveness and dynamism for Blacks.

Additionally, data from over 1 million participants from 2009 to 2016 (Sawyer & Gampa, 2018) revealed that White participants' explicit attitudes were less pro-White during BLM than pre-BLM, and that attitudes became meaningfully less pro-White over time during BLM. This means that participants' attitudes over time were less pro-White but not necessary more pro-Black. In other words, the BLM movement impacted attitudes towards Whites and Blacks. Thus, it is plausible that awareness about discrimination of Blacks triggered higher evaluations for Black males compared to White males because attitudes can change based on knowledge about the outgroup's circumstances. Moreover, past research indicates that pro-Black attitudes increased after Blacks complained about experiencing discrimination. For instance, Unzueta and

colleagues (2014) examined if social dominance orientation predicted reactions to Black and White discrimination claimants. Using vignettes, either a White or Black police officer was presented to have applied for a job promotion. In one vignette, the White officer applied for the promotion, but a Black officer was selected for the position. In another vignette, the Black officer applied for the job, but a White officer received the promotion. In both scenarios, the officers who did not receive the promotion complained that they were denied the promotion due to racial discrimination. The findings indicated that White participants reported greater liking (i.e., likable, friendly, easy to get along with, and considerate) for a Black person over a White person after each complained about experiencing discrimination. These findings indicate that awareness about racial discrimination by outgroup members can increase racial attitudes that are either pro-Black or pro-White. Similarly, in interpersonal social contexts in which participants shared information about themselves, White participants indicated greater liking, operationalized as smiles, laughs, and nods (Mendes & Koslov, 2013) toward Blacks compared to Whites. Also, more pro-Black judgments were found for applicants admitted to an academic honor society compared to White applicants (Axt et al., 2016). Thus, it is possible that the higher ratings of solidarity and dynamism for Black males, in the present dissertation, may have been triggered by socio-cultural discourses surrounding the treatment of Blacks in current U.S. society, resulting in positive associations and pro-Black stereotypes toward Black males.

In sum, the results indicate that Blacks were rated more favorable on the dimensions of solidarity and dynamism compared to Whites and that these findings may be a function of socio-cultural events and discourses. In the next section, the findings of the dissertation as they pertain to the intersectionality of the social identity markers of accent and race are discussed.

Intersectionality of Accent and Race

People form impressions of others by assigning individuals into various social categories (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; Hogg, 2006; Operario & Fiske, 2003), and then ascribing them with stereotypes, which, in turn, impact intergroup communication outcomes. Since both visual and auditory cues of interlocutors are processed in interactions (Hansen, Rakić, & Steffens, 2017; Paladino & Mazzurega, 2020; Rakić et al., 2011), one of the goals of the present dissertation was to examine the combined effects of a speaker's accent and race on language attitudes (i.e., evaluations of status, solidarity, and dynamism), and then on intergroup communication outcomes, as mediated by language attitudes. Findings revealed that White-SAE accented speakers were evaluated as higher status compared to Black-Nigerian accented speakers. Also, contrary to prediction, Black-Nigerian accented speakers were rated higher on solidarity than White-SAE accented speakers. These findings provide empirical evidence for the intersectionality of accent and race on language attitudes, and are consistent with the notion of mixed stereotypes for outgroup members, per the stereotype content model (Fiske et al., 2002). According to the model, stereotypes are a mixed combination of competence (i.e., competent, intelligent, skilled, confident) and warmth (i.e., warm, likeable, friendly, honest—similar to evaluations of solidarity), which is reflected in low ratings on one dimension (status in the case of this dissertation) and high ratings on another dimension (solidarity in the case of this dissertation; Fiske et al., 2002). By placating disadvantaged outgroups and ascribing them with socially desirable but subordinating stereotypes or traits, mixed stereotypes function to promote existing ideological beliefs and systems of privilege and dominance (Ridgeway, 2001). Thus, disadvantaged groups can be ascribed socially desirable stereotypes but only stereotypes that subordinate them and reinforce beliefs about social groups. In this dissertation, Black-Nigerian accented speakers were ascribed the stereotype of being more socially attractive compared to

White-SAE accented speakers. However, Black-Nigerian accented speakers were also evaluated less favorably on status compared to White-SAE speakers, which reinforces ideological beliefs that standard accents are often spoken by the (White) dominant, upper middle-class in society.

Similar to mixed stereotypes, findings from the present dissertation, in which Black-Nigerian accented speakers were evaluated as having less status but gained more solidarity compared to White-SAE speakers, also support results of past research. For instance, although the effect of race was not examined in their study, Acheme and Cionea (2022) reported that U.S. American listeners rated SAE accented speakers higher on status and rated non-SAE accented speakers (also Nigerians) higher on solidarity. Their results mirror this dissertation's findings regarding accent and race evaluations of White-SAE and Black-Nigerian accented speakers. Similarly, Galinsky and colleagues (2013) examined the intersection between racial and gender stereotypes and their impact on leadership selection, athletic participation, and interracial dating. Of relevance to the findings of the present dissertation are the results about leadership selections. Galinsky et al. (2013) found that a majority-White sample was more likely to choose a White male for a leadership position within a company over a Black male. In other words, certain attributes and traits such as leadership and status (which also captures characteristics such as competent, intelligent, organized, or experienced) are ascribed to White males relative to Black males. Therefore, higher status evaluations for White-SAE accented speakers circle back to perceptions and ideologies surrounding socio-economic status for White speakers with an SAE accent, especially given that standard language varieties tend to be racialized (Gaither et al., 2015; Shuck, 2004, 2006) and associated with the upper middle class (Lippi-Green, 1997). Conversely, higher solidarity evaluations for Black-Nigerian accented speakers signal mixed

(ambivalent) stereotypes about the social attractiveness of Black non-SAE accented speakers, while still reinforcing beliefs about socio-economic status for racialized accented speakers.

Furthermore, the findings also point to a more complex picture of the role of intersectionality in social categorization and intergroup outcomes by revealing that stereotypes of minority group members are not always negative but can also combine positive traits (Fiske et al., 2002). Similarly, there is empirical evidence from the present dissertation indicating that evaluations of accents impact evaluations of race. In other words, the effect of one exacerbates the effect of the other. In the accent-only conditions, status evaluations were higher for SAE speakers compared to Nigerian speakers, whereas in the race-only conditions, solidarity and dynamism evaluations were higher for Black males relative to White males. A similar pattern of findings was observed in the accent-race conditions, whereby White-SAE accented speakers were rated higher on status relative to Black-Nigerian accented speakers, who were rated higher on solidarity compared to White-SAE speakers. It is plausible that audio stimuli triggered a different information processing mechanism for U.S. American listeners than visual stimuli or vice versa. In other words, the social perceptions activated by the facial markers of race may have been different from those elicited by auditory markers of accents, which, in turn, influenced stereotypes of status for SAE accents and stereotypes of solidarity for Black males. Perhaps, looking at the pictures of Black males aroused more favorable feelings towards Blacks in evaluations of social attractiveness. This would be explained by the common ingroup identity model, which posits that prejudice toward an outgroup is reduced by redirecting categorizing toward more positive characteristics and outcomes (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2009). Specifically, positive evaluations of Black males on the dimensions of solidarity and dynamism may have

been a function of redirecting social categorization of Black males toward positive stereotypes of social attractiveness and liveliness.

The findings of this dissertation also revealed that status mediated the relationship between the combined accent and race of a speaker and symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance. Lower evaluations of status for Black-Nigerian accented speakers resulted in higher perceptions of threat to the U.S. American worldview, increased feelings of anxiety toward Black-Nigerian accented speakers and promoted less willingness to interact with Black-Nigerian accented speakers in the future. Each of these findings are discussed in more detail below.

In terms of the indirect effect of the intersectionality of accent and race on symbolic threat, through status, results point to a similar pattern of findings as observed in the indirect effect reported for accent on symbolic threat, as mediated by status. As discussed, such findings could be reflective of public concerns over immigrants changing the worldviews, values, norms, and traditions of the U.S. American society (e.g., Conway et al., 2007). Moreover, socioeconomic status has been found to impact feelings of threat, in that, as participants' socioeconomic status decreases, feelings of perceived threat towards immigrants increase (Koçak, 2021). Therefore, given appeals and policies in the public and political sphere in the U.S. that have called for more border control and stricter regulations of immigrants (Schmuck & Matthes, 2021), the findings of this dissertation are plausible. The combined accent and race of Black-Nigerian speakers could have triggered participants to categorize them as immigrants, which further influences the stereotypes of status (i.e., competence, intelligence, socioeconomic class, level of education) ascribed to them, and, in turn, impacts feelings of threat toward such individuals, as members of an outgroup.

With respect to intergroup anxiety, findings showed that lower status evaluations of Black-Nigerian accented speakers resulted in more feelings of anxiety, discomfort, tension, as well as anticipation of negative outcomes in intergroup communication. In other words, U.S. American listeners associated the lower status of Black-Nigerian accented speakers with feelings of anxiety and apprehension towards communicating with such speakers, in general. These findings provide empirical support for the underlying factors that impede (anticipated) intergroup interactions. Specifically, the intersectionality of a speaker's accent and race influences beliefs and stereotypes about their status, which, in turn, impact feelings of discomfort and communication apprehension. Thus, U.S. American listeners' responses revealed that the combined effect of a speaker's accent and race triggers feelings of anxiety through a mediated process in which Black-Nigerian accented speakers are first ascribed with lower status, an evaluation that, then, increases anxiety. These feelings of intergroup anxiety triggered by stereotypes of status are consistent with past intergroup research. For instance, in their meta-analysis of the relationship between various intergroup threats (i.e., realistic threat, symbolic threat, group esteem threat, distinctiveness threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes), and intergroup outcomes, Riek et al. (2006) reported that negative stereotypes were directly and indirectly associated with intergroup anxiety. As also observed in the present dissertation, Riek and colleagues found that negative attributes ascribed to outgroup members impact feelings of anxiety. In other words, negative evaluations of outgroup members are associated with intergroup anxiety. Likewise, Littleford and colleagues (2005) examined same-sex dyadic interactions between White and Black college students, and White and Asian American college students. White participants reported experiencing greater discomfort and anxiety as well as cardiovascular responses (i.e., their heart rate increased) while interacting with Blacks and Asian

Americans compared to other White college students (Littleford et al., 2005). Indeed, social group membership impacts feelings of intergroup anxiety, as was also observed in the present dissertation Similarly, perceived status differences between groups were found to be positively correlated with intergroup anxiety in previous research (Correnblum & Stephan, 2001; Stephan et al., 2002). Given that most participants in the current dissertation's main study were White, perceived status differences between White participants and Black-Nigerian accented speakers may have also impacted feelings of discomfort and apprehension of future interactions with Black-Nigerian accented speakers, in general.

Furthermore, negative perceptions and stereotypes of outgroup members have been shown to cause intergroup anxiety (e.g., Berrenberg et al., 2002; Van Zomeren et al., 2007). In their theorizing of intergroup anxiety, Stephan (2014) proposed a theoretical model (of intergroup anxiety) specifying the antecedents and consequences of such anxiety. According to the model, and of utmost importance to the findings of the present dissertation, causes of intergroup anxiety include personality traits (e.g., social identity markers), attitudes and related cognitions (e.g., stereotypes), personal experience (e.g., negative contact), and situational factors (e.g., linguistic barriers). Personality traits concern the personal and social identity characteristics that predispose individuals to experience intergroup anxiety, such as being ethnocentric, mistrustful, or intolerant. Attitudes and related cognitions pertain to negative perceptions of outgroup, such as their lack of moral values, incompetence, or aggressiveness/hostility. Personal experience has to do with levels of intergroup contact and knowledge of the outgroup, such that low levels of contact and knowledge about the outgroup can impact understandings of outgroup behaviors, traits, and values, which, in turn, impact feelings of anxiety. Finally, situational factors concern circumstances that create negative affect and negative expectations and

cognitions, such as competition, unequal ratios of ingroup to outgroup members, and status differences between social groups (Stephan, 2014). This dissertation's findings provide empirical support for the aforementioned causes of intergroup anxiety for U.S. American listeners. The indirect effect of accent and race of a speaker on intergroup anxiety, through status, reflects the dimensions of personality/social identity and attitudes and related cognitions in Stephan's (2014) theoretical model of intergroup anxiety. In other words, the social identity markers of being Black/non-SAE impacted feelings of intergroup anxiety. Similarly, attitudes and related cognitions in the form of lower status evaluations also affected intergroup anxiety toward Black-Nigerian accented speakers, in general. Various aspects of an individual's social identity, such as their accent and race, can predispose people to experience intergroup anxiety because such markers impact the trajectory of intergroup interactions. Social identity markers can impede future interactions because of the discomfort associated with interacting with Black-Nigerian accented speakers. Equally, negative attitudes and stereotypes of outgroup members impact feelings of intergroup anxiety (Stephan, 2014). Thus, the lower status evaluations of Black-Nigerian accented speakers, which resulted in intergroup anxiety for U.S. American listeners, likely emerge from social identity traits ascribed to Black-Nigerian accented speakers as well as related attitudes and cognitions about such outgroup members. In sum, social identity markers and stereotypes are antecedents that affect feelings of intergroup anxiety as revealed by the findings of the present dissertation that align with the theoretical model of intergroup anxiety.

