

EVALUATIONAL REACTIONS TO ENGLISH, CANADIAN
FRENCH AND EUROPEAN FRENCH VOICES

by

MALCOLM S. PRESTON

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Department of Psychology,
McGill University,
Montreal.

August 1963.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	1
AIM OF THE PRESENT STUDY.....	6
METHOD.....	6
Procedure.....	6
Subjects.....	8
Auspices.....	8
Speakers.....	8
RESULTS.....	9
Speaker Differences.....	10
Guise Differences: Evaluative Reactions of English Canadian Listeners.....	11
Guise Differences: Evaluative Reactions of French Canadian Listeners.....	12
DISCUSSION.....	14
Speaker Differences.....	14
Guise Differences: English Canadian Listeners.....	15
Guise Differences: French Canadian Listeners.....	18
Evaluational Reactions as Uncontaminated Attitudes..	19
SUMMARY.....	22
REFERENCES.....	32

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his thanks to the principals and teachers of the four schools used in this study for their cooperation in making the testing possible, to the eight speakers whose voices were employed, and to Miss Grace Yeni-Komshian for advice and criticism of the final draft. This research was carried out with the financial support of the Carnegie Corporation of America and the Defense Research Board of Canada.

INTRODUCTION

There has been some research in recent years which has attempted to demonstrate the effect of needs, attitudes and stereotyped beliefs on social judgements and perception (see, for instance, Secord, 1959). One type of experimental design that highlights the role that such factors play in perception consists of observing and comparing the reactions of a subject when presented with the same stimulus under different labelling conditions. A technique which employs this sort of design has been developed by Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner, and Fillenbaum (1960). They compared a listener's evaluative reactions to the same individual speaking in two languages. In this case, different labels (languages) are attached to the same stimulus (a person's voice). A variation of this technique was employed by Anisfeld, Bogo, and Lambert (1962) in which two different dialects in the same language were presumed to function as distinctive labels.

In the Lambert et al. (1960) study, the recorded voices of four near perfect male bilinguals speaking once in French and once in English were played before two groups of listeners. The listeners consisted of English and French Canadian second year college students from the Montreal area. The students were asked to give their impressions of the personality of each speaker. To do this, each speaker was rated on a number of desirable personality traits, such as "dependability" and "intelligence," on six-point scales anchored at one end by "very little" and at the other end by "very much." The listeners were unaware that they were hearing four speakers speaking once in each language. All eight voices delivered the same message.

The differences(D) between the English and French guises of each speaker on each of the personality traits were noted for each listener, with account taken of the direction of the difference (plus for English and minus for French). For instance, for Speaker A on the trait of intelligence, a score of +3 for a given listener indicates that this listener judged Speaker A to be 3 points higher along the intelligence dimension when speaking in English than when speaking in French. In view of the fact that the message was the same for all eight voices and that the same speaker was used for both guises, it was felt that discrepancies of this type might reflect the influence of attitudes toward English and French Canadians on the evaluative judgements of the listener.

The results of this study showed that both English and French Canadian listeners evaluated the English voices more favorably than the French voices. This, coupled with the fact that there were generally low correlations between attitude measures and evaluative reactions, led the authors to interpret their findings as reflecting the existence of community-wide stereotyped attitudes of English and French Canadians in the Montreal area.

Studies employing the matched guise technique like the present one are primarily interested in exploring the variations in impressions of personality that can be attributed to the dialectical characteristics of a speaker's voice. Dialectical here refers to those features of speech which identify the linguistic-cultural group of the speaker. However, other features of speech may also play a role in the formation of a listener's impression. Previous investigation (see Licklider and Miller, 1951, p.1070f, or Kramer, 1962, 1963) suggests that the vocal or phonological features of a speaker's voice play a role in the formation of a listener's impression.

In general, it has been found that although a listener's judgements of a speaker's personality are not very accurate, listeners often agree that a speaker possesses a given set of traits. Recently, Kjeldergaard (1963) has attempted to determine the effect that two vocal characteristics, rate and loudness, have on impressions of personality. A third factor in speech which plays a role is the content of the passage spoken. Markel and Roblin (1963) have demonstrated that the emotional affective content of the message affects a listener's evaluation of the speaker. Thus, how much of a trait a listener will attribute to a speaker will depend on the dialectical and vocal characteristics of speech as well as the content of the message.

It is not inconceivable, however, that when a person switches from one language to another some of the vocal characteristics of his speech also change, in addition to the switch in language. Thus, a person may not only be rated less intelligent by an English Canadian when he speaks in French just because he is speaking in French, but also because he actually "sounds" less intelligent. To guard against this source of error, only speakers who habitually used both languages in similar contexts in the two linguistic communities were employed in the present study, and the assumption was made that the vocal characteristics of the speakers' voices involved in the formation of personality impressions remain unchanged when different languages were employed by the speakers.

The effect of content is essentially ignored in the present study since the same message was employed by all speakers. However, the other two factors were free to exercise an effect. If variations in personality impressions attributable to dialectical factors in voice reflect attitudes towards the cultural groups represented by the speakers, as the results

of other studies have suggested, then a comparison of the relative roles that dialectical and vocal factors play should cast some light on the strength of these attitudes. For instance, if one were to find that vocal factors play a relatively more important role than the dialectical factors, one might conclude that attitudes towards the cultural groups under consideration are not very strong. The relative strengths of these two factors can be determined without measuring each directly. The present study does this by comparing the number of differences in impression attributable to switches in language with the number of differences in impression attributable to a change of speakers.

Inspection of the procedure of the Lambert et al. (1960) study reveals the following 4 points which became the basis for the present study.

1. Subjects - The English and French Canadian listeners were roughly equated on educational level and age. However, the English group consisted of both males and females, while the French group was comprised of males only.

2. Sex of voices - Only male speakers were employed.

3. Auspices - The study was presented to the English listeners by two of the authors, both of whom were known to the students. In the case of the French listeners, it was presented by a priest connected with the college, and by the first author who, while fluent in French, had a noticeable English accent.

4. Dialect of the speakers - Three of the speakers spoke Canadian French in their French guise, while the fourth spoke Parisian French. There was some indication that the Parisian French was evaluated in a different fashion than the Canadian French. Also, there were wide variations in the

kind of Canadian French spoken. One speaker, for instance, used a low class Canadian French as spoken in the "bush." All English guises, however, were characteristically middle class Montreal Canadian English.

AIM OF THE PRESENT STUDY

The present study was designed to map out, by means of the matched guise technique, the views that English and French Canadians hold of each other and of the Continental French, keeping in mind the following questions: 1) will female listeners exhibit the same sort of comparative evaluations as male listeners, 2) will male speakers show the same pattern of comparative evaluations as female speakers, 3) will comparative evaluations to English and Canadian French speakers differ from those to English and Continental French speakers, and 4) are personality impressions of a speaker as revealed by the matched guise technique primarily a function of the phonological or vocal characteristics of the speaker's voice, or do the dialectal characteristics play a larger role? The design of the study included a control for bias of the auspices, and in the selection of the speakers careful attention was taken so that their English and French guises were characteristic of the educated middle class.