Lastly and with respect to social distance or (un)willingness to engage in future interactions with a target group, findings indicated that status mediated the relationships between a speaker's accent and race and social distance in that lower status evaluations of Black-Nigerian accented speakers resulted in less willingness to engage in interactions with Black-Nigerian

accented speakers. In other words, U.S. American listeners associated the lower status of Black-Nigerian accented speakers with greater social distance towards Black-Nigerian accented speakers, as a whole. As discussed, social distance captures voluntary associations with outgroup members as fellow citizens, coworkers, family members, and significant other(s), with lower scores on this measure indicating less willingness to engage in such associations. The findings of the current dissertation are plausible because ideological beliefs as well as the socioeconomic status of host nationals affect attitudes and feelings of social distance (Koçak, 2021). Thus, the lower the perceived socioeconomic status of immigrants, the less willing host nationals are in engaging with immigrants. Furthermore, social distance is a measure of prejudice (Z. Massey et al., 2018), indicating that lower evaluations of status for Black-Nigerian accented speakers, which resulted in greater social distance from this group, are reflective of the prejudicial attitudes of U.S. American listeners toward Black-Nigerians, as a group. In other words, by ascribing lower status evaluations to Black-Nigerian accented speakers, U.S. American listeners indicated prejudicial attitudes in the form of social distance toward Black-Nigerian accented speakers, as a whole. Participants' unwillingness to voluntary associate with Black non-SAE speakers, either as fellow citizens or coworkers, signals prejudice toward Black non-SAE accented speakers. These results are consistent with past research on relational openness and willingness to interact with outgroup members. Carlson and colleagues (2019), for instance, reported that openness and agreeableness toward immigrants were negatively correlated with prejudice, meaning that the less open host nationals were toward immigrants, the greater their prejudice towards immigrants was. Findings of the current dissertation also indicate that status evaluations are negatively associated with prejudice (i.e., social distance) for Black-Nigerian accented speakers.

The stigma associated with non-standard accents as well as racial minority group membership can preclude social interactions. Past research has identified various groups that have suffered stigma including Blacks, non-standard accented speakers, and individuals from lower socioeconomic class and status in society (e.g., Dovidio et al., 2001; Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010b; Lindemann, 2005; Twenge & Campbell, 2002). The findings of the present dissertation provide empirical support regarding the stigma attached to the combined effects of being a Black minority group member who speaks English with a non-SAE accent. Negative attitudes and stereotypes towards others' speech (Dragojevic, 2018) as well as their race, as indicated in the present dissertation study, result in avoidance of future interactions with such individuals. Moreover, popular beliefs and mantras about non-standard accented speakers being difficult to understand (Dragojevic, 2018) or having "thick" accents can result in unwillingness to interact with them as well. It is plausible that these beliefs about non-standard accented speakers impacted participants' scores on social distance toward Black-Nigerian accented speakers. Therefore, the results of the present dissertation point to the disproportionate communicative burden that is placed on non-standard accented speakers in interactions (Dragojevic & Giles, 2016; Lippi-Green, 2012), such that the mere presence of a non-SAE accent and non-White race can result in unwillingness for future interactions with Black-Nigerian accented speakers. Although not tested in the present dissertation, by being unwilling to associate with Black-Nigerian accented speakers, U.S. American listeners may be placing the burden of communication on Black-Nigerian accented speakers as a function of their accent and race as well as evaluations of lower status. This results in expectations that immigrants should make the communicative process easier for U.S. American listeners, when, in fact, effective communication relies on the efforts of both speakers and listeners.

Finally, lower status evaluations for Black-Nigerian speakers that resulted in greater feelings of symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance may have been the result of participants' frame of reference and how they socially categorized Black-Nigerian and White-SAE accented speakers. It is plausible that, for U.S. American listeners, the frame of reference triggered by White-SAE speakers was different from the frame of reference triggered by Black-Nigerian speakers. An ingroup (national) frame of reference (i.e., fellow U.S. American speaker) may have been activated by White-SAE speakers, whereas an outgroup (international) frame of reference (i.e., non-U.S. American) may have been triggered by Black-Nigerian speakers resulting in lower status evaluations, which, in turn, led to increased threat perceptions, anxiety, and social distance. Given that speaking with an accent is socially constructed and speaking with a non-standard accent is not only a function of identity construction but also a signifier of outgroup status (Dragojevic, 2018), (manipulation check) findings indicate that an outgroup status (i.e., non-U.S. American Black) was attributed to Black-Nigerian speakers, resulting in intergroup outcomes. As discussed, past language attitudes research (i.e., research examining evaluations toward accented speech) has reported that non-standard accented speakers are socially categorized as foreign and non-U.S. For instance, Dragojevic and Giles (2014) examined ingroup and outgroup evaluations based on accented speech, predicting that ingroup membership would change based on the reference frames used (i.e., interregional, or international). In their study, listeners' frames of reference were manipulated by pairing an American Southern English (ASE) accented speaker with either a Californian accented speaker (i.e., interregional reference frame) or a Punjabi accented speaker (i.e., international reference frame). Participants reported having a stronger connection with the ASE accented speaker, perceived the ASE accent to be more similar, and evaluated ASE accented speakers to be higher in solidarity when the reference

frame was international (i.e., ingroup categorization) as opposed to interregional (i.e., outgroup categorization). Therefore, reference frames impact social categorization and may provide explanations for the findings of the present dissertation. Lower status evaluations for Black-Nigerian speakers resulting in greater feelings of symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance may have been a function of participants' frame of reference, in that Black-Nigerian speakers were socially categorized as Black-immigrant (international)-non-U.S. accented speakers, whereas White-SAE speakers were socially categorized as White-(national)-U.S. accented speakers, impacting language-based stereotypes and intergroup communication outcomes.

In conclusion, the findings of the current dissertation indicate that social categorizations based on language use, race, and the intersectionality of accent and race impact the stereotypes attributed to speakers, which, in turn, affect feelings of symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance. As observed, evaluations of a speaker's status play a significant role in intergroup outcomes. As discussed, the ideological beliefs, connotations, and expectations surrounding language use and racial markers are hinged in the power relations between members of different language and racial groups. Popular beliefs about so-called standard varieties as well as racial cues/connotations of racial group membership continue to be perpetuated by educational institutions, media, and the government, thereby impacting the dominance, competence, intelligence, literacy, experience, and socioeconomic class ascribed to speakers. These beliefs about language use and racial minority group members, in turn, result in greater feelings of threat to the U. S. American social order, as well as increased intergroup anxiety and social distance triggered by Black non-SAE speakers. Indeed, both social categorization and stereotyping have been shown to have detrimental consequences in intergroup communication outcomes. In the

next section, the implications of the dissertation findings are discussed as they pertain to intergroup theories.

Theoretical Implications

The current dissertation study relied on assumptions of SIT, ITT, and the intersectionality framework to examine the independent and concurrent effect of accent and race on intergroup communication outcomes, as mediated by language attitudes. The findings of this dissertations have several implications for these theories. First, and as it pertains to SIT, results indicating higher evaluations of the SAE accent compared to the Nigerian accent support the assumptions of SIT, which proposes that evaluations of one's ingroup are determined through social comparisons with specific outgroups. By rating the SAE accent more favorably, U.S. American listeners likely strived to maintain a positive ingroup identity as it pertains to evaluations of status. In addition, SIT theoretical constructs were used within a new context, that is, in the intergroup evaluations of SAE and Nigerian accented speakers. Thus, this study suggests SIT could be applied to ingroup and outgroup evaluations as illustrated by the findings of the present dissertation. Positive ingroup status evaluations for the SAE accent signal positive associations attributed to fellow U.S. American speakers by U.S. listeners, as well as less favorable attitudes toward Nigerian accented speakers on the dimension of status. By evaluating SAE accented speakers higher than Nigerian accented speakers, U.S. listeners ascribed positive social identity to members of their language group, which further supports the applicability and heuristic value of SIT constructs in the context of language attitudes research.

Second, positive evaluations of Black males relative to White males on the dimensions of solidarity and dynamism were unexpected but suggest that outgroup behavior is not always evaluated negatively. Per SIT, social identity processes trigger intergroup comparisons, resulting

in ingroup favoritism and outgroup discrimination (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). However, this was not the case in the current dissertation. The findings of this dissertation contribute to SIT by indicating that there may be conditions in which members of the ingroup do not necessarily discriminate against outgroups but can have favorable attitudes toward outgroup members. As discussed, socio-cultural discourses, awareness, and sensitivity against prejudice and discrimination of Blacks as well as advocacy and allyship may have impacted intergroup behaviors, resulting in more favorable evaluations of Black males. In other words, the mere social categorization of an outgroup member does not ultimately result in outgroup discrimination or derogation. Perhaps implicit attitudes in the form of ingroup favoritism and outgroup discrimination, per SIT, may be better captured using implicit measures, specifically given that explicit attitudes in the form of self-reports did not indicate outgroup discrimination toward Black males, nor more favorable ingroup evaluations toward White males.

Third, findings from the present dissertation show that evaluations of outgroup members are hinged in ideological beliefs about group membership. It is within social groups that meanings and expectations for language use, symbols, and events are constructed and interpreted (Johnson, 2013). Theoretically, the findings of this dissertation contribute to intergroup research by indicating that ideologies surrounding group membership as well as the social connotations of the social identity markers of race and accent serve as antecedents that explain intergroup processes and outcomes. Furthermore, the dissertation findings indicate how socially constructed, marked, and abstract categories such as race and accent cues have detrimental consequences for (anticipated) intergroup communication, such as feelings of greater social distance, intergroup anxiety, and symbolic threat. In other words, the findings of the current dissertation reflect the causal link between markers of social identity and intergroup

communication outcomes. Thus, status evaluations of a speaker based on their accent and race or the combination of both are predictors of symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance. This provides further support for the social dynamics between social group relations, per SIT.

Fourth, the findings of this dissertation provide empirical support for ITT by explaining the antecedents of intergroup symbolic threat and anxiety. Evaluations of Black-Nigerian accented speakers' status were identified as an underlying mechanism that affects how threatened and anxious U.S. American listeners feel towards Black-Nigerians, as a group. While ITT explains the role perceived threats play in intergroup relations, the findings of the present dissertation describe the antecedents of threat, which include the accent and race of a speaker as well as evaluations of the speaker's status. An individual's accent and race (i.e., social identity markers) work together to impact evaluations of intelligence, competence, socioeconomic class, which, in turn, influence how uneasy, tensed, worried, and threatened people feel in potential interactions with such outgroup members. In other words, the markers of one's social identity as well as the stereotypes ascribed to individuals based on their group membership have detrimental consequences for individuals' beliefs about the U.S. American social order and worldview, which relates to ITT. Indeed, perceived threats play a role in intergroup relations, per ITT; however, social categorization and stereotyping processes are predictors of symbolic threat. Also, the findings provide evidence that personality/social identity traits (i.e., being Black and non-SAE accented) and attitudes and related cognitions (i.e., stereotypes of low status) cause intergroup anxiety, as posited in Stephan's (2014) theoretical model of intergroup anxiety, as already discussed. Thus, the findings of the current dissertation provide evidence for the theoretical scope and the heuristic value of the model of intergroup anxiety.

Furthermore, results from the combined effect of a speaker's accent and race on symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance contribute to intersectionality theory by providing empirical evidence of the intersectionality of social identities. One of the goals of the present dissertation was to examine intersectionality theory, a critical theory traditionally used in qualitative research (e.g., Atewologun, 2018), in quantitative research. The findings of the current dissertation expand the theory by not only applying it within a new (quantitative) research context but also by indicating the heuristic value of the theory by demonstrating that, indeed, social identities exacerbate each other's effects, as observed in the present dissertation. In other words, evaluations of a speaker's accent affect evaluations of their race and vice versa. Both markers of social identity operate concurrently and influence the outcomes of each other as observed in the accent-race conditions. Thus, examining the combined effects of accent and race in language attitudes research provides a more complex, nuanced understanding of the role of social categorization processes as well as the outcomes of intergroup communication as compared to examining accents alone. Both audio and visual markers are not only used in the social categorization of speakers but are also relied upon in ascribing speakers with stereotypes that, in turn, impact feelings of symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance.