METHOD

Procedure

Tape recordings of 8 perfectly bilingual speakers reading a 1-1/2 minute passage of philosophical prose once each in both French and its translated English equivalent were made. These recordings were then played to English and French Canadian second year college students from the Montreal area. The listeners were asked to evaluate each of the 16 voices on 18 personality traits on six-point scales, anchored at one end by "very little" and at the other end by "very much." The traits, written in their positive form, were: intelligence (intelligence), dependability (digne de confiance),

ambition (ambition), courageousness (courageux), kindness (bonté), height (taille), affectionateness (affectueux), sense of humor (sens de l'humour), self-confidence (confiance en soi), sociability (sociabilité), likeability (aimable), good looks (attrait physique), conscientiousness (conscientieux), entertainingness (jovialité), character (caractère), leadership (apte à diriger), religiousness (pieux), and sincerity (sincère).

To facilitate the presentation of the results, the 18 personality traits were grouped under three logical headings: 1) competence, which included intelligence, ambition, self-confidence, leadership, and courageousness; 2) integrity, which included dependability, sincerity, character, conscientiousness, and kindness; 3) social attractiveness, which included sociability, likeability, entertainingness, sense of humor and affectionate. Religiousness, good looks, and height were not included in the above categories since they did not clearly fit into any of them.

The experimenters introduced the study as an experimental investigation of the extent to which people can make accurate judgements about a person from his voice alone. They were told that the two languages were being used to enlarge the scope of the study. There was no evidence that the listeners became aware they were actually hearing the voices of 8 people speaking once each in both languages.

Each voice was rated on a separate page in the test booklet distributed to the listeners. In order to prevent the formation of a habitual mode of response, four different orders of traits were used. The 16 voice rating sheets in each listener's booklet contained four copies of each of the four different orders of traits arranged in a random fashion. The last 3 pages of the test booklet contained a personal questionnaire designed to

determine the listeners' economic status, age and degree of bilinguality.

Subjects

Eighty English Canadian and ninety-two French Canadian first year college students from Montreal served as listeners. Each set contained roughly the same number of males and females, making four groups of listeners in all. The average ages were for male English Canadians 18.9 years, for female English Canadians 17.5 years, for male French Canadians 17.3 years, and for female French Canadians 17.6 years. With few exceptions all listeners were Catholic, which contrasts with the first study in which the English listeners were predominantly Protestant and Jewish.

Auspices

Two male experimenters were employed. The study was presented to the English listeners in English and to the French listeners in French. A graduate student at McGill University presented the study to half of the English listeners and half of the French listeners, while a graduate student at the Université de Montréal (a genuine French Canadian) presented the study to the rest of the listeners. The listeners were told by each E that the study was part of the ongoing research of the psychology department at his university. Originally, it had been planned to carry out a separate analysis on each E's listeners. However, since the N was quite small and inspection revealed no difference, the experimenters' groups were combined.

Speakers

Eight speakers were employed. In the English guises, all speakers spoke what would be accepted as middle class Montreal English without a French accent. Four of the speakers were males and four were females. In the French guises, two males and two females spoke genuine, uncaricatured

middle class Canadian French, while the other two males and two females spoke good educated French that would be immediately identified by a French speaking person as the kind of French spoken in France. In effect, then, there were four different categories of speakers which could be identified by sex and kind of French spoken in the French guise: male FC (French Canadian), female FC, male FF (French French) and female FF. English Canadians, French Canadians and French nationals were used as judges in order to meet the above specifications. The voices were presented to all listeners in the same order. It was so arranged that the first eight voices on the tape were the English and French guises of four of the speakers, one from each of the four categories. In each set of eight voices, the French and English guises of any one speaker were maximally separated.

RESULTS

In the analysis, the four categories of speakers, as well as the four groups of listeners, were kept distinct. The algebraic differences of the ratings between the English and French guises of each speaker on each of the personality traits were recorded for each listener. A plus was assigned to differences favoring the English guise, a minus for the French guise. In each group of listeners, on each personality trait, and for each speaker category, the difference scores were summed over both speakers, and t-tests were applied to see if the difference scores departed significantly from zero. In this way, the significance of difference between the two language guises (hereafter called guise differences) could be tested.

Since we were also interested in differences between speakers,

two other analyses were carried out. First of all, the above difference scores were summed over each speaker separately, for each group of listeners, on each personality trait yielding guise differences for each individual speaker. One could then see if the same pattern of guise differences occurred for both speakers in a given category. Secondly, the raw data was combined in a fashion that yielded the possibility of testing for "speaker differences." This was done for each personality trait by combining, within each category, the English and French ratings of one speaker, and subtracting this result from the combined English and French ratings of the other speaker. These difference scores were summed over all listeners in each group for each trait. To determine if these difference scores departed significantly from zero, t-tests were then applied. The significance of difference between the two speakers in each category (speaker differences) could be tested in this manner. If the dialectical characteristics of speech play the relatively larger role in the formation of personality impressions of a speaker, we would expect to find the same pattern of guise differences for both speakers in a given category, as well as fewer significant speaker differences than guise differences.

Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 present the values of t for guise differences on each trait for each individual speaker for the four groups of listeners. Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 present the t values for guise and speaker differences for each of the four categories of speakers on the 18 traits for the four groups of listeners.

SPEAKER DIFFERENCES

It is clear from Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 that there is a considerable lack of agreement in listeners' impressions between the two members of each

of the four pairs of speakers. There are slightly fewer significant guise differences in common than there are significant opposing guise differences. Furthermore, considering only the sign of the guise differences irrespective of whether or not they are significant, it is evident that there are roughly the same number of agreements between the two members of each of the four pairs of speakers as there are disagreements.

Looking at each individual speaker category, there is a tendency for more sign agreements than disagreements to occur between the two females in the FC category, and more sign disagreements than agreements to occur between the two females in the FF category. The number of agreements and disagreements are very nearly equal in the two male speaker categories.

From Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 it is clear that there are, with one exception, almost twice as many significant speaker differences than guise differences in each speaker category and listener group. There also appears to be a consistent trend for both English and French Canadian listeners to rate the same speaker in any given category above the other speaker in that category.

GUISE DIFFERENCES: EVALUATIVE REACTIONS OF ENGLISH CANADIAN (EC) LISTENERS

Generally speaking, EC listeners viewed the female speakers more favorably in French and the male speakers more favorably in English.