These findings demonstrate that examining the intersectionality of auditory and visual social identity markers provides a more complex picture in social categorization and intergroup communication, which has not received considerable attention from past research on language attitudes. Indeed, the combined effects of a speaker's accent and race affect more distal intergroup outcomes. As observed, examining the intersectionality of social identities in intergroup communication is important in providing an ecologically valid (i.e., the processing of both auditory and visual stimuli in interactions) understanding of intergroup dynamics. Merely

singling out the effects of social identities does not provide a full picture or nuances of social categorization, stereotyping, and communicative outcomes. The indirect effects of the combined accent and race of a speaker found in the present dissertation provide empirical support for the idea of intersectional effects of social identities on intergroup communication outcomes. Accent, indeed, influences evaluations of race, which, in turn, influence communication outcomes between members of different groups. In summary, the findings of this dissertation contribute to SIT, ITT, and intersectionality theory by providing empirical support for the assumptions of the theories and also illustrating the heuristic value and applicability of the theories within the context of language attitudes and intergroup communication. In the next section, the practical implications of the findings are discussed.

Practical Implications

Results of this dissertations also have several practical implications for intergroup communication and relations. First, and as the findings indicate, speaking with a non-SAE accent impacts evaluations of competence, intelligibility, confidence, socioeconomic class, level of education, and so forth. Stereotypes regarding the status of a non-standard accented speaker can have effects in practical settings such as employment, education, promotion, and social influence, to name a few. For instance, lower status perceptions of non-SAE accented speakers can impact access to employment opportunities. Speaking with an accent could impact how competent a job applicant is perceived to be, even though the non-SAE accented speaker could be perfectly proficient in the language. This could limit access and opportunities for immigrants seeking to adapt and be integrated into the U.S. society.

In addition, evaluations of lower status for accented speakers have consequences for social influence and compliance-gaining. A non-standard accented speaker may be in a position

of authority and be disrespected or ignored by their subordinates because of perceptions surrounding language use and competence. For instance, past research reports that international teaching assistants are stigmatized and evaluated poorly due to their non-SAE accents (Adebayo & Allen, 2020). Similarly, ideologies and beliefs surrounding a so-called standard variety have consequences for communication in settings where customer satisfaction is of utmost priority. To illustrate, speaking with a non-SAE accent as a customer service representative or receptionist could pose a threat to evaluations of the speaker's competence and/or customer satisfaction because of expectations of how English *should* be spoken. This experience could consequently lead to negative impressions that could harm a company's image. A frustrated client who has negative beliefs about non-standard accented speakers is likely to evaluate them with lower status compared to an SAE speaker, which could impede future interactions altogether (Dragojevic, 2018) or even further patronage of the business. An unsatisfied client with negative beliefs about non-SAE accented speakers could post a review that could impact other customers' perceptions of the business. Thus, one person's beliefs and negative attitudes can have ripple effects in practical settings such as customer service.

The empirical evidence surrounding negative language attitudes indicates that attitudes about non-SAE accents exist and point to the need for interventions that can raise cultural awareness about the ideologies surrounding accents and language use, especially since speaking with an accent does not imply a lack of proficiency in language use. For instance, if there is an increase in the positive portrayal of non-standard accented speakers in the media, these positive portrayals could promote more exposure to non-U.S. American accents, facilitating familiarity with non-U.S. American accents. Perhaps familiarity with non-standard accented speakers could result in positive parasocial or mediated contact, which could lead to more individuation and

particularization of accented speakers. Besides, exposure to a certain group can increase favorable attitudes toward them (e.g., Z. Massey et al., 2018; Schiappa et al., 2005; 2006). Since media serves as an important agent for transmitting beliefs and ideologies, positive portrayals of non-standard accented speakers in places of authority can change negative language attitudes about status. Given that past research has shown that mediated contact with members of an outgroup can result in less prejudice toward them (Z. Massey et al., 2018; Schiappa et al., 2005; 2006), perhaps the positive portrayal and representation of Blacks and other minority group members in the media could also impact the characteristics and traits ascribed to them. Also, there is a need for a shift in the rhetoric surrounding Nigerian immigrants. Nigerian immigrants have been reported as one of the most successful immigrant populations in the U.S. (Joel, 2018). In their interactions with U.S. Americans, Nigerian participants reported they were evaluated as hardworking and educated (Acheme, 2021). Therefore, positive interpersonal interactions and contacts with Nigerian immigrants can play a role in changing the rhetoric about Nigerians and Africans, in general.

Second, it was observed that not all stereotypes are necessarily negative, although they are still stereotypes/generalizations based on social group membership. Greater evaluations of solidarity and dynamism for Blacks as compared to Whites may demonstrate some changes in the characteristics attributed to Black men. The racial and sociocultural climate in the U.S. may be changing, which could also be indicative of more awareness and sensitivity toward the plight of Black minority group members. Although these findings were contrary to predictions, it was noted that positive attitudes towards Blacks may exist, contrary to popular conceptions and stereotypes of Blacks. It is the utmost hope of the author that favorable evaluations of solidarity and dynamism for Black males relative to White males are truly reflective of participants'

attitudes and not just a result of social desirability bias. These findings signal hope in the perceptions of Blacks and minority groups, as a whole. That stereotypes of social attractiveness and dynamism were ascribed to Black males, compared to stereotypes that have portrayed Black men as criminals and thugs (Okantah, 2016), offers some hope that the racial climate in the U.S. could be changing, which may also have long-term consequences on issues such as police brutality and lynching of Black men (e.g., Dave et al., 2020). Movements such as BLM can play a role in changing the attributes and traits ascribed to Blacks (Sawyer & Gampa, 2018). Visible advocacy and allyship regarding the treatment of Blacks not only promotes sensitivity and awareness but can impact the stereotypes ascribed to Blacks by outgroup members. Similarly, open condemnation against prejudice and discrimination of people based on their race is pivotal for changing societal attitudes and stereotypes about minority group members.

Furthermore, findings pertaining to U.S. American listeners' attitudes and feelings of symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance toward Black-Nigerian accented immigrants have implications for immigration and intergroup communication. Popular rhetoric, beliefs, and policies surrounding immigration affect the treatment and acceptance of immigrants (Esses, 2021). Feelings of threat, anxiety, and unwillingness for voluntary associations with Black non-SAE speakers can influence the climate and outcomes of interactions for both host nationals and immigrants. For host nationals, attitudes towards Black non-standard accented listeners can impact the openness of receiving immigrants into the U.S., especially when said immigrant groups are attributed lower status which, in turn, poses a threat to the U.S. American worldview, traditions, and social order, as well as feelings of discomfort and apprehension of anticipated intergroup interactions. As observed, participants reported favorable evaluations of Black males on the dimensions of solidarity and dynamism but experienced feelings of symbolic

threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance toward Black-Nigerian accented speakers, as mediated by lower status evaluations. These findings point to a more complex picture, in that, the non-SAE accent may have triggered social categorization processes of Black-Nigerian accented speakers as outgroup, immigrant, and "foreign," resulting in feelings of threat, discomfort, and unwillingness for future interactions. Black males, however, may have been socially categorized as fellow (Black) U.S. American nationals, hence the positive evaluations of social attractiveness and dynamism. Indeed, social categorization processes can affect communicative outcomes in interactions between immigrants and host nationals.

Additionally, the findings of the current dissertation have implications for Black non-SAE accented immigrants' adaptation to U.S. society. Stereotypes and beliefs communicated by host nationals to Black non-SAE speakers during interactions could affect feelings of belonging to the U.S. society. The constant reminder of their non-U.S. accent can impede interactions with host nationals, affecting immigrants' sense of belonging, identification with, and integration into the host country, as well as functional fitness (Kim, 2019) in the U.S. In other words, knowledge about the stereotypes host nationals ascribe to Black non-SAE immigrants may affect becoming accustomed to the U.S. society, and may influence their sense of acceptance and efficacy within this society in which they are also citizens. Indeed, the feelings of threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance communicated by host nationals pose adaptation challenges for Black non-SAE immigrants. Thus, Black non-SAE immigrants do not only have to grapple with the stigma associated with non-standard accents but also the connotations of being Black. Compared to other White immigrant group members, Black non-SAE speakers may encounter unique challenges due to the combined effect of their accent and race in adapting to the U.S. society.

Moreover, host nationals' attitudes toward immigrants can influence the stringency of immigration policies, affect the number of immigrants admitted into the country each year, as well as the types of support offered to new immigrants (Reyna et al., 2013). With the unfortunate rising in social wars, conflicts, and unrest around the world in recent times (International Monetary Fund, 2022), refugees and asylum seekers can be negatively affected by punitive immigration policies due to beliefs and stereotypes attributed to Black non-standard accented immigrants. However, by portraying and highlighting the positive economic, social, and educational aspects immigrants add to the U.S. American society (e.g., paying taxes, filling labor needs, being educators, adding to the multicultural makeup of the country), it may be possible to gradually change anti-immigrant rhetoric. Besides, there seem to be more positive beliefs about immigration in the U.S. society, recently. Compared to the Gallup poll of 2007, in 2017, U.S. Americans reported that immigrants improved life in the U.S. Specifically, 57% (compared to 40% in 2007) of U.S. Americans indicated that immigrants to the U.S. made things better in terms of food, music, and arts; 45% (compared to 28% in 2007) reported that immigrants made the U.S. American economy better, in general. In terms of immigrants' impact on the U.S. social and moral norms, the numbers increased to 31% in 2017 compared to 19% in 2007 (Gallup, 2017). Indeed, popular opinions can impact evaluations of immigrants and, in turn, decrease the stigma as well as the feelings of threat, anxiety, and apprehension of intergroup communication with accented and racial minority immigrants, in general.

In summary, the findings of this dissertation contribute practical knowledge about the effects of accent and race on intergroup communication and relations, and offer several suggestions for how we may capitalize on such findings to improve the treatment of and

interactions with accented, racially diverse others. In the next section, the limitations of the study are discussed along with propositions for future research.

Limitations & Future Directions

Like any other scientific effort, this dissertation has several limitations. First, the present dissertation only examined attitudes towards one biological sex—males. The author chose to focus on males because prescriptive stereotypes tend to be higher for men compared to women (Fiske & Steven, 1993; Koenig, 2018). Thus, the findings of this dissertation do not generalize to include stereotypes and intergroup outcomes towards females or individuals with different sexual or gender orientations. It is possible that there may be significant differences on the dimensions of status, solidarity, and dynamism between SAE and non-SAE accented female speakers, for instance. Societal norms and gender expectations might impact language attitudes. Future research would benefit from examining how individuals are evaluated not only based on the intersectional effects of their accent and race but also based on their biological sex and/or gender, and how the intersectionality of these social identities impacts intergroup outcomes, as mediated by evaluations of status, solidarity, and dynamism, as well as other variables beyond language attitudes, such as conscientiousness or openness. Also, future research could benefit from investigating how societal norms surrounding gender expectations for how members of different sexes and gender *ought to* sound. It is possible that gender norms and stereotypes, could impact the evaluations of transgender or transracial individuals, for example, such as societal expectations regarding of vocal features, and appearance. These evaluations can, in turn, affect intergroup communication outcomes such as willingness to interact, identity (in)security, willingness to accommodate, or intergroup anxiety, to name a few. Additionally, given that the dissertation findings provided empirical evidence for the effects of the status dimension, future

research could also examine the effects of social class in language attitudes and intergroup outcomes. If language ideologies surrounding status are, indeed, tied to socioeconomic class (Giles et al., 2010), then future research would benefit from investigating the role social class plays in the evaluations of speakers. As discussed, social identities markers such as race and accents are rooted in power dynamics within society and affect access and opportunities for minority group members. Thus, examining the effect of (perceived) class on language attitudes and intergroup outcomes can also shed light into the processes that underpin ideological beliefs as well as connotations about social groups and how they impact intergroup processes.

Second, past research indicates that polarization of racial attitudes may occur between members of different political groups (Sawyer & Gampa, 2018). However, political orientation was not examined in the present study. It is possible that differences in the evaluation of speakers' accent and race may have differed depending on participants' political orientation. The attitudes of conservatives may be different from those of liberals. Conservatives may be more likely to experience attitudinal reactions toward Black immigrants with a non-SAE accent due to political beliefs surrounding immigrants and immigration, for instance. Hence, future research would benefit from investigating the role political orientation plays in the evaluation of accented, non-SAE speakers. More knowledge could be gained from examining political orientation, not only as a social identity but also as a predictor of intergroup behavior and outcomes relative to racial minority, non-SAE accented speakers. Second, social dominance (i.e., the preference for intergroup hierarchies and inequality) and right-wing authoritarianism (i.e., conventionalism and authoritarian submission) have been linked to negative attitudes towards immigrants, particularly as related to threats to national security and safety (Cohrs & Stelzl, 2010; Esses, 2021). These variables were not explored in the present dissertation either. Examining how social dominance

and right-wing authoritarianism orientations are associated with feelings of symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance toward Black non-SAE accented immigrants could shed light onto the mechanisms that impact the outcomes of intergroup communication. It would also be relevant for future research to explore how social dominance and right-wing authoritarianism orientations affect the evaluations of status, solidarity, and dynamism, which could provide more knowledge about the antecedents underlying language attitudes.

Third, the use of photographs (for the race-only conditions) and photographs together with audio recordings (for the accent-race conditions) is also a shortcoming of the present dissertation study. It is possible that just looking at a photograph of a White or Black male and/or listening to an audio recording along with their photos may not have exemplified a realistic face-to-face scenario for participants, specifically because people physically see and hear their interaction partners. Thus, it is plausible that the experimental manipulation for the race only and accent and race conditions used in the present dissertation did not mirror in-person settings, and thereby may have not elicited the responses that would have emerged in actual face-to-face intergroup interactions.

Moreover, the binary created, wherein the SAE accent was associated with White speakers/individuals and the Nigerian accent represented Black speakers/individuals, may have oversimplified intersectionality. Non-SAE is not always Black, and neither is SAE always identical to White; the complexity of these socially constructed markers of identity is more nuanced. Therefore, future research could replicate the present study but record face-to-face interactions between members of different races who speak with different accents to investigate how social identity markers impact communication outcomes in in-person settings, such as the

classroom, workplace, or jury duty, to name a few. Future research could also examine ideological beliefs and reactions towards Blacks who speak with SAE accents and how these predictive expectancies impact intergroup communication outcomes. Such research could provide a more ecologically valid situation and shed even more light onto intergroup dynamics as they occur in everyday life as opposed to controlled settings, as was the case for the present dissertation. Also, future research could use physiological measures to assess the physical and biological reactions ingroup members experience when interacting with members of an outgroup. Given that the findings regarding Black males being evaluated more favorably than White males on the dimensions of solidarity and dynamism were contrary to prediction, future research could examine implicit reactions to Blacks and how those affect intergroup communication outcomes. Using implicit measures in exploring the role social identity markers exert in intergroup interactions controls for the social desirability bias that can compound findings obtained using explicit measures, particularly when participants are aware of societal expectations against bias and prejudice toward minority group members.

Fourth, compared to statistics from the U.S. Census Bureau on the racial distribution of the U.S. population, the main study sample had a higher racial distribution of Whites, which is a limitation of the dissertation study. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2021), the population estimates for Whites was 75.8% but, in the dissertation study, the distribution for Whites was 85.9% (i.e., about 10% higher). Higher racial distributions of White participants may have impacted the findings of the study. Thus, future research could ensure a representative sample that reflects the racial distribution of the U.S. population is used.

Furthermore, similar to the present dissertation, future research is needed to extend scholarship in language attitudes by not only documenting language attitudes but also exploring

the distal impacts language-based stereotypes have in intergroup communication. It is contended that exploring the impact of language attitudes on intergroup outcomes is a first step in understanding group dynamics and processes. In other words, research indicates that speakers are stereotyped based on their accent and language use. So, what? What are the effects of language-based stereotypes on intergroup communication outcomes? How do language-based stereotypes serve as predictors or antecedents in intergroup relations and outcomes? An understanding of the underlying dynamics and mechanisms that shape intergroup processes can, in turn, facilitate initiatives and strategies to improve negative attitudes that are triggered from language use and racial markers. By having empirical evidence showing the antecedents, causes, and consequences of language-based stereotypes on intergroup communication outcomes, knowledge about how to develop initiatives and strategies to change negative ideologies surrounding language and racial cues, for instance, can be gleaned. Therefore, given the findings of the present dissertation, future research can explore how to change ideological beliefs about language use because these beliefs do impact intergroup outcomes.

Conclusion

The author of the current dissertation contended that the social identity markers of accent and race impact language attitudes, which, in turn, affect feelings of symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance towards Nigerian accented speakers and Black-Nigerian accented speakers, in general. Results replicated past research in language attitudes, such that the SAE accent was evaluated more favorably than the Nigerian accent on the dimension of status. Also, Black males were rated higher on dimensions of solidarity and dynamism compared to White males. Additionally, the findings of the dissertation study revealed that status evaluations played a significant role in mediating the relationship between a speaker's

accent and symbolic threat as well as, the combined accent and race of a speaker and perceptions of symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance. Indeed, ideological beliefs about minority group members and/or language use(rs) influence stereotypes of socioeconomic status ascribed to non-SAE and Black non-SAE accented speakers. The lower status evaluations of Black-Nigerian accented speakers resulted in greater perceptions of threat to the U.S. American worldview, increased feelings of discomfort, and (un)willingness for voluntary future associations with Black-Nigerian accented speakers, in general.

The present dissertation's findings provide empirical evidence regarding the underlying mechanisms and antecedents that shape intergroup communication outcomes (i.e., accent, race, and evaluations of status). With rising globalization, migration, and multiculturalism around the world, there is a need to improve intergroup contact and relations; the present study takes an initial step in this direction by providing explanations for what causes U.S. American individuals to experience feelings of symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and social distance in intergroup interactions.

References

Aboud, F. E., & Amato, M. (2003). Development and socialization influences on intergroup bias. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 65-85). Blackwell Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9781405106542.2002.00004.x

Acheme, D. E. (2018). *The evaluation of non-standard accented English: An intergroup perspective on language attitudes* [Masters' thesis, Cleveland State University]. https://etd.ohiolink.edu/apexprod/rws_etd/send_file/send?accession=csu1529591883681638&disposition=inline

Acheme, D. E. (2021). Stereotyped communication: The ascribed identities of Nigerians living in the U.S. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* (Advanced online publication). https://doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2021.1974924

Acheme, D. E., & Cionea, I. A. (2021). Protest structures: Responses from Nigerians in the United States to police brutality and #BlackLivesMatter protests. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 41*(1), 29-48. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X211049473

Acheme, D. E., & Cionea, I. A. (2022). "Oh, I like your accent": Perceptions and evaluations of standard and non-standard accented English speakers. *Communication Reports, 35*(2), 92-105. https://doi.org/10.1080/08934215.2022.2037679

Adebayo, C. T., & Allen, M. (2020). The experiences of international teaching assistants in the US classroom: A qualitative study. *Journal of International Students, 10*(1), 69-83. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v10i1.1086

Adegbola, O., Skarda-Mitchell, J., & Gearhart, S. (2018). Everything's negative about Nigeria: A study of US media reporting on Nigeria. *Global Media and Communication, 14*(1), 47-63. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742766518760086

Allen, T. W. (1994). *The invention of the White race* (Vol. 1). Verso Books.

Allen, T. W. (1997). *The invention of the White race* (Vol. 2). Verso Books.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.

Altman, A. (2020, June 4). *Why the killing of George Floyd sparked an American uprising*. Time Magazine. https://time.com/5847967/george-floyd-protests-trump/

American Anthropological Association. (1998). American Anthropological Association statement on "race." *American Anthropologist, 100*(3). www.aaanet.org/stmts/racepp.htm

Asante, G., Sekimoto, S., & Brown, C. (2016). Becoming "Black": Exploring the racialized experiences of African immigrants in the United States. *Howard Journal of Communications, 27*(4), 367-384. https://doi.org/10.1080/10646175.2016.1206047

Atwell Seate, A., & Mastro, D. (2016). Media's influence on immigration attitudes: An intergroup threat theory approach. *Communication Monographs, 83*(2), 194-213. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2015.1068433

Atewologun, D. (2018). Intersectionality theory and practice. In M. A. Hitt (Ed.) *Oxford research encyclopedia of business and management*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.48

Axt, J. R., Ebersole, C. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2016). An unintentional, robust, and replicable pro-Black bias in social judgment. *Social Cognition, 34*(1), 1-39. https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2016.34.1.1

Bashi, V., & McDaniel, A. (1997). A theory of immigration and racial stratification. *Journal of Black Studies, 27(5*), 668-682. https://doi.org/10.1177/002193479702700505

BBC. (2021, April 22). *George Floyd: Timeline of Black deaths and protests.* BBC. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-52905408

Berrenberg, J. L., Finlay, K. A., Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2002). Prejudice toward people with cancer or AIDS: Applying the integrated threat model. *Journal of Applied Biobehavioral Research, 7(*2), 75-86. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9861.2002.tb00078.x

Birney, M. E., Rabinovic, A., & Morton, T. A. (2020). Where are you from? An investigation into the intersectionality of accent strength and nationality status on perceptions of nonnative speakers in Britain. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *39*(4), 495-515. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X20932628

Blackmon, D. A. (2008). *Slavery by another name: The re-enslavement of black Americans from the civil war to World War II*. Doubleday.

Blair, I. V., Judd, C. M., & Chapleau, K. M. (2004). The influence of Afrocentric facial features in criminal sentencing. *Psychological Science, 15*, 674-679. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00739.x

Bond, B. J. (2021). The development and influence of parasocial relationships with television characters: A longitudinal experimental test of prejudice reduction through parasocial contact. *Communication Research*, *48*(4), 573-593. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650219900632

Bramlett-Solomon, S., & Carstarphen, M. G. (2018). *Race, gender, class, and media. Studying mass communication and multiculturalism*. Kendall/Hunt Higher Education.

Bresnahan, M. J., Ohashi, R., Nebashi, R., Liu, W. Y., & Shearman, S. M. (2002). Attitudinal and affective response toward accented English. *Language & Communication*, *22*(2), 171-185. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309(01)00025-8

Burgoon, J. K. (1993). Interpersonal expectations, expectancy violations, and emotional communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *12*(1-2), 30-48. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X93121003

Burgoon, J. K. (2015). Expectancy violations theory. In C. R. Berger & M. E. Roloff (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of interpersonal communication*. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118540190.wbeic102

Cargile, A. C., & Giles, H. (1998). Language attitudes toward varieties of English: An American- Japanese context. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *26*(3), 338-356. https://doi.org/10.1080/00909889809365511

Chavez, A. F., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1999). Racial and ethnic identity and development. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, *1999*(84), 39-47. https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.8405

Clarke, S. A. (1997). Fear of the Black planet: Race, identity politics, and common sense. In N. Gates (Ed.), *Cultural and literary critiques of the concepts of "race"* (pp. 267-291). Routledge.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*(1), 155-159. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

Conway, M., Grabe, E. M., & Grieves, K. (2007). Villains, victims and the virtuous in Bill O'Reilly's "no-spin zone". *Journalism Studies*, *8*(2), 197-223. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700601148820

Corenblum, B., & Stephan, W. G. (2001). White fears and native apprehensions: An integrated threat theory approach to intergroup attitudes. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, *33*(4), 251-268. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0087147

Creese, G. (2019). "Where are you from?" Racialization, belonging and identity among second-generation African-Canadians. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *42*(9), 1476-1494. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2018.1484503

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139-168. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/uchclf1989&div=10&id=&page=

Cohrs, J. C., & Stelzl, M. (2010). How ideological attitudes predict host society members' attitudes toward immigrants: Exploring cross-national differences. *Journal of Social Issues*, *66*(4), 673-694. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01670.x

Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist, 64*(3), 170-180. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014564

Cuvier, B. G. (1831.). *The Animal Kingdom arranged in conformity with its organization by the baron Cuvier the crustacea arachnides and insecta* (P. A. Latreille, Trans.). G. C. Carvill. (Original work published 1831). Henderson Publishing.

Dave, D. M., Friedson, A. I., Matsuzawa, K., Sabia, J. J., & Safford, S. (2020). Black Lives Matter protests and risk avoidance: The case of civil unrest during a pandemic. *Working Paper 27408, National Bureau of Economic Research*. https://doi.org/10.3386/w27408

Davis, F. J. (1991). *Who is Black? One nation's definition*. The Pennsylvania State University Press.

De Vries, K. M. (2015). Transgender people of color at the center: Conceptualizing a new intersectional model. *Ethnicities*, *15*(1), 3-27. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796814547058

Díaz-Campos, M., & Killam, J. (2012). Assessing language attitudes through a matched-guise experiment: The case of consonantal deletion in Venezuelan Spanish. *Hispania*, *94*(1) 83-102. http://www.jstor.org/stable/41440364

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Niemann, Y. F., & Snider, K. (2001). Racial, ethnic, and cultural differences in responding to distinctiveness and discrimination on campus: Stigma and common group identity. *Journal of Social Issues, 57,* 167-188. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00207

Dragojevic, M. (2016). Language attitudes as intergroup terrain. In A. Maass & H. Giles (Eds.), *Advances in intergroup communication* (pp. 49-66). Peter Lang Publishing. https://doi.org/10.3726/b10467

Dragojevic, M. (2018). Language attitudes. In H. Giles & J. Harwood (Eds.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of communication* (pp.179-192). Oxford University Press.

Dragojevic, M., Fasoli, F., Cramer, J., & Rakić, T. (2021). Toward a century of language attitudes research: Looking back and moving forward. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *40*(1), 60-79. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X20966714

Dragojevic, M., Gasiorek, J., & Giles, H. (2016). Accommodative strategies as core of the theory. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Communication accommodation theory: Negotiating personal relationships and social identities across contexts* (pp. 36-59). Cambridge University Press.