English vs. French Canadian female speakers - EC female listeners rated the FC female speakers as being more intelligent, ambitious and self-confident, but shorter than their English counterparts. EC male listeners rated the FC female speakers as being more intelligent, ambitious, self-confident, dependable, courageous and sincere. Thus, English Canadians ap-

parently view FC females as being more competent. EC male listeners also view the FC female as having more integrity.

English vs. French Canadian male speakers - The male speakers did not fare so well in their French guise. EC female listeners rated the male speakers in English as taller, more likeable, affectionate, sincere, and conscientious and as possessing more character and a greater sense of humor than the same speakers in their FC guises. EC male listeners rated these speakers in English as taller, more kind, dependable and entertaining. It appears, then, that FC male speakers are viewed as lacking integrity and as being less socially attractive by the EC females and to a less marked extent the EC males.

English vs. French French speakers - In contrast to the EC-FC comparisons, English Canadians made very few distinctions between the EC and FF speakers. This is especially so with EC male listeners who viewed FF women as more self-confident and as possessing more leadership, but showed no difference between EC and FF males except on height and religiousness. The EC female listeners rated FF females higher on sociability and self-confidence and the FF males lower on height, likeability and sincerity.

GUISE DIFFERENCES: EVALUATIVE REACTIONS OF FRENCH CANADIAN (FC) LISTENERS

FC listeners showed more significant guise differences than did the EC listeners. Except for the tendency of FC female listeners to rate FC males over EC males, French Canadians in general rated FF guises higher and FC guises lower than their matched English guises.

English vs. French Canadian female speakers - FC female listeners rated FC females as more religious but as shorter, and less intelligent,

ambitious, dependable, kind, likeable, affectionate, entertaining, good-looking, and as possessing less leadership than the EC female. FC male listeners presented a similar pattern. They viewed the EC female as taller, and more intelligent, self-confident, courageous, sincere, sociable, likeable, affectionate, entertaining, better looking, and as possessing more leadership, character, and sense of humor, but as less religious. The results suggest that French Canadians view EC women as being more competent, socially more attractive and as possessing more integrity than FC women.

English vs. French Canadian male speakers - Reactions of FC female listeners differed considerably from those of FC male listeners in this category. FC female listeners rated the FC males higher on ambition, self-confidence, entertainingness, and sense of humor. FC male listeners, however, rated the EC males higher on intelligence, leadership, character and height.

English vs. French French female speakers - FF female speakers were rated higher by both male and female FC listeners. FC female listeners rated FF females higher on intelligence, self-confidence, good-looking, leadership, character and height, but lower on religiousness. Male listeners rated FF females higher on intelligence, ambition, self-confidence, courageous and good looks. It appears that French Canadians generally view FF women as being more competent than EC women.

English vs. French French male speakers - Male and female FC listeners both rated FF males higher than EC males, but on different patterns of traits. FC female listeners rated FF males higher on intelligence, ambition, self-confidence, character and good looks, while FC male listeners rated FF males higher on ambition, sociability, likeability, affectionate, and sense of humor. FC females apparently view FF men as being more com-

petent, while FC males view them as being more socially attractive.

DISCUSSION

SPEAKER DIFFERENCES

If stereotyped attitudes towards linguistic cultural groups play an important role in the formation of impressions of personality, then speakers within a category should show similar patterns of guise differences. The results, however, revealed that speakers within the same category differed widely in the patterns of guise differences they presented. For instance, considering male EC-FF comparisons, EC male listeners viewed Cru more favorably in English and Rue more favorably in French. With respect to female EC-FC comparisons, these same listeners viewed Lap more favorably in French but showed no difference between the two guises for Bou. These findings cast some doubt on whether the same pattern of guise differences noted in Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 would have been found if other bilingual speakers had been used with the same listeners.

Besides differing on the patterns of guise differences they presented, speakers within a category differed in another fashion. It is evident from the results that both EC and FC listeners tended to rate the same speaker in both guises more favorably than the other speaker. This, plus the fact that there were more speaker differences than guise differences (Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8) suggests that listeners, in forming an impression of a speaker's personality, depend more on the vocal and phonological characteristics of voice than on the dialectical characteristics; both, however, play a role. It may be that these findings reflect the instructional set given the listeners - to ignore all other factors except

the speaker's voice in judging his personality. Or, these findings may be an indication that attitudes held by these particular listeners towards each other and the European French are, comparatively speaking, not very strong. More research with different speakers and other listeners is needed to explore these possibilities.

GUISE DIFFERENCES: ENGLISH CANADIAN LISTENERS

Differences between male and female listeners' evaluational reactions -

The results presented in Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 reveal no striking listener-sex differences. In 54 cases out of a total of 72, there was no difference between male and female listeners' comparative evaluational reactions to the speakers. There were 48 cases in which both sexes showed no difference between the French and English guises and 6 cases in which they showed differences favoring the same guise. In only 18 cases did one sex show a difference and the other sex did not, and there were no cases in which one sex favored one guise while the other sex favored the other guise.

Differences between EC-FF and EC-FC comparisons - The fact that English Canadians showed relatively few differences between EC and FF guises, while they did show a sizeable number of differences between EC and FC guises, suggests that English Canadians can and do make a distinction between the two varieties of French. One possibility is that English Canadians may be less involved emotionally and motivationally with FF people, and therefore less concerned or interested in them. Under these conditions it would not be very important for English Canadians to distinguish between themselves and the European French. In contrast to the local French populace, it appears that FF people are neither downgraded nor taken as potential social models to any great extent.

Differences between evaluational reactions to male and female speakers - There were 45 cases out of a total of 72 in which comparative evaluations to male speakers did not differ from those to female speakers. In 44 of those cases the listeners showed no differences between the two guises, while in just one case did the listeners show the same difference for male and female speakers. In 26 cases listeners showed a difference for one sex but not the other, and in one case the listeners showed a difference favoring one guise for one sex, and the other guise for the other sex. Nevertheless, on those traits which did show significant guise differences, EC listeners (with only two exceptions), rated the female speakers in the French guises higher and male speakers in the same guises lower than their English-speaking counterparts.

The tendency to rate FC male speakers lower than EC male speakers, noted in previous studies, is probably the expression of a negative prejudice towards French Canadians. This tendency apparently does not generalize to female speakers. One possibility why this negative prejudice is selectively directed toward FC males may be that FC males are more salient sources of frustration to English Canadians. FC males are certainly better known than FC females as the power figures who control local and regional governments. Another possibility is that it may be more acceptable to direct negatively prejudiced feelings towards the male members of a group than towards the female members. It may be that only under conditions of intense hatred would negative feelings be expressed towards females. A third possibility, not incompatible with the first two, may be that the increased attractiveness of FC women in the eyes of EC males is partly a

result of her inaccessibility. A reaction to this on the part of EC females may lead them to upgrade the FC female also. Further research is necessary to examine these possibilities.