Dragojevic, M., & Giles, H. (2014). The reference frame effect: An intergroup perspective on language attitudes. *Human Communication Research, 40*(1), 91-111. https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12017

Dragojevic, M., & Giles, H. (2016). I don't like you because you're hard to understand: The role of processing fluency in the language attitudes process. *Human Communication Research, 42*(3), 396-420. https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12079

Dragojevic, M., Giles H., & Watson, B. M. (2013). Language ideologies and language attitudes: A foundational framework. In H. Giles & B. M. Watson (Eds.). *The social meanings of language, dialect and accent: International perspectives on speech styles* (pp. 1-25). Peter Lang Publishing.

Dragojevic, M., & Goatley-Soan, S. (2020). Americans' attitudes toward foreign accents: Evaluative hierarchies and underlying processes. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 43*(2), 167-181. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1735402

Dragojevic, M., Mastro, D., Giles, H., & Sink, A. (2016). Silencing nonstandard speakers: A content analysis of accent portrayals on American primetime television. *Language in Society, 45*(1), 59-85. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404515000743

Dryer, R. (1997). White. In N. Gates (Ed.), *Cultural and literary critiques of the concepts of "race"* (pp. 6-26). Garland Publishing.

Eagly, A. H., & Kite, M. E. (1987). Are stereotypes of nationalities applied to both women and men? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 451-462. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022- 3514.53.3.451

Edwards, J. (1982). Language attitudes and their implications among English speakers. In E. B. Ryan & H. Giles (Eds.), *Attitudes toward language variation: Social and applied contexts* (pp. 20-33). Edward Arnold.

Edwards, J. (1999). Refining our understanding of language attitudes. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *18*(1), 101-110. https://doi.org10.1177/0261927X99018001007

Else-Quest, N. M., & Hyde, J. S. (2016). Intersectionality in quantitative psychological research: I. Theoretical and epistemological issues. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *40*(2), 155-170. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684316629797

Esses, V. M. (2021). Prejudice and discrimination toward immigrants. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *72*, 503-531. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-080520-102803

Esses, V., & Dovidio, J. (2002). The role of emotions in determining willingness to engage in intergroup contact. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*(9), 1202-1214. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672022812006

Eze, E. C. (1997*). Race and the enlightenment*. Blackwell.

Fairbanks, G. (1960). *Voice and articulation drillbook* (2nd ed.). Harper & Row.

Fanon, F. (2003). The fact of blackness. In L. M. Alcoff & E. Mendieta (Eds.), *Identities: Race, class, gender, and nationality* (pp. 62-74). Blackwell.

Feagin, J. R. (2006). *Systemic racism: A theory of oppression*. Routledge.

Feagin, J. R., & McKinney, K. D. (2003). *The many costs of racism*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Finke, P., & Sökefeld, M. (2018). Identity in anthropology. In H. Callan, S. Coleman, & C. Jackman (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of anthropology* (pp. 1-13). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118924396.wbiea2142

Fischer, E. F. (1999). Cultural logic and maya identity: Rethinking constructivism and essentialism. *Current Anthropology*, *40*(4), 473-500. https://doi/10.1086/200046

Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. L. (1990). A continuum of impression formation from category-based to individuating processes: Influences of information and motivation on attention and interpretation. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *23*, 1-74. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60317-2

Fiske, S. T., & Stevens, L. E. (1993). *What's so special about sex? Gender stereotyping and discrimination*. Sage.

Fix, M., Galster, G., & Struyk, R. (1993). An overview of auditing for discrimination. In M. Fix & R. Struyk (Eds.), *Clear and convincing evidence: Measurement of discrimination in America* (pp. 1-68). Urban Institute Press.

Fosco, M. (2018, June 6). *The most successful ethnic group in the U.S. may surprise you*. Ozy. https://www.ozy.com/around-the-world/the-most-successful-ethnic-group-in-the-u-s-may-surprise-you/86885/

Fraser, B. P., & Brown, W. J. (2002). Media, celebrities, and social influence: Identification with Elvis Presley. *Mass Communication & Society*, *5*(2), 183-206. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327825MCS0502_5

Fredrickson, G. M. (1988). *The arrogance of race.* Wesleyan University Press.

Fredrickson, G. M. (2002). *Racism: A short history.* Princeton University Press.

Freeman, J. B., & Ambady, N. (2011). A dynamic interactive theory of person construal. *Psychological Review*, *118*(2), 247-279. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022327

Fuertes, J. N., Gottdiener, W., Martin, H., Gilbert, T. C., & Giles, H. (2012). A meta-analysis of the effects of speakers' accents on interpersonal evaluations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *42*(1), 120-133. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.862

Gagnon, A., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1996). Discrimination in the minimal group paradigm: Social identity or self-interest? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *22*(12), 1289-1301. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672962212009

Gaither, S. E., Cohen-Goldberg, A. M., Gidney, C. L., & Maddox, K. B. (2015). Sounding Black or White: Priming identity and biracial speech. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *6*, 457. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00457

Gal, S., & Irvine, J. T. (1995). The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research*, *4*(63), 967-1001. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/40971131.pdf

Galinsky, A. D., Hall, E. V., & Cuddy, A. C. J. (2013). Gendered races: Implications for interracial dating, leadership selection, and athletic recruitment. *Psychological Science*, *24*, 498-506. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612457783

Gallup Poll. (2017, June 28). *Americans more positive about effects of immigration*. https://news.gallup.com/poll/213146/americans-positive-effects-immigration.aspx

Gans, H. J. (2017). Racialization and racialization research. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *40*(3), 341-352. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1238497

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2009). A common ingroup identity: A categorization-based approach for reducing intergroup bias. In T. D. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (pp. 489-506). Taylor & Francis.

Golash-Boza, T. M. (2015). *Race and racisms: A critical approach*. Oxford University Press.

Goodman, A. H., Yolanda, T. M., & Joseph, L. J. (2012). *Race: Are we so different*? Wiley-Blackwell/American Anthropological Association.

Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge University Press.

Giles, H. (2012). *The handbook of intergroup communication*. Routledge.

Giles, H. (2016). (Ed.). *Communication accommodation theory: Negotiating personal relationships and social identities across contexts*. University Press.

Giles, H., Bourhis, R. Y., & Taylor, D. M. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 307–348). Academic Press.

Giles, H., & Johnson, P. (1987). Ethnolinguistic identity theory: A social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 68*, 69-99. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1987.68.69

Giles, H., & Marlow, M. L. (2011). Theorizing language attitudes existing frameworks, an integrative model, and new directions. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 35*(1), 161-197. https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2011.11679116

Giles, H., Reid, S. A., & Harwood, J. (Eds.). (2010). *The dynamics of intergroup communication* (Vol. 8). Peter Lang Publishing.

Giles, H., Williams, A., Mackie, D. M., & Rosselli, F. (1995). Reactions to Anglo-and Hispanic-American-accented speakers: Affect, identity, persuasion, and the English-only controversy. *Language & Communication*, *15*(2), 107-120. https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(94)00019-9

Gluszek, A., & Dovidio, J. F. (2010a). Speaking with a nonnative accent: Perceptions of bias, communication difficulties, and belonging in the United States. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 29*(2), 224-234. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927x09359590

Gluszek, A., & Dovidio, J. F. (2010b). The way they speak: A social psychological perspective on the stigma of nonnative accents in communication. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 14*(2), 214-237. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868309359288

Hall, S. (2019). *Essential essays volume 1. Foundations of cultural studies*. Duke University Press.

Hamel, L., Kearney, A., Kirzinger, A., Lopes, L., Muñana, C., & Brodie, M. (2020, June 26). *KFF Health tracking poll – June 2020*. Kaiser Family Foundation. https://www.kff.org/racial-equity-and-health-policy/report/kff-health-tracking-poll-june-2020/

Hannaford, I. (1996). *Race: The history of an idea in the West.* Johns Hopkins University Press & The Woodrow Wilson Center.

Hansen, K., Rakić, T., & Steffens, M. C. (2017). Competent and warm*? Experimental Psychology*, *64*(1), 27-36. https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169/a000348

Hansen, K., Steffens, M. C., Rakić, T., & Wiese, H. (2017). When appearance does not match accent: Neural correlates of ethnicity-related expectancy violations. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 12*(3), 507-515. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsw148

Hartigan Jr., J. (1997). Establishing the fact of whiteness. *American Anthropologist*, *99*(3), 495-505. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1997.99.3.495

Harvard Law Review. (1991). Invisible man: Black and male under Title VII. *Harvard Law Review, 104*(3), 749–768.

https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/hlr104&id=767&men_tab=srchresults

Harwood, J., Giles, H., & Palomares, N. A. (2008). Intergroup theory and communication processes. In J. Harwood & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 1-17). Peter Lang Publishing.

Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Helms, J. E. (1993). Introduction: Review of racial identity terminology. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and white racial identity: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 282-295). Praeger.

Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helm's White and people of color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Sage.

Hoad, N. (2005). Thabo Mbeki's AIDS blues: The intellectual, the archive, and the pandemic. *Public Culture*, *17*(1), 101-128. https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-17-1-101

Hoffner, C. A., & Cohen, E. L. (2012). Responses to obsessive compulsive disorder on Monk among series fans: Parasocial relations, presumed media influence, and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *56*(4), 650-668. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2012.732136

Hogg, M. A. (2016) Social identity theory. In S. McKeown, R. Haji, & N. Ferguson (Eds.), *Understanding peace and conflict through social identity theory. Peace psychology book series* (pp. 3-17). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29869-6_1

Hoquet, T. (2014). Biologization of race and racialization of the human: Bernier, Buffon, Linnaeus. In N. Bancel, T. David, & D. Thomas (Eds.), *The invention of race* (pp. 17-32). Routledge.

Ifekwunigwe, J. O., Wagner, J. K., Yu, J. H., Harrell, T. M., Bamshad, M. J., & Royal, C. D. (2017). A qualitative analysis of how anthropologists interpret the race construct. *American Anthropologist*, *119*(3), 422-434. https://doi.org//10.1111/aman.12890

Imamura, M., Ruble, R., & Zhang, Y. B. (2016). English proficiency, identity, anxiety, and intergroup attitudes: US Americans' perceptions of Chinese. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *45*(6), 526-539. https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2016.1240704

Imamura, M., Zhang, Y. B., & Harwood, J. (2011). Japanese sojourners' attitudes toward Americans: Exploring the influences of communication accommodation, linguistic competence, and relational solidarity in intergroup contact. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *21*(1), 115-132. https://doi.org/10.1075/japc.21.1.09ima

Imamura, M., Zhang, Y. B., & Shim, C. (2012). US host nationals' attitudes toward Japanese: The role of communication and relational solidarity in the intergroup contact hypothesis. *Asian Journal of Communication*, *22*(6), 584-600. https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2012.717096

International Monetary Fund. (2022, May 20). *Social unrest is rising, adding to risks for global economy*. https://blogs.imf.org/2022/05/20/social-unrest-is-rising-adding-to-risks-for-global-economy/

Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities* (pp. 35-84). School of American Research Press.

Jenkins, R. (1996). Ethnicity etcetera: Social anthropological points of view. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *19*(4), 807-822. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.1996.9993936

Joel, M. (2018, March 26). *Are Nigerian immigrants the top of the class in the U.S.?* Africa Check. https://africacheck.org/reports/nigerian-immigrants-top-class-us/

Johnson, C. R. (2013). *Recognizing racial publics--an exploration of racial identity and community among black women in understanding obesity and weight loss messages*. (Publication no. 8895) [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oklahoma]. ShareOK. https://shareok.org/handle/11244/319490

Kachanoff, F. J., Bigman, Y. E., Kapsaskis, K., & Gray, K. (2021). Measuring realistic and symbolic threats of COVID-19 and their unique impacts on well-being and adherence to public health behaviors. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *12*(5), 603-616. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620931634

Kang, O. (2010). Relative salience of suprasegmental features on judgments of L2 comprehensibility and accentedness. *System*, *38*(2), 301-315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.01.005

Kang, O., & Yaw, K. (2021). Social judgement of L2 accented speech stereotyping and its influential factors. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. (Advanced online publication). https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1931247

Kenny, D. A. (2021). *Mediation*. https://davidakenny.net/cm/mediate.htm

Khan, Z., & Bruschke, J. (2016). Media coverage of Muslims, perceived threats, ethnocentrism, and intercultural contact: Applying cultivation theory, integrated threat theory, and the contact hypothesis. *The Northwest Journal of Communication, 44*(1), 7-34.

Khazano, O. (2021, June 4). *Americans say immigrants should learn English. But U.S. policy makes that hard*. https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2021/06/why-cant-immigrants-learn-english/619053/

Kim, Y. Y. (2019). Integrative communication theory of cross-cultural adaptation. In C. Liberman, A. Rancer, & T. Avtgis (Eds.), *Casing communication theory* (pp. 105-116). Kendall Hunt.