To test the notion that the unfavorable view of FC males is a reflection of a negative prejudice towards French Canadians, several pilot studies have been carried out. In one of these studies, it was reasoned that the unfavorable attitude that English Canadians hold toward French Canadians should make it less likely that English Canadians would be persuaded by or accept ideas from French Canadians. Two English Canadian speakers were found who could imitate the style of English spoken by middle class French Canadians in Montreal. This style of English, of course, has a distinct French Canadian flavor. They recorded, once in their regular unaccented Montreal English and once in their French Canadian style English, a passage purporting to be an excerpt from a defense attorney's summary statement to the jury in support of a client accused of bank robbery. These passages were played to several comparable groups of English Canadian high school students who evaluated the guilt of the client and the ability of the lawyer. Some classes heard the argument in regular English and others in the accented English.

The prediction was upheld in the case of one of the speakers. The listeners found the defense attorney's argument less convincing and the defendant more likely to be guilty when the lawyer spoke with a French Canadian accent in his English. However, no differences in the guilt of the client or the ability of the lawyer were noted between the unaccented and accented presentations of the other speaker. There was some evidence that the first speaker had a thicker accented English than the second speaker.

This may account for the fact that the prediction was upheld for the first speaker only. While further research is needed, it seems reasonably clear that dialectical variations in speech affect potential social interaction as well as perception.

GUISE DIFFERENCES: FRENCH CANADIAN (FC) LISTENERS

A glance at Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 reveals that the pattern of comparative evaluational reactions for French Canadians is more complex than those for English Canadians. It is apparent that just what sort of pattern is obtained depends on the sex of listener, the kind of comparison being made (EC vs. FC or EC vs. FF), and the sex of the speakers. For this reason the results of the French Canadian listeners will be discussed in a different fashion.

Two findings in particular provide important suggestions for a more careful social psychological study of relations between English and French Canadians. In the first place, there is a tendency for French Canadians to rate FF guises higher and FC guises lower than their matched English guises. The one exception occurred when female listeners rated FC male speakers over EC male speakers. The pattern of evaluations presented suggests that French Canadians view their own linguistic-cultural group as inferior to both the EC and FF groups. It is not unlikely to presume that, under these circumstances, French Canadians would be prone to take either of these other groups as models for changes in their own manners of behaving (including speech styles) and in basic values.

In the second place, with respect to EC-FC comparisons, it is evident that FC male listeners rated both the male and female members of their own linguistic-cultural group lower than they rated the corresponding

members of the EC group. FC female listeners, on the other hand, rated FC male guises higher and FC female guises lower than their matched English guises. The tendency to see their own group as inferior in comparison to the EC group is more marked among FC males who apparently do not value any features of representatives of the FC group, which were examined in this study. The fact that the female listeners favored the FC male guise suggests that they may place more value on French Canadian culture and thus, may play, in effect, an important role in its preservation. It is likely that this preference for French Canadian values by females is passed on in their own families through language, religion and tradition.

On the other hand, comparison of the results of this study (data collected in 1962) with those of Lambert et al. (1960) suggests that there may be a trend on the part of male French Canadians towards viewing their own group as less inferior in comparison to the EC group. In the 1960 study (data collected in 1958-59), it was found that FC males viewed EC males as taller, better looking, and as possessing more leadership, intelligence, self-confidence, dependability, ambition, sociability, character and likeability. In the present study, FC males attending the same classical college viewed EC males as superior on only four traits: height, intelligence, leadership and character. Notably absent are ambition and self-confidence. These changing views that the French Canadian male has of himself are certainly in accord with the rapid social change that has occurred recently in the Province of Quebec and with the rise in French Canadian nationalism. The matched guise technique appears to be a valuable indicator of such changes.

EVALUATIONAL REACTIONS AS UNCONTAMINATED ATTITUDES

One of the weaknesses of most paper and pencil attitude question-

naires lies in the fact that the respondent becomes immediately aware of the experimenter's purpose. Once the respondent becomes aware, he may inhibit the expression of his true feelings if he believes that they fall too far away from some cultural norm. Forced choice techniques help to correct this but they still encounter the problem of transparency from the Ss' point of view. No evidence was found that indicated any of the Ss used in the present study became aware of its true purpose. It seems, then, that attitudes as measured by the matched guise technique are not contaminated by the listener's awareness of the real purpose of the experimenter. Therefore, it is reasonable to believe that the matched guise technique furnishes the investigator with a purer measure of attitude.

If this were the case, one might expect to find, for instance, that attitudes as measured by the indirect matched guise technique do not agree with attitudes as measured by some more direct questionnaire method. The Lambert et al. 1960 study lends some support to this notion since it found relatively low correlations between comparative evaluational reactions and several direct paper and pencil attitude measures. More support comes from another study completed after the present one in which French Canadian college students from Quebec City evaluated the personalities of the speakers employed in the present study. They then rated on 4 sheets, similar to those used for evaluating the speakers, how, in their opinion, they thought that most French Canadians would respond if asked to give their general impressions of English and French Canadians, both male and female. The results for a group of male listeners (average age = 16.3) are presented in Table 9. The tendency to rate both male and female speakers higher in the EC guises than in the FC guises is again evident. However, the pattern

presented when attitudes are measured more directly is quite different. Here it is evident that FC females are preferred over EC females and the tendency to downgrade FC males has given way to a tendency to downgrade EC males. Evidence of a similar nature comes from a study by Lambert, Anisfeld, and Yeni-Komshian (1963) done in Israel. Again, there were large discrepancies between attitudes as measured by the two methods.

If attitudes as measured by the matched guise technique are uncontaminated by the listener's awareness, then it follows that attitudes measured in this fashion should be better predictors of behavior in situations where one suspects prejudice is operating than attitudes measured in a more direct fashion. This idea could be easily tested by measuring attitudes with both methods and then correlating each with the reactions to a French Canadian accented lawyer as described in the pilot study above.

SUMMARY

English and French Canadian college students in Montreal rated the personality characteristics of several bilingual speakers on a tape recorder. The speakers read a standard passage once in English and once in either Canadian French or European French. The listeners were unaware they were hearing the same speaker more than once. There were four categories of speakers with two speakers in each category: 2 males and 2 females who spoke Canadian French in the French guise, and 2 males and 2 females who spoke European French in the French guise. Comparisons between the two guises and between the two speakers in each category were made for each trait. The results revealed that (1) both dialectical and vocal characteristics of voice play a role in the formation of personality impressions of the speakers with the vocal characteristics playing the more important role and (2) sex and language background of the listeners as well as sex of the speaker and kind of comparison being made (English vs. Canadian French or English vs. European French) affect comparative evaluational reactions to the speakers. Several hypotheses were offered to explain the guise differences obtained and suggestions were made for further research.