Kinzler, K. D., Corriveau, K. H., & Harris, P. L. (2011). Children's selective trust in native-accented speakers. *Developmental Science, 14*(1), 106-111. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467- 7687.2010.00965.x

Kinzler, K. D., Dupoux, E., & Spelke, E. S. (2007). The native language of social cognition. *National Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 104*(30), 12577-12580. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0705345104

Kinzler, K. D., Shutts, K., & Correll, J. (2010). Priorities in social categories. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 40*(4), 581-592. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.739

Kinzler, K. D., Shutts, K., DeJesus, J., & Spelke, E. S. (2009). Accents trumps race in guiding children's social preferences. *Social Cognition, 27*(4), 623-634. https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2009.27.4.623

Kim, Y. S. (2016). Multiculturalism and interethnic communication in Korea: An examination of the context-behavior factors. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 25*(3), 81-98. https://www-s3-live.kent.edu/s3fs-root/s3fs-public/file/Yang-Soo-KIM.pdf

Kim, Y. Y. (2005). Association and dissociation: A contextual theory of interethnic communication. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 323-349). Sage.

Kim, Y. Y. (2017). Contextual theory of interethnic communication. In Y. Y. Kim (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of intercultural communication* (pp. 1-10). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118783665.ieicc0010

Kleider, H. M., Cavrak, S. E., & Knuycky, L. R. (2012). Looking like a criminal: Stereotypical black facial features promote face source memory error. *Memory & Cognition*, *40*(8), 1200-1213. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-012-0229-x

Koçak, O. (2021). The effects of religiosity and socioeconomic status on social distance towards refugees and the serial mediating role of satisfaction with life and perceived threat. *Religions*, *12*(9), 737-761. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12090737

Koenig, A. M. (2018). Comparing prescriptive and descriptive gender stereotypes about children, adults, and the elderly. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*(1086), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01086

Krogstak, J. M., Lopez, M. H., & Passel, J. S. (2020). *A majority of Americans say immigrants mostly fill jobs U.S. citizens do not want.* Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/06/10/a-majority-of-americans-say-immigrants-mostly-fill-jobs-u-s-citizens-do-not-want/

Lambert, W. E., Hodgson, R. C., Gardner, R. C., & Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *60*(1), 44-51. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0044430

Langmia, K., & Durham, E. (2007). Bridging the gap: African and African American communication in historically black colleges and universities. *Journal of Black Studies, 37*(6), 805-826. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934705285564

Lavan, N., Burston, L. F., Ladwa, P., Merriman, S. E., Knight, S., & McGettigan, C. (2019). Breaking voice identity perception: Expressive voices are more confusable for listeners. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 72*(9), 2240-2248. https://doi.org/10.1177/1747021819836890

Lawrence, C. R. (1987). The id, the ego, and equal protection: Reckoning with unconscious racism. *Stanford Law Review*, *39*(2), 317-388. https://doi.org/10.2307/1228797

Lewontin, R. (1995). *Human diversity.* Scientific American Library.

Lindemann, S. (2005). Who speaks "broken English"? US undergraduates' perceptions of non-native English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *15*(2), 187-212. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00087.x

Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States.* Psychology Press.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). The standard language myth. In R. Lippi-Green (Ed.), *English with an accent: Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed., pp. 55-64). Routledge.

Littlefield, A., Lieberman, L., & Reynolds, L. (1982). Redefining race: The potential demise of a concept in physical anthropology. *Current Anthropology, 23*, 641-656. https://doi.org/10.1086/202915

Littleford, L. N., Wright, M. O. D., & Sayoc-Parial, M. (2005). White students' intergroup anxiety during same-race and interracial interactions: A multimethod approach. *Basic*

and Applied Social Psychology, *27*(1), 85-94. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp2701_9

Ma, D. S., Correll, J., & Wittenbrink, B. (2015). The Chicago face database: A free stimulus set of faces and norming data. *Behavior Research Methods, 47*, 1122-1135. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-014-0532-5.

Maher, J. C. (2010). Metroethnicies and metrolanguages. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *The handbook of language and globalization* (pp. 575-591). Blackwell.

Maher, J. C., Millar, M., Sayanagi, N., Rackham, D., Nishozono-Maher, A., Usui, N., & Buckley, L. (2010). Multilingual awareness in Japan: A national survey of young people's attitudes. *The Japan Journal of Multilingualism and Multiculturalism, 16*, 37-49. https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/40018274323/

Mandishona, T. C. (2018). *Consciously becoming Black: A phenomenological exploration of black sub-Saharan African international students' racial identity development at historically black colleges and universities in the American south*. (Publication No. 1520) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi]. Aquila. https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations/1520/

Manusov, V., & Spitzberg, B. (2008). Attribution theory. In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 37-49). Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483329529.n3

Marks, J. (1995). *Human biodiversity: Genes, race, and history.* Aldine de Gruyter.

Marlow, M. L., & Giles, H. (2010). "We won't get ahead speaking like that!" Expressing and managing language criticism in Hawai'i. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *31*(3), 237-251. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630903582714

Massey, D. G. (2001). Residential segregation and neighborhood conditions in U.S. metropolitan areas. In N. J. Smelser, W. J. Wilson, & F. Mitchell (Eds.), *America becoming: Racial trends and their consequences* (Vol. 1, pp. 391-434). National Academies Press.

Massey, Z. B., & Cionea, I. A. (2020, November). *Factor structure and validity assessment of a new scale to measure identity insecurity.* [Conference presentation]. Annual meeting of the National Communication Association conference, virtual convention, United States.

Massey, Z. B., Meirick, P., & Banas, J. (2018, November). *Muslim in media: How parasocial contact will increase or decrease prejudice.* [Conference presentation]. Annual meeting of the National Communication Association conference, Salt Lake City, UT, United States.

Massey, Z. B., & Miller, C. H. (2018). Case studies on interethnic conflict: A theoretical integration. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *66*, 130-147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.04.006

Maye, J., Aslin, R. N., & Tanenhaus, M. (2010). The weckud wetch of the wast: Lexical adaptation to a novel accent. *Cognitive Science, 32*(3), 543-562. https://doi.org/10.1080/03640210802035357

Mehler, J., Jusczyk, P., Lambertz, G., Halsted, N., Bertoncini, J., & Amiel-Tison, C. (1988). A precursor of language acquisition in young infants. *Cognition*, *29*(2), 143-178. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(88)90035-2

Mendes, W. B., & Koslov, K. (2013). Brittle smiles: Positive biases toward stigmatized and outgroup targets. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 142*(3), 923-933. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029663

Migration Policy Institute (2015). *The Nigerian diaspora in the United States*. https://www.migrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/publications/RAD-Nigeria.pdf

Milroy, J. (2001). Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *5*(4), 530-555. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00163

Milroy, L. (2001). Britain and the United States: Two nations divided by the same language (and different language ideologies). *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *10*, 56-89. https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.2000.10.1.56

Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (1999). *Authority in language: Investigating Standard English* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Montgomery, G. P., & Acheme, D. E. (2022). Processing fluency and inferred motive: L1 English users' evaluations of non-standard accented speech. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology.* (Advanced online publication). https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X221081010

Montgomery, G. P. (2019). *Hispanic/Latino (a) immigrant acculturation and US American native English speakers' intergroup perceptions and attitudes: Accommodation, social attraction, and anxiety* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas]. https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/31354/Montgomery_ku_0099D_16668_DATA_1.pdf?sequence=1

Montgomery, G. P., & Zhang, Y. B. (2018). Intergroup anxiety and willingness to accommodate: Exploring the effects of accent stereotyping and social attraction. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 37*(3), 330-349. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X17728361

Montgomery, G. P., Zhang, Y. B., & Imamura, M. (2021). The effects of Latino immigrants' acculturation strategy and US Americans' assimilation attitudes on perceptions of

accommodation satisfaction and willingness to communicate. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 82*, 157-167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2021.03.008

Mukhopadhyay, C. C., Henze, R., & Moses, Y. T. (2013). *How real is race?: A sourcebook on race, culture, and biology*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Neuliep, J. W., & Speten-Hansen, K. M. (2013). The influence of ethnocentrism on social perceptions of nonnative accents. *Language & Communication, 33*(3), 167-176. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2013.05.001

Oakes, P. (2003). The root of all evil in intergroup relations? Unearthing the categorization process. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 3-21). Blackwell Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9781405106542.2002.00001.x

Ohama, M. L., Gotay, C. C., Pagano, I. S., Boles, L., & Craven, D. D. (2000). Evaluations of Hawaii creole English and standard English. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 19*(3), 357-377. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X00019003005

Okantah, M. S. (2016). In search of the real brother man: An African centered approach to Black cultural identity. *Africology: The Journal of Pan African Studies, 9*(10), 411-423. https://www.jpanafrican.org/docs/vol9no10/9.10-25-Mwatabu.pdf

Oliver, M. (2003). African American men as "criminal and dangerous": Implications of media portrayals of crime on the "criminalization" of African American men. *Journal of African American Studies, 7*(2), 3-18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12111-003-1006-5

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1997). By the rivers of Babylon: Race in the United States. In N. Gates (Ed.), *Cultural and literary critiques of the concepts of "race"* (pp. 76-95). Garland Publishing.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2014). *Racial formation in the United States.* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Operario, D., & Fiske, S. T. (2003). Stereotypes: Content, structures, processes, and context. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 22-44). Blackwell Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9781405106542.2002.00002.x

Ortiz, M., & Harwood, J. (2007). A social cognitive theory approach to the effects of mediated intergroup contact on intergroup attitudes. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, 51*(4), 615-631. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838150701626487.

Owen, W. F. (1984). Interpretive themes in relational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70*(3), 274-287. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335638409383697

Park, J. J. (2012). When race and religion collide: The effect of religion on interracial friendship during college. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *5*(1), 8-21. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026960

Paladino, M. P., & Mazzurega, M. (2020). One of us: On the role of accent and race in real-time in-group categorization. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 39*(1), 22-39. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X19884090

Palan, S., & Schitter, C. (2018). Prolific.ac—A subject pool for online experiments. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, *17*, 22-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2017.12.004

Peer, E., Vosgerau, J., & Acquisti, A. (2014). Reputation as a sufficient condition for data quality on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Behavior Research Methods, 46*(4), 1023-1031. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-013-0434-y

Preddie, J. P., & Biernat, M. (2021). More than the sum of its parts: Intersections of sexual orientation and race as they influence perceptions of group similarity and stereotype content. *Sex Roles, 84*(9), 554-573. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-020-01185-3

Rakić, T., Steffens, M. C., & Mummendey, A. (2011). Blinded by the accent! The minor role of looks in ethnic categorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*(1), 16-29. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021522

Reyna, C., Dobria, O., & Wetherell, G. (2013). The complexity and ambivalence of immigration attitudes: Ambivalent stereotypes predict conflicting attitudes toward immigration policies. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *19*(3), 342-356. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032942

Ridgeway, C. L. (2001). How do status beliefs develop? The role of resources and interactional experiences. In J. T. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations* (pp. 357-277). Cambridge University Press.

Riek, B. M., Mania, E. W., & Gaertner, S. L. (2006). Intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *10*(4), 336-353. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1004_4

Roessel, J., Schoel, C., & Stahlberg, D. (2020). Modern notions of accent-ism: Findings, conceptualizations, and implications for interventions and research on nonnative accents. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *39*(1), 87-111. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X19884619

Roessel, J., Schoel, C., Zimmermann, R., & Stahlberg, D. (2019). Shedding new light on the evaluation of accented speakers: Basic mechanisms behind nonnative listeners'

evaluations of nonnative accented job candidates. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *38*(1), 3-32. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X17747904

Sawyer, J., & Gampa, A. (2018). Implicit and explicit racial attitudes changed during Black Lives Matter. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *44*(7), 1039-1059. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218757454

Schiappa, E., Gregg, P. B., & Hewes, D. E. (2005). The parasocial contact hypothesis. *Communication Monographs*, *72*(1), 92-115. https://doi.org/10.1080/0363775052000342544

Schiappa, E., Gregg, P. B., & Hewes, D. E. (2006). Can one TV show make a difference?: *Will & Grace* and the parasocial contact hypothesis. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *51*(4), 15-37. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v51n04_02.

Schmidt, R. (2002). Racialization and language policy: The case of the USA. *Multilingua*, *21*(2/3), 141-162. https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.2002.007

Sloan, P. (1987). Buffon's species concept. From logical universals to historical individuals: Buffon's idea of biological species. In J. Roger & F. L. Fischer (Eds.), *Histoire du concept d'espece dans les sciences de la vie* [*A history of the concept of species in the life sciences*] (pp. 101-140). Foundation Singer-Polignac.

Smedley, A. (2002, September). *Racializing the human body: Example of the United States.* [Conference presentation]. Meeting of the Inter-Congress of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Tokyo, Japan.

Smedley, A. (1999b). *Race in North America: Origin and evolution of a worldview* (2nd ed.). Westview Press.

Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. D. (2005). Race as biology is fiction, racism as a social problem is real: Anthropological and historical perspectives on the social construction of race. *American Psychologist*, *60*(1), 16-26. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.1.16

Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. D. (2012). *Race in North America: Origin and evolution of a worldview*. Westview Press.

Smith, T. B., Bowman, R., & Hsu, S. (2007). Racial attitudes among Asian and European American college students: A cross-cultural examination. *College Student Journal*, *41*, 436-443. https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/facpub/2022

Showers, F. (2015). Being black, foreign and woman: African immigrant identities in the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *38*(10), 1815-1830. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2015.1036763

Shuck, G. (2004). Conversational performance and the poetic construction of an ideology. *Language in Society*, *33*(2), 195-222. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404504332021

Shuck, G. (2006). Racializing the nonnative English speaker. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *5*(4), 259-276. http://languageandglobalization.pbworks.com/f/Racializing+the+Non-Native+Speaker.pdf

Spickard, P. R. (1992). The illogic of American racial categories. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 12-23). Sage.

Statista. (2020). *Primary languages spoken at home in Nigeria as of 2020*. https://www.statista.com/statistics/1268798/main-languages-spoken-at-home-in-nigeria/

Stephan, W. G. (2014). Intergroup anxiety: Theory, research, and practice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *18*(3), 239-255. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868314530518

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 23-45). Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410605634

Stephan, W. G., Boniecki, K. A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K. S., Jackson, L. A., McNatt, P. S., & Renfro, C. L. (2002). Racial attitudes of Blacks and Whites: An integrated threat theory analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(9), 1242-1254. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672022812009

Stewart, T. L., Latu, I. M., Branscombe, N. R., & Denney, H. T. (2010). Yes we can!: Prejudice reduction through seeing (inequality) and believing (in social change). *Psychological Science, 21*(11), 1557-1562. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610385354

Stroessner, S. J. (1996). Social categorization by race or sex: Effects of perceived non-normalcy on response times. *Social Cognition, 14*(3), 247-276. https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.1996.14.3.247

Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information, 13*, 65-93. https://doi.org/10.1177/053901847401300204

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An intergroup theory of conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel, (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Brooks/Cole.

Tamir, C., & Anderson, M. (2022). *The Caribbean is the largest origin source of Black immigrants, but fastest growth is among African immigrants.* Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/race-ethnicity/2022/01/20/the-caribbean-is-the-largest-origin-source-of-black-immigrants-but-fastest-growth-is-among-african-immigrants/

Taylor, E., Guy-Walls, P., Wilkerson, P., & Addae, R. (2019). The historical perspectives of stereotypes on African-American males. *Journal of Human Rights and Social Work, 4*(3), 213-225. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41134-019-00096-y

Tonry, M. (2011). *Punishing race: A continuing American dilemma*. Oxford University Press.

Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2002). Self-esteem and socio- economic status: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 6,* 59-71. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0601_3

Unzueta, M. M., Everly, B. A., & Gutiérrez, A. S. (2014). Social dominance orientation moderates reactions to black and white discrimination claimants. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 54*, 81-88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.04.005

U. S. Census Bureau. (2021). *Quick facts United States.* https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045221

U. S. Census Bureau. (2020). *Improved race and ethnicity measures reveal U.S. population is much more multiracial*. https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2021/08/improved-race-ethnicity-measures-reveal-united-states-population-much-more-multiracial.html

U. S. Census Bureau. (2020). *Language spoken at home*. https://www.census.gov/acs/www/about/why-we-ask-each-question/language /

U. S. Census Bureau. (1997). *About*. https://www.census.gov/topics/population/race/about.html

Vallejo-Martín, M., Canto, J. M., San Martín García, J. E., & Perles Novas, F. (2021). Prejudice towards immigrants: The importance of social context, ideological postulates, and perception of outgroup threat. *Sustainability, 13*(9), 4993-5007. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13094993

Van Knippenberg, B., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2005). Leader self-sacrifice and leadership effectiveness: The moderating role of leader prototypicality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(1), 25-37. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.25

Van Zomeren, M., Fischer, A. H., & Spears, R. (2007). Testing the limits of tolerance: How intergroup anxiety amplifies negative and offensive responses to out-group-initiated contact. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *33*(12), 1686-1699. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207307485

Vedantam, S. (2005, January 23). *Many Americans believe they are not prejudiced. Now a new test provided powerful evidence that a majority of us really are*. Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/magazine/2005/01/23/see-no-bias/a548dee4-4047-4397-a253-f7f780fae575/

Walker, A. (2011). Racial profiling separate and unequal keeping the minorities in line-the role of law enforcement in America. *St. Thomas Law Review, 23*, 576-619. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/stlr23&div=31&id=&pag%20e=

Walther, E., & Trasselli, C. (2003). I like her, because I like myself: Self-evaluation as a source of interpersonal attitudes. *Experimental Psychology*, *50*(4), 239-246. https://doi.org/10.1026//1618-3169.50.4.239

Waterston, A. (2006). Are Latinos becoming" white" folk? And what that still says about race in America. *Transforming Anthropology*, *14*(2), 133-150. https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1525/tran.2006.14.2.133

Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 23*(1), 55-82. https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.an.23.100194.000415

World Population Review. (2021). *What languages do people speak in Nigeria?* https://worldpopulationreview.com/languages/nigeria

Zahn, C. J., & Hopper, R. (1985). Measuring language attitudes: The speech evaluation instrument. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *4*(2), 113-123. https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/10.1177/0261927X8500400203

Appendix A

The Rainbow Passage (Fairbanks, 1960)

The excerpt below of the rainbow passage was read by SAE and Nigerian accented speakers when producing the audio sample used in the dissertation studies.

When the sunlight strikes raindrops in the air, they act as 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.

Many complicated ideas about the rainbow have been formed. The difference in the rainbow depends considerably upon the size of the 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 super-imposition 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 light 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 B

Pilot Study 1 and Pilot Study 2 Measures of Prototypicality

Prototypicality (SAE Accent) (Adapted from B. Van Knippenberg & D. Van Knippenberg, 2005 and Montgomery, 2019)

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion.

Items were measured on a 0-100-type scale, from 0 = *strongly disagree* to 100 = *strongly agree.*

1. This accent is a typical SAE accent.
2. This accent is similar to the SAE accent, overall.
3. This accent is representative of the accent of SAE speakers.
4. This accent resembles the accent of other SAE speakers.
5. This accent is a good example of SAE speakers' accent.
6. This accent is characteristic of speakers with SAE accent.
7. This accent has a lot in common with the accent of other SAE speakers.

Open-Ended Questions

1. In your opinion, what makes this accent **typical** of the SAE accent?
2. In your opinion, what makes this accent **not typical** of the SAE accent?

Prototypicality (Nigerian Accent) (Adapted from B. Van Knippenberg & D. Van Knippenberg, 2005 and Montgomery, 2019)

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion.

Items were measured on a 0-100-type scale, from 0 = *strongly disagree* to 100 = *strongly agree.*

1. This accent is a typical Yoruba English accent.
2. This accent is similar to the Yoruba English accent, overall.
3. This accent is representative of the accent of Yoruba English accented speakers.
4. This accent resembles the accent of other Yoruba English accented speakers.
5. This accent is a good example of the accent of speakers with Yoruba English accent.
6. This accent is characteristic of speakers with Yoruba English accent.
7. This accent has a lot in common with the accent of other Yoruba English accented speakers.

Open-Ended Questions

1. In your opinion, what makes this accent **typical** of the Yoruba English accent?
2. In your opinion, what makes this accent **not typical** of the Yoruba English accent?

Vocal attractiveness (SAE and Nigerian accents)

[Items created by the author]

Instructions for participants: Please listen to the speaker and answer questions about the accent of this individual.

Items were measured on a 0-100-type scale, from 0 = *strongly disagree* to 100 = *strongly agree.*

1. How attractive does the voice of the individual in the audio clip sound?
2. Overall, how charming would you say the voice of the individual in the audio clip is?
3. How attractive do you find the vocal features (e.g., pitch, tone, timbral/quality of sound) of the individual in the audio clip?

Prototypicality (White Photograph) (Adapted from B. Van Knippenberg & D. Van Knippenberg, 2005 and Montgomery, 2019)

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion.

Items were measured on a 0-100-type scale, from 0 = *strongly disagree* to 100 = *strongly agree.*

1. The individual in the photograph looks like a typical White male.
2. The individual in the photograph looks similar to a White male, overall.
3. The individual in the photograph is representative of how White males generally look like.
4. The individual in the photograph resembles the phenotype (i.e., skin color, lip and nose size, and hair texture) of White males, in general.
5. The individual in the photograph is a good example of the phenotype (i.e., skin color, lip and nose size, and hair texture) of White males, in general.
6. The individual in the photograph is characteristic of how White males, in general, look (e.g., skin color, lip and nose size, and hair texture).
7. The individual in the photograph has common features (e.g., skin color, lip and nose size, and hair texture) to typical Black males.

Open-Ended Questions

1. In your opinion, what makes the individual in the photograph **typical** of White males?
2. In your opinion, what makes the individual in the photograph **not typical** of White males?

Prototypicality (Black Photograph) (Adapted from B. Van Knippenberg & D. Van Knippenberg, 2005 and Montgomery, 2019)

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion.

Items were measured on a 0-100-type scale, from 0 = *strongly disagree* to 100 = *strongly agree.*

1. The individual in the photograph looks like a typical Black male.
2. The individual in the photograph looks similar to Black males, overall.
3. The individual in the photograph is representative of how Black males generally look like.
4. The individual in the photograph resembles the phenotype (i.e., skin color, lip and nose size, and hair texture) of Black males, in general.
5. The individual in the photograph is a good example of the phenotype (i.e., skin color, lip and nose size, and hair texture) of Black males, in general.
6. The individual in the photograph is characteristic of how Black males, in general, look (e.g., skin color, lip and nose size, and hair texture).
7. The individual in the photograph has common features (e.g., skin color, lip and nose size, and hair texture) to typical Black males.

Open-Ended Questions

1. In your opinion, what makes the individual in the photograph **typical** of Black males?
2. In your opinion, what makes the individual in the photograph **not typical** of Black males?

Physical attractiveness (White and Black Photographs)

[Items created by the author]

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion. Items were measured on a 0-100-type scale, from 0 = *not at all attractive/good looking* to 100 = *extremely attractive/good looking.*

1. To what extent do you consider the individual in the photograph to be physically attractive?
2. Overall, how good looking would you say is the individual in the photograph?
3. How attractive do you find the physical/facial features of the individual in the photograph?

Appendix C

Measures for the Main Experimental Study

Speech Evaluation Instrument (Zahn & Hopper, 1985)

Instructions for participants: Please think back to the speaker/photograph you have just heard/saw. Below are a series of adjectives. Indicate to what extent the speaker/person in the photograph is like some of those adjectives. Choose the number that is closest to what the speaker/individual in the photograph is like as a person.

Items were measured on a 7-point semantic differential scale.

1. Literate	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Illiterate
2. Educated	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Uneducated
3. Upper-class	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Lower-class
4. Rich	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Poor
5. Intelligent	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Unintelligent
6. White-collar	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Blue-collar
7. Clear	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Unclear
8. Complete	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Incomplete
9. Fluent	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Disfluent
10. Organized	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Disorganized
11. Experienced	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Inexperienced
12. Advantaged	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Disadvantaged
13. Sweet	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Sour
14. Nice	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Awful
15. Good-natured	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Hostile

16. Kind	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Unkind
17. Warm	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Cold
18. Friendly	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Unfriendly
19. Likeable	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Unlikeable
20. Pleasant	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Unpleasant
21. Considerate	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Inconsiderate
22. Good	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Bad
23. Honest	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Dishonest
24. Active	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Passive
25. Talkative	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Shy
26. Unaggressive	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Aggressive
27. Enthusiastic	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Hesitant
28. Strong	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Weak
29. Confident	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Unsure
30. Energetic	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Lazy

Symbolic threat (Stephan et al., 2002) [Accent-only conditions]

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion.

Items were measured on a 7-point Likert Scale, from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree.*

1. SAE and Nigerian accented speakers have very different values.
2. Nigerian accented speakers have no right to think they have better values than SAE accented speakers.

3. Nigerian accented speakers want their rights to be put ahead of the rights of SAE accented speakers.
4. Nigerian accented speakers don't understand the way SAE accented speakers view the world.
5. Nigerian accented speakers do not value the rights granted by the Constitution (life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness) as much as SAE accented speakers do.
6. Nigerian accented speakers and SAE accented speakers have different family values.
7. Nigerian accented speakers don't value the traditions of their group as much as SAE accented speakers do.
8. Nigerian accented speakers regard themselves as morally superior to SAE accented speakers.
9. The values of Nigerian accented speakers regarding work are different from those of SAE speakers.
10. Most Nigerian accented speakers will never understand what SAE accented speakers are like.
11. Nigerian accented speakers should not try to impose their values on SAE accented speakers.
12. SAE accented speakers do not get as much respect from Nigerian accented speakers as they deserve.