Table 1

English Canadian Female Listeners (1)

Traits	Female Speakers				Male Speakers			
	EC vs. FC		EC vs. FF		EC vs. FC		EC vs. FF	
	LAP	BOU	MON	TRE	CLE	COU	CRU	RUE
<u>Competence</u>								
Intelligence	<u>-2.57</u> (2)	<u>-.73</u>	<u>-.72</u>	<u>-.21</u>	1.26	.12	<u>3.03</u>	-1.65
Ambition	<u>-3.13</u>	<u>-.66</u>	<u>-.65</u>	<u>-.95</u>	.27	.64	<u>.82</u>	-1.84
Self-confidence	<u>-1.65</u>	<u>-2.29</u>	<u>-2.26</u>	<u>-1.75</u>	1.10	<u>-.31</u>	.71	<u>-2.48</u>
Leadership	<u>-3.00</u>	<u>.42</u>	<u>.0</u>	<u>-2.07</u>	1.74	<u>-.37</u>	2.03	<u>-1.51</u>
Courageousness	<u>-1.30</u>	<u>-1.12</u>	<u>-.09</u>	<u>-2.11</u>	.84	.0	<u>2.18</u>	.21
<u>Integrity</u>								
Character	<u>-3.06</u>	1.02	<u>2.59</u>	<u>-1.32</u>	1.65	<u>2.86</u>	<u>4.30</u>	-1.19
Dependability	<u>1.55</u>	<u>-.37</u>	<u>1.84</u>	<u>.40</u>	.11	<u>.76</u>	<u>2.13</u>	<u>-.09</u>
Conscientiousness	<u>-2.13</u>	<u>2.35</u>	<u>-.38</u>	<u>-.50</u>	2.02	<u>2.38</u>	<u>3.21</u>	<u>-.40</u>
Sincerity	<u>-1.77</u>	<u>.63</u>	<u>.34</u>	<u>-.30</u>	<u>2.85</u>	<u>1.92</u>	<u>3.84</u>	1.46
Kindness	<u>2.33</u>	.0	.29	1.30	<u>-.11</u>	<u>2.73</u>	<u>1.77</u>	.78
<u>Social</u>								
<u>Attractiveness</u>								
Sociability	.51	<u>-3.07</u>	<u>-.59</u>	<u>-2.77</u>	<u>-.67</u>	1.20	<u>-.44</u>	.18
Likeability	.09	<u>-1.49</u>	<u>-.22</u>	<u>.11</u>	<u>2.52</u>	<u>2.52</u>	1.60	1.09
Affectionate	1.73	<u>-1.75</u>	.09	<u>-.57</u>	<u>.0</u>	<u>4.02</u>	<u>-.20</u>	.51
Entertainingness	1.16	<u>-2.36</u>	.59	<u>-2.87</u>	.40	<u>1.60</u>	.89	.0
Sense of humor	.39	<u>-1.84</u>	<u>-.45</u>	<u>-.09</u>	.41	<u>3.59</u>	.45	1.65
Height	.33	<u>4.75</u>	<u>-.82</u>	<u>2.04</u>	<u>3.02</u>	<u>3.70</u>	1.86	<u>2.46</u>
Good Looks	.0	<u>-.31</u>	.10	<u>-2.36</u>	<u>-1.02</u>	<u>3.49</u>	.42	<u>.26</u>
Religiousness	<u>-1.00</u>	<u>-.86</u>	.0	<u>-.60</u>	<u>-.37</u>	<u>1.02</u>	.44	<u>-.38</u>

1 - Positive entries indicate that English guises are evaluated more favorably than French, and minus entries indicate a more favorable evaluation for French guises.

2 - Underlined entries are significant at the .05 level, two-tailed t-tests.

Table 2

English Canadian Male Listeners (1)

Traits	Female Speakers				Male Speakers			
	EC vs. FC		EC vs. FF		EC vs. FC		EC vs. FF	
	LAP	BOU	MON	TRE	CLE	COU	CRU	RUE
<u>Competence</u>								
Intelligence	-4.88(2)	1.03	-.74	-2.01	.73	.79	3.10	-2.95
Ambition	-6.11	1.09	-.64	-2.52	1.27	1.17	1.79	-2.93
Self-confidence	-4.40	-.10	-.58	-2.51	-1.15	.54	3.08	-3.48
Leadership	-1.47	.98	-.94	-3.40	.49	.69	3.61	-3.72
Courageousness	-3.05	-.27	.12	-1.98	.56	.0	2.36	-3.30
<u>Integrity</u>								
Character	-.45	-.12	.08	-1.53	.09	.89	2.15	-4.10
Dependability	-2.95	-.10	.26	-1.48	2.29	1.45	2.66	-3.10
Conscientiousness	-3.31	1.60	.44	.0	2.17	.50	1.04	-1.93
Sincerity	-3.37	-.21	.14	-1.12	.84	.0	2.74	-3.25
Kindness	-.61	.62	-.19	2.43	1.20	1.76	1.09	-.72
<u>Social</u>								
<u>Attractiveness</u>								
Sociability	-.47	-1.25	.97	-2.61	-.41	2.00	1.56	-1.85
Likeability	.54	.29	.31	-.45	-.62	2.44	2.09	-2.39
Affectionate	.72	.0	1.66	-.55	-.52	2.81	-.71	-1.66
Entertainingness	-.87	-.67	2.10	-2.70	.94	2.92	.30	-.45
Sense of humor	-.09	-1.51	1.44	-2.11	-1.90	1.67	-.93	.15
Height	-2.14	3.65	.70	1.49	1.07	3.08	2.70	.86
Good Looks	1.36	.95	1.95	-1.83	-1.54	2.89	1.09	-1.11
Religiousness	-2.33	.79	-1.01	1.52	1.28	-1.28	-1.91	-3.30

1 - Positive entries indicate that English guises are evaluated more favorably than French, and minus entries indicate a more favorable evaluation for French guises.

2 - Underlined entries are significant at the .05 level, two-tailed t-tests.

Table 3

French Canadian Female Listeners (1)

Traits	Female Speakers				Male Speakers			
	EC vs. FC		EC vs. FF		EC vs. FC		EC vs. FF	
	LAP	BOU	MON	TRE	CLE	COU	CRU	RUE
<u>Competence</u>								
Intelligence	- .36	<u>3.66(2)</u>	.12	<u>-3.66</u>	- .38	- .59	<u>-3.25</u>	-1.05
Ambition	.73	<u>1.62</u>	1.77	<u>-4.69</u>	-1.17	<u>-2.32</u>	<u>-.42</u>	<u>-3.10</u>
Self-confidence	1.80	<u>2.79</u>	1.09	<u>-6.86</u>	-1.43	<u>-2.89</u>	- .93	<u>-2.16</u>
Leadership	1.39	<u>5.14</u>	.31	<u>-5.84</u>	- .73	<u>-2.20</u>	- .58	<u>-.36</u>
Courageousness	- .43	<u>3.84</u>	<u>2.73</u>	<u>-2.30</u>	- .77	<u>-.89</u>	-1.50	- .22
<u>Integrity</u>								
Character	.64	<u>5.03</u>	1.42	<u>-4.91</u>	-1.10	-1.28	<u>-2.70</u>	- .67
Dependability	-.94	<u>3.78</u>	<u>2.12</u>	<u>-.65</u>	.85	-1.20	<u>-.86</u>	- .84
Conscientiousness	- .78	<u>1.93</u>	<u>-.84</u>	- .43	1.36	- .61	.24	-1.83
Sincerity	- .78	<u>3.30</u>	.77	.0	.95	-1.46	- .48	.51
Kindness	<u>-2.28</u>	<u>2.21</u>	.61	1.55	- .14	1.57	- .21	.22
<u>Social</u>								
<u>Attractiveness</u>								
Sociability	.40	<u>3.26</u>	<u>2.02</u>	<u>-2.51</u>	-1.12	-1.30	.54	-1.15
Likeability	<u>2.06</u>	<u>3.22</u>	<u>2.01</u>	<u>-.20</u>	-1.66	- .65	- .44	.10
Affectionate	<u>3.89</u>	<u>2.49</u>	1.18	.36	- .26	1.50	-1.81	- .65
Entertainingness	<u>2.23</u>	<u>3.63</u>	<u>2.40</u>	<u>-3.30</u>	<u>-2.21</u>	- .77	-1.48	- .51
Sense of humor	<u>2.46</u>	<u>3.81</u>	<u>-.19</u>	<u>-3.31</u>	<u>-2.78</u>	-1.24	- .09	- .66
Height	1.53	1.67	- .21	<u>-3.40</u>	- .96	.76	- .68	1.39
Good Looks	<u>2.19</u>	<u>6.23</u>	1.22	<u>-6.07</u>	.81	- .85	<u>-3.10</u>	-1.67
Religiousness	<u>-3.75</u>	<u>-2.30</u>	<u>3.16</u>	<u>-.61</u>	-1.15	-1.13	.0	.69

1 - Positive entries indicate that English guises are evaluated more favorably than French, and minus entries indicate a more favorable evaluation for French guises.

2 - Underlined entries are significant at the .05 level, two-tailed t-tests.

Table 4

French Canadian Male Listeners (1)

Traits	Female Speakers				Male Speakers			
	EC vs. FC		EC vs. FF		EC vs. FC		EC vs. FF	
	LAP	BOU	MON	TRE	CLE	COU	CRU	RUE
<u>Competence</u>								
Intelligence	.79	5.18 (2)	- .39	-3.82	1.30	2.34	-1.59	-1.45
Ambition	2.18	<u>2.14</u>	.29	-5.26	.97	- .74	-3.02	- .58
Self-confidence	<u>1.41</u>	<u>1.09</u>	- .47	-4.15	- .36	1.17	.56	-3.19
Leadership	1.49	4.83	2.65	-3.22	1.81	3.25	1.50	<u>1.34</u>
Courageousness	.36	<u>2.08</u>	<u>1.47</u>	-7.47	1.32	.0	- .36	.35
<u>Integrity</u>								
Character	.30	2.11	2.50	-5.08	1.47	1.99	- .56	-1.24
Dependability	<u>2.48</u>	<u>2.49</u>	.51	-1.73	.08	2.50	.56	- .94
Conscientiousness	.0	1.67	.21	-2.55	1.31	.0	1.58	.09
Sincerity	.64	1.18	.78	- .32	.41	2.12	1.54	- .26
Kindness	<u>3.35</u>	.61	- .09	- .34	-1.64	<u>1.78</u>	.32	.35
<u>Social</u>								
<u>Attractiveness</u>								
Sociability	2.67	- .37	1.28	-3.96	-2.30	1.03	-3.00	-1.12
Likeability	<u>2.62</u>	1.25	<u>2.53</u>	-4.01	-2.30	.71	-2.18	- .95
Affectionate	<u>4.49</u>	.23	<u>2.36</u>	-1.57	- .75	1.82	-3.55	- .90
Entertainingness	<u>3.80</u>	.0	<u>2.68</u>	-2.56	-3.58	1.36	-2.10	- .26
Sense of humor	<u>4.28</u>	-1.05	<u>2.70</u>	-2.58	-1.29	- .09	-2.89	-1.29
Height	.0	3.74	2.28	-2.90	.68	3.43	1.22	.23
Good Looks	5.12	<u>3.82</u>	<u>1.45</u>	-5.55	- .17	.49	-3.27	.60
Religiousness	-1.70	-1.41	.08	.49	- .51	.52	-1.22	- .55

1 - Positive entries indicate that English guises are evaluated more favorably than French, and minus entries indicate a more favorable evaluation for French guises.

2 - Underlined entries are significant at the .05 level, two-tailed t-tests.

Table 5

Male EC - FC Category

Traits	Guise Differences (1)				Speaker Differences (2)			
	French Listeners Males	French Listeners Females	English Listeners Males	English Listeners Females	French Listeners Males	French Listeners Females	English Listeners Males	English Listeners Females
<u>Competence</u>								
Intelligence	2.44(3)	-0.62	0.92	1.09	-4.62	-4.59	-2.77	-4.15
Ambition	0.07	-2.05	1.68	0.52	-7.66	-4.35	-3.08	-3.96
Self-confidence	0.24	-2.69	-0.53	0.64	-6.94	-7.74	-4.46	-5.28
Leadership	3.12	-1.77	0.72	1.19	-5.31	-4.71	-4.58	-4.30
Courageousness	0.97	-0.96	0.41	0.64	-2.80	-4.04	-0.78	-0.71
<u>Integrity</u>								
Character	2.28	-1.82	0.56	2.68	-4.56	-5.96	-1.70	-1.14
Dependability	1.46	-0.07	2.77	0.55	-2.46	-0.72	0.77	-0.60
Conscientiousness	0.98	0.58	1.83	3.13	-0.52	-1.26	-1.40	-1.37
Sincerity	1.79	0.07	0.60	3.18	-1.11	-2.90	-0.36	-0.83
Kindness	-0.22	0.75	2.02	1.77	-1.28	-0.74	0.53	0.89
<u>Social</u>								
<u>Attractiveness</u>								
Sociability	-1.02	-1.65	0.86	0.14	-5.28	-4.95	-4.36	-7.27
Likeability	-1.60	-1.74	0.96	2.95	-4.68	-4.39	-3.13	-2.34
Affectionate	0.76	0.55	1.17	2.55	-1.45	-1.83	-1.61	-2.57
Entertainingness	-1.95	-2.15	2.53	1.13	-6.19	-4.60	-4.13	-5.74
Sense of humor	-0.95	-2.53	-0.19	2.09	-6.21	-3.23	-3.35	-6.12
Height	2.83	-0.08	2.69	4.16	0.61	0.11	-1.69	-1.48
Good Looks	0.45	0.15	0.67	1.31	-6.86	-5.80	-5.02	-6.51
Religiousness	-0.13	-1.40	-0.15	0.46	-1.42	0.17	0.13	1.77

1 - Positive entries indicate that English guises are evaluated more favorably than French, and minus entries indicate a more favorable evaluation for French guises.