Symbolic threat (Stephan et al., 2002) [Race-only conditions]

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion.

Items were measured on a 7-point Likert Scale, from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree.*

1. Whites and Blacks have very different values.
2. Blacks have no right to think they have better values than Whites.
3. Blacks want their rights to be put ahead of the rights of Whites.
4. Blacks don't understand the way Whites view the world.
5. Blacks do not value the rights granted by the Constitution (life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness) as much as Whites do.
6. Blacks and Whites have different family values.
7. Blacks don't value the traditions of their group as much as Whites do.
8. Blacks regard themselves as morally superior to Whites.
9. The values of Blacks regarding work are different from those of Whites.
10. Most Blacks will never understand what Whites are like.
11. Blacks should not try to impose their values on Whites.
12. Whites do not get as much respect from Blacks as they deserve.

Symbolic threat (Stephan et al., 2002) [Race-Accent conditions]

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion.

Items were measured on a 7-point Likert Scale, from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree.*

1. White-SAE and Black-Nigerian accented speakers have very different values.
2. Black-Nigerian accented speakers have no right to think they have better values than White-SAE accented speakers.

3. Black-Nigerian accented speakers want their rights to be put ahead of the rights of White-SAE accented speakers.
4. Black-Nigerian accented speakers don't understand the way White-SAE accented speakers view the world.
5. Black-Nigerian accented speakers do not value the rights granted by the Constitution (life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness) as much as White-SAE accented speakers do.
6. Black-Nigerian accented speakers and White-SAE accented speakers have different family values.
7. Black-Nigerian accented speakers don't value the traditions of their group as much as White-SAE accented speakers do.
8. Black-Nigerian accented speakers regard themselves as morally superior to White-SAE accented speakers.
9. The values of Black-Nigerian accented speakers regarding work are different from those of White-SAE accented speakers.
10. Most Black-Nigerian accented speakers will never understand what White-SAE accented speakers are like.
11. Black-Nigerian accented speakers should not try to impose their values on White-SAE accented speakers.
12. White-SAE accented speakers do not get as much respect from Black-Nigerian accented speakers as they deserve.

Realistic Threat (Stephan et al., 2002) [Accent-only conditions]

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion.

Items were measured on a 7-point Likert Scale, from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*

1. Nigerian accented speakers hold too many positions of power and responsibility in this country.
2. Nigerian accented speakers dominate American politics more than they should.
3. When Nigerian accented speakers are in positions of authority, they discriminate against SAE speakers when making hiring decisions.
4. Too much money is spent on educational programs that benefit Nigerian accented speakers.
5. Nigerian accented speakers have more economic power than they deserve in this country.
6. Nigerian accented speakers receive too much of the money spent on healthcare and childcare.
7. Too much money per student is spent on education for Nigerian accented speakers.
8. The tax system favors Nigerian accented speakers.
9. Many companies hire less qualified Nigerian accented speakers over more qualified SAE speakers.
10. Nigerian accented speakers have more political power than they deserve in this country.
11. Public service agencies favor Nigerian accented speakers over SAE speakers.
12. The legal system is more lenient on Nigerian accented speakers than on SAE speakers.

Realistic Threat (Stephan et al., 2002) [Race-only conditions]

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion.

Items were measured on a 7-point Likert Scale, from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*

1. Blacks hold too many positions of power and responsibility in this country.
2. Blacks dominate American politics more than they should.
3. When Blacks are in positions of authority, they discriminate against Whites when making hiring decisions.
4. Too much money is spent on educational programs that benefit Blacks.
5. Blacks have more economic power than they deserve in this country.
6. Blacks receive too much of the money spent on healthcare and childcare.
7. Too much money per student is spent on education for Blacks.
8. The tax system favors Blacks.
9. Many companies hire less qualified Blacks over more qualified Whites.
10. Blacks have more political power than they deserve in this country.
11. Public service agencies favor Blacks over Whites.
12. The legal system is more lenient on Blacks than on Whites.

Realistic Threat (Stephan et al., 2002) [Race-Accent conditions]

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion.

Items were measured on a 7-point Likert Scale, from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*

1. Black-Nigerian accented speakers hold too many positions of power and responsibility in this country.
2. Black-Nigerian accented speakers dominate American politics more than they should.
3. When Black-Nigerian accented speakers are in positions of authority, they discriminate against SAE speakers when making hiring decisions.
4. Too much money is spent on educational programs that benefit Black-Nigerian accented speakers.
5. Black-Nigerian accented speakers have more economic power than they deserve in this country.
6. Black-Nigerian accented speakers receive too much of the money spent on healthcare and childcare.
7. Too much money per student is spent on education for Black-Nigerian accented speakers.
8. The tax system favors Black-Nigerian accented speakers.
9. Many companies hire less qualified Black-Nigerian accented speakers over more qualified White-SAE speakers.
10. Black-Nigerian accented speakers have more political power than they deserve in this country.
11. Public service agencies favor Black-Nigerian accented speakers over White-SAE speakers.
12. The legal system is more lenient on Black-Nigerian accented speakers than on White-SAE speakers.

Intergroup Anxiety (Stephan et al, 2002)

[Accent-only conditions]

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate how you would feel when interacting with Nigerian accented speakers.

[Race-only conditions]

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate how you would feel when interacting with Blacks.

[Race-Accent conditions]

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate how you would feel when interacting with Black-Nigerian accent speakers.

For all conditions, items were measured on a 7-point Likert Scale, from 1 = *not at all* to 7 = *extremely*:

I would feel:

1. Not at all Nervous ……..… Extremely Nervous
2. Not at all Friendly ……..… Extremely Friendly
3. Not at all Uncertain …… Extremely Uncertain
4. Not at all Comfortable …… Extremely Comfortable
5. Not at all Worried ……Extremely Worried
6. Not at all Trusting ……Extremely Trusting
7. Not at all Threatened ……Extremely Threatened
8. Not at all Confident ……. Extremely Confident
9. Not at all Awkward ……..… Extremely Awkward
10. Not at all Safe …… Extremely Safe

11. Not at all Anxious ……..…… Extremely Anxious
12. Not at all At Ease ……...… Extremely At Ease

Social Distance (Esses & Dovidio, 2002) [Accent-only conditions]

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion. Items were measured on a 7-point Likert Scale, from 1 = *not at all willing* to 7 = *extremely willing.*

If given the opportunity, would you:

1. Marry a person who speaks with a Nigerian accent?
2. Have an intimate relation with a person who speaks with a Nigerian accent?
3. Accept a person who speaks with a Nigerian accent as a family member through marriage?
4. Have a person who speaks with a Nigerian accent as a close friend?
5. Confide in a person who speaks with a Nigerian accent?
6. Accept a person who speaks with a Nigerian accent as a neighbor?
7. Have a person who speaks with a Nigerian accent visit one's home?
8. Visit a person who speaks with a Nigerian accent in his or her home?
9. Accept a person who speaks with a Nigerian accent as a work colleague?
10. Have a person who speaks with a Nigerian accent as a casual acquaintance?
11. Accept a person who speaks with a Nigerian accent as one's boss?
12. Attend a cultural activity sponsored by organization of individuals who speak with a Nigerian accent?

Social Distance (Esses & Dovidio, 2002) [Race-only conditions]

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion. Items were measured on a 7-point Likert Scale, from 1 = *not at all willing* to 7 = *extremely willing.*

If given the opportunity, would you:

1. Marry a Black person?
2. Have an intimate relation with a Black person?
3. Accept a Black person as a family member through marriage?
4. Have a Black person as a close friend?
5. Confide in a Black person?
6. Accept a Black person as a neighbor?
7. Have a Black person visit one's home?
8. Visit a Black person in his or her home?
9. Accept a Black person as a work colleague?
10. Have a Black person as a casual acquaintance?
11. Accept a Black person as one's boss?
12. Attend a cultural activity sponsored by a Black organization?

Social Distance (Esses & Dovidio, 2002) [Race-Accent conditions]

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion.

Items were measured on a 7-point Likert Scale, from 1 = *not at all willing* to 7 = *extremely willing.*

If given the opportunity, would you:

1. Marry a Black-Nigerian accented person?
2. Have an intimate relation with a Black-Nigerian accented person?
3. Accept a Black-Nigerian accented person as a family member through marriage?
4. Have a Black-Nigerian accented person as a close friend?
5. Confide in a Black-Nigerian accented person?
6. Accept a Black-Nigerian accented person as a neighbor?
7. Have a Black-Nigerian accented person visit one's home?
8. Visit a Black-Nigerian accented person in his or her home?
9. Accept a Black-Nigerian accented person as a work colleague?
10. Have a Black-Nigerian accented person as a casual acquaintance?
11. Accept a Black-Nigerian accented person as one's boss?
12. Attend a cultural activity sponsored by organization of Black individuals who speak with a Nigerian accent?

Exposure to Diverse Individuals

[Items created by the author]

Instructions for participants: Please read the following statements carefully. Indicate your agreement with each statement by selecting the answer choice that best fits your opinion.

Items were measured on a 7-point Likert Scale, from 1 = *never* to 7 = *always.*

1. How often do you hear people who speak with an accent that is not the SAE accent in the media (T.V., movies, etc.)?
2. How frequently have you been exposed to people who speak with an accent that is not the SAE accent?
3. How often do you hear people who speak with a Nigerian accent in the media (T.V., movies, etc.)?
4. How frequently have you been exposed to people who speak with a Nigerian accent in everyday interactions?
5. How often do you see non-Whites/racial minorities in the media (T.V., movies, etc.)?
6. How frequently do you interact with non-Whites/racial minorities in everyday interactions?
7. How often do you see Blacks in the media (T.V., movies, etc.)?
8. How frequently do you interact with Blacks in everyday interactions?
9. How often do you see non-Whites/racial minority-non-SAE speakers in the media (T.V., movies, etc.)?
10. How frequently have you been exposed to non-White/racial minority-non-SAE speakers in everyday interactions?
11. How often do you see Black-Nigerian accented speakers in the media (T.V., movies, etc.)?
12. How frequently have you been exposed to Black-Nigerian accented speakers in everyday interactions?

Immigration Attitudes (Adapted from Montgomery, 2019)

Instructions for participants: The following questions ask you to think about your feelings toward African immigrants as a group. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. Items were measured on a 7-point Likert Scale, from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree***.** Higher numbers indicate more agreement with the statement.

1. I have warm feelings toward African immigrants.
2. I feel friendly toward African immigrants.
3. Overall, my feelings toward African immigrants are positive.
4. I have favorable feelings toward African immigrants.
5. I have respectful feelings toward African immigrants.
6. My feelings toward African immigrants are unpleasant.
7. When I think about African immigrants, I feel calm.
8. When I think about African immigrants, I feel uncomfortable.
9. I admire African immigrants.

Exoticism

[Items created by the author]

Instructions for participants: The following questions ask you to think about your perceptions toward <u>African accents</u>. Please choose the option that is closest to your perceptions. Items were measured on a 7-point semantic differential scale.

I find African accents:

1. Unlovely	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Lovely
2. Unappealing	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Appealing

3. Repulsive	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Alluring
4. Uninteresting	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Fascinating
5. Boring	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Thrilling
6. Bleak	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Charming
7. Plain	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Striking
8. Ordinary	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Distinctive
9. Dull	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Stunning
10. Unimpressive	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Impressive
11. Crude	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Fine
12. Unremarkable	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Remarkable
13. Unpleasing	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Pleasing

Demographics

Please answer the following demographic information about yourself.

1. What is your age? (Please enter a number)
2. In which state do you live? [drop-down menu options]
3. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
    a. High school degree or less
    b. Some college
    c. 2 year college degree
    d. 4 year college degree
    e. Professional degree
    f. Graduate degree (e.g., M. A., Ph.D.)

   g. Other (please specify)

   h. I prefer not to answer this question

4. What is your occupation?

5. What ethnicity/racial group do you mostly identify with?

   a. American-Indian or Alaska native

   b. Asian

   c. Black or African-American

   d. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

   e. Hispanic or Latino/Latina

   f. White

   g. A combination of some of the above

   h. Another ethnicity/race (please specify)

   i. I prefer not to answer this question

6. What is your annual income?

   a. Less than $25,000

   b. $25,000 - $49,999

   c. $50,000 - $75,999

   d. $75,000 - $99,999

   e. Over $100,000

   f. I prefer not to answer this question

7. What is your biological sex?

   a. Male

   b. Female

c. Intersex

d. Other

e. I prefer not to answer this question

8. Which statement best describes your current employment status?

    a. Working full time as paid employee

    b. Working part time as paid employee

    c. Self-employed

    d. Not working (specify reason)

    e. I prefer not to answer this question

9. In which start do you live?