2 - Positive entries indicate that CLE was evaluated more favorably than COU, and minus entries indicate a more favorable evaluation of COU.

3 - Underlined entries are significant at the .05 level, two-tailed t-tests.

Table 6

Female EC - FC Category

Traits	Guise Differences (1)				Speaker Differences (2)			
	French Listeners		English Listeners		French Listeners		English Listeners	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
<u>Competence</u>								
Intelligence	3.89(3)	2.06	-3.02	-2.37	-8.13	-2.22	-3.98	-7.95
Ambition	2.98	1.62	-4.03	-2.49	-6.87	-3.77	-1.77	-4.62
Self-confidence	1.76	2.86	-3.46	-2.96	-6.81	-5.01	-3.69	-6.03
Leadership	3.84	4.35	-0.66	-1.99	-6.18	-4.60	-3.48	-5.76
Courageousness	1.63	2.61	-2.17	-1.74	-5.17	-2.82	-4.79	-4.39
<u>Integrity</u>								
Character	1.50	3.58	-0.93	-1.30	-6.61	-5.49	-4.72	-2.54
Dependability	3.53	1.78	-2.40	1.05	-2.67	-1.40	-1.33	-2.98
Conscientiousness	1.08	0.93	-1.54	0.17	-4.12	-0.08	-1.87	-1.94
Sincerity	1.44	2.17	-3.77	-1.06	-1.51	-0.13	-2.25	-2.10
Kindness	2.59	0.21	0.69	1.94	-2.77	-1.97	-1.42	-2.19
<u>Social</u>								
<u>Attractiveness</u>								
Sociability	1.72	2.64	-1.09	-1.77	-7.60	-4.47	-7.25	-5.59
Likeability	2.37	3.59	0.69	-0.82	-7.50	-4.16	-6.19	-6.73
Affectionate	2.89	4.67	0.64	0.00	-5.88	-4.49	-5.70	-3.71
Entertainingness	2.63	3.93	-1.09	-1.35	-7.02	-4.57	-6.43	-7.44
Sense of humor	1.90	4.23	-1.12	-1.29	-7.80	-6.27	-5.47	-5.53
Height	2.24	2.57	1.43	3.79	-4.85	-2.89	-3.93	-2.62
Good looks	6.57	5.46	1.92	-0.27	-6.29	-5.28	-7.33	-5.72
Religiousness	-2.05	-3.77	-1.25	-1.24	0.00	-0.42	1.15	1.36

- 1 - Positive entries indicate that English guises are evaluated more favorably than French, and minus entries indicate a more favorable evaluation for French guises.
- 2 - Positive entries indicate that Lap was evaluated more favorably than Bou, and minus entries indicate a more favorable evaluation of Bou.
- 3 - Underlined entries are significant at the .05 level, two-tailed t -tests.

Table 7

Male EC - FF Category

Traits	Guise Differences (1)				Speaker Differences (2)			
	French Listeners Males	French Listeners Females	English Listeners Males	English Listeners Females	French Listeners Males	French Listeners Females	English Listeners Males	English Listeners Females
<u>Competence</u>								
Intelligence	-1.94	-2.70	-0.67	0.11	<u>4.15</u>	2.83	8.21	7.47
Ambition	-2.40(3)	-2.33	-1.83	-0.64	<u>0.57</u>	<u>3.98</u>	<u>4.91</u>	<u>3.06</u>
Self-confidence	-1.79	-2.03	-0.78	-1.41	1.59	<u>1.52</u>	<u>4.88</u>	<u>3.35</u>
Leadership	1.62	-0.72	-0.60	0.09	2.99	2.74	<u>5.27</u>	<u>3.78</u>
Courageousness	0.00	-1.29	-0.55	1.50	-1.02	<u>3.23</u>	1.87	1.82
<u>Integrity</u>								
Character	-1.33	-2.12	-1.21	1.90	<u>4.53</u>	2.94	4.77	4.56
Dependability	-0.06	-0.86	-0.52	1.23	<u>2.21</u>	<u>1.99</u>	<u>3.22</u>	<u>2.38</u>
Conscientiousness	0.82	-1.14	-0.84	1.54	<u>3.12</u>	2.72	<u>3.71</u>	<u>3.73</u>
Sincerity	0.69	-0.23	0.00	<u>3.46</u>	<u>1.48</u>	-1.60	<u>3.09</u>	-0.16
Kindness	0.43	0.00	0.42	<u>1.94</u>	0.38	1.47	-0.21	-2.00
<u>Social</u>								
<u>Attractiveness</u>								
Sociability	-3.16	-0.38	0.13	0.06	-0.68	1.42	3.54	-1.53
Likeability	-2.17	-0.23	-0.43	<u>2.11</u>	-1.54	2.76	<u>1.77</u>	1.64
Affectionate	-3.07	-1.71	-1.66	<u>0.32</u>	-4.89	<u>0.97</u>	-0.25	-1.85
Entertainingness	-1.20	-1.11	-0.14	0.57	-4.67	-0.62	0.00	0.25
Sense of humor	-2.54	-0.44	-0.43	1.52	-4.02	0.73	-0.40	-0.96
Height	0.72	0.56	<u>2.44</u>	<u>2.63</u>	-1.02	-0.21	0.59	0.52
Good Looks	-1.51	-3.01	<u>0.06</u>	<u>0.39</u>	2.75	<u>4.49</u>	<u>3.74</u>	2.06
Religiousness	-1.12	<u>0.38</u>	-3.83	0.06	-2.19	<u>0.33</u>	<u>2.51</u>	-1.42

1 - Positive entries indicate that English guises are evaluated more favorably than French, and minus entries indicate a more favorable evaluation for French guises.

2 - Positive entries indicate that RUE was evaluated more favorably than CRU, and minus entries indicate a more favorable evaluation of CRU.

3 - Underlined entries are significant at the .05 level, two-tailed t-tests.

Table 8

Female EC - FF Category

Traits	Guise Differences (1)				Speaker Differences (2)			
	French Listeners		English Listeners		French Listeners		English Listeners	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
<u>Competence</u>								
Intelligence	<u>-3.07</u> (3)	<u>-2.06</u>	-1.69	-0.61	1.82	<u>3.26</u>	2.00	1.33
Ambition	<u>-3.66</u>	<u>-1.95</u>	-1.79	-1.07	<u>3.33</u>	<u>5.09</u>	1.86	1.25
Self-confidence	<u>-3.48</u>	<u>-5.88</u>	-2.07	<u>-2.70</u>	<u>2.96</u>	<u>4.97</u>	<u>3.44</u>	<u>3.37</u>
Leadership	<u>-1.09</u>	<u>-4.07</u>	<u>-2.82</u>	-1.40	<u>3.94</u>	<u>7.88</u>	<u>3.36</u>	1.86
Courageousness	<u>-4.54</u>	<u>-0.20</u>	<u>-1.73</u>	-1.28	<u>4.55</u>	<u>4.71</u>	<u>2.13</u>	<u>2.22</u>
<u>Integrity</u>								
Character	-1.98	<u>-2.98</u>	-0.99	0.76	<u>2.87</u>	<u>5.31</u>	<u>3.44</u>	0.65
Dependability	-0.82	<u>1.15</u>	-0.65	1.70	<u>0.47</u>	<u>1.89</u>	<u>4.05</u>	1.05
Conscientiousness	-1.73	-0.78	0.33	-0.62	<u>2.37</u>	<u>2.97</u>	<u>1.86</u>	1.14
Sincerity	0.23	0.78	-0.47	0.06	<u>0.70</u>	<u>1.55</u>	<u>3.04</u>	-0.39
Kindness	-0.18	1.82	1.33	1.02	-0.06	0.00	<u>-0.51</u>	-1.32
<u>Social</u>								
<u>Attractiveness</u>								
Sociability	-1.81	-0.24	-1.29	<u>-2.09</u>	1.39	<u>3.68</u>	<u>2.02</u>	1.39
Likeability	-1.07	1.03	-0.13	<u>-0.12</u>	1.60	<u>1.81</u>	<u>0.99</u>	-0.10
Affectionate	0.57	0.99	0.85	-0.45	-1.66	-1.20	-1.73	-1.48
Entertainingness	-0.51	-0.45	-0.45	-1.09	-0.20	1.92	1.76	0.20
Sense of humor	-0.10	-1.52	-0.19	-0.30	-1.65	1.61	0.07	0.30
Height	-0.30	<u>-2.96</u>	1.54	0.60	1.88	1.87	-0.95	<u>-3.02</u>
Good looks	<u>-2.97</u>	<u>-2.98</u>	-0.14	-1.63	1.93	<u>3.80</u>	-0.15	<u>-0.55</u>
Religiousness	<u>0.41</u>	<u>2.40</u>	0.43	-0.36	-0.07	<u>-1.14</u>	<u>2.03</u>	0.34

- 1 - Positive entries indicate that English guises are evaluated more favorably than French, and minus entries indicate a more favorable evaluation for French guises.
- 2 - Positive entries indicate that Mon was evaluated more favorably than Tre, and minus entries indicate a more favorable evaluation of Tre.
- 3 - Underlined entries are significant at the .05 level, two-tailed t-tests.

Table 9

College des Jesuites (1)

Traits	Voice Evaluation		Direct Attitude Measure	
	EC vs. FC Female	EC vs. FC Male	EC vs. FC Female	EC vs. FC Male
<u>Competence</u>				
Intelligence	1.63	2.27(2)	-2.53(3)	.35
Ambition	<u>3.32</u>	<u>1.12</u>	<u>.11</u>	<u>3.84</u>
Self-confidence	<u>2.93</u>	<u>2.14</u>	1.51	<u>4.54</u>
Leadership	<u>4.20</u>	<u>1.50</u>	.31	<u>1.12</u>
Courageousness	<u>2.81</u>	<u>2.11</u>	<u>-4.72</u>	<u>-4.75</u>
<u>Integrity</u>				
Character	2.61	.70	-4.10	- .62
Dependability	<u>1.03</u>	<u>2.85</u>	<u>-3.91</u>	-1.85
Conscientiousness	.87	- .38	<u>-2.18</u>	2.23
Sincerity	1.27	<u>2.22</u>	<u>-6.04</u>	<u>-3.37</u>
Kindness	.89	- .13	<u>-6.14</u>	<u>-5.38</u>
<u>Social</u>				
<u>Attractiveness</u>				
Sociability	1.74	.34	-2.97	-2.73
Likeability	<u>3.17</u>	.76	<u>-4.85</u>	<u>-5.25</u>
Affectionate	<u>4.13</u>	- .46	<u>-6.19</u>	<u>-7.01</u>
Entertainingness	<u>3.90</u>	.62	<u>-5.46</u>	<u>-3.33</u>
Sense of humor	<u>4.54</u>	.57	<u>-2.90</u>	<u>-2.41</u>
Height	1.38	2.88	.33	- .51
Good Looks	<u>7.23</u>	<u>.50</u>	<u>-5.63</u>	<u>-4.70</u>
Religiousness	<u>-2.44</u>	<u>-2.61</u>	<u>-4.47</u>	<u>-2.96</u>

1 - Positive entries indicate that English guises are evaluated more favorably than French, and minus entries indicate a more favorable evaluation for French guises.

2 - Underlined entries are significant at the .05 level, two-tailed t-tests.

3 - Positive entries indicate a more favorable view for English Canadians, and minus entries indicate a more favorable view for French Canadians.

REFERENCES

- Anisfeld, M., Bogo, N., and Lambert, W.E. Evaluational reactions to accented English speech. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1962, 65, 223-231.
- Kjeldergaard, P.M. Changes in perceived personality traits as a function of manipulations of vocal characteristics. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1963. (Mimeo)
- Kramer, E. The nonverbal aspects of voice: A review and a call for further research. Paper read at Michigan Academy of Arts, Sciences, and Letters, Ann Arbor, March 1962.
- Kramer, E. The judgement of personal characteristics and emotions from nonverbal properties of speech. Psychol. Bull., 1963, 60, 408-420.
- Lambert, W.E., Anisfeld, M., and Yeni-Komshian, Grace. Evaluational reactions of Jewish and Arab adolescents to dialect and language variations. Montreal: McGill University, 1963. (Mimeo)
- Lambert, W.E., Hodgson, R.C., Gardner, R.C., and Fillenbaum, S. Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1960, 60, 44-51.
- Licklider, J.C.R., and Miller, G.A. The perception of speech. In S.S. Stevens (Ed.) Handbook of experimental psychology. New York: Wiley, 1951.
- Markel, N.N., and Roblin, Gloria L. The effect of content on judgements of personality from voice. Paper read at EPA, New York, April 1963.
- Secord, P.L. Stereotyping and favorableness in the perception of Negro faces. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1959, 59, 309-314.