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ABSTRACT

Many studies have found that listeners prefer a standard dialect to a non-standard dialect. The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of Louisiana natives towards two non-standard dialects of the state.

Four Blacks and four Cajuns were recorded as they answered the question, "What would you do if you had a flat tire?" The most typical Black and Cajun speaker was chosen from each group.

An audience of 60 college seniors majoring in business were asked to listen to the two speech samples and rate the speakers on twelve personality traits. Six of the traits pertained to the speaker’s authoritativeness and the other six pertained to the speaker's character. Each listener was also asked to identify the two dialects and to indicate whether or not he was a Louisiana native.

The responses of the listeners were compared by the use of t tests. Only 34 per cent of the Louisiana natives could identify the two dialects. Within the group that could not identify the dialects there was a slight but insignificant preference for the Black on the character scales. This preference increased on the authoritativeness ratings and was significant at the .05 level. In the group
of natives who did recognize the dialects the difference on
the character scale was still insignificant but on the
authoritativeness scale the difference was significant at
the .01 level.

From the above it can be assumed that the majority of
Louisiana natives cannot correctly identify Black and Cajun
dialects on the basis of short conversational speech
samples. Among those who cannot identify them there is a
slight preference for the Black dialect. This preference is
increased among those who can identify the dialects.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

Does a speaker's dialect produce an effect on his audience independent of the effect produced by the message? This is an important consideration in a country with as many minority groups as the United States. In recent years the Civil Rights movement and all of its accompaniments have made a certain amount of social and economic mobility available to minority groups that these groups have not enjoyed before. Supposedly every person who applies for a job is evaluated by the potential employer on his skills alone. But is a person with a non-standard dialect hindered by his speech? Does his interviewer make unfavorable judgments about the personality, intelligence and ability of the non-standard speaker? According to the findings of previous research in the field, he probably does.

This study proposed to investigate the current attitudes of Louisiana natives towards the credibility of speakers of two minority group dialects in the state. The dialects studied were Louisiana-French (Cajun) and non-standard Southern Negro (Black).
In 1961, Harms found that listeners make judgments on the socio-economic status of speakers from listening to taped recordings of speech (3). Nine male natives of Ohio, ranging in age from 30-50 years old, made 40-60 second tape recordings of responses to questions like "How are you?", "Ask for the time," etc. The material was therefore relatively content free and similar to the kind of talk associated with an introduction situation. The Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Status Position was used to place the speakers in status groups according to educational background and occupation. High-status subjects held advanced degrees such as the Ph.D. or the D.D.S. and prestige occupations. Middle-status subjects were high school graduates with middle-class occupations. Low-status people were unskilled workers with less than eight years of schooling.

The listeners were 180 non-college adult residents of Ohio. They were also classified into three status groups according to the Hollingshead procedure. The listeners were told to try to guess the status of each speaker as well as to rate his credibility as a speaker. One speaker from each status group was heard by each audience of 60 members. The 60 members were also equally divided regarding the three status groups. Therefore, each audience of 20 high-status, 20 middle-status and 20 low-status members heard three speakers of varied status. The results show that listeners can accurately judge a speaker's status from listening to
speech samples of this sort and that listeners of various statuses associate high status with high credibility and low status with low credibility. Most listeners reported that they made their judgments after hearing only 10-15 seconds of the speech sample.

In 1960, Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillenbaum conducted a study of listeners' judgments of a speaker's personality based on his dialect (4). The study was conducted in Montreal where there is much tension between French-speaking Canadians and English-speaking Canadians. The experimenters made tape recordings of five "perfectly" bilingual speakers reading a 2½-minute passage of French prose of a philosophical nature. The same speakers then recorded the same passage in English. Bilingual speakers and a standard passage were used to minimize the effects of vocal differences and message.

The listeners were given copies of the message beforehand in order to get acquainted with the message and therefore to be able to focus their attention on the voices of the speakers. They were also given a response sheet for each voice which directed them to rate each speaker on fourteen traits using six-point scales. The scale values ranged from "very little" (fort peu, for French subjects) to "very much" (beaucoup). The traits considered were height, good looks, leadership, sense of humor, intelligence, religiousness, self-confidence, dependability, entertainingness, kindness, ambition, sociability, character and general
likeability. The rating was done while the voices played and during a 90-second interval between speakers.

The tapes were played to an English-speaking audience (EC) and then to a French-speaking audience (FC). The English sample consisted of 64 students in beginning psychology at McGill University. Their ages averaged 18.8 years, and both sexes were included in the group. English was the first language for all but nine of the group. The French sample consisted of 66 male students in their final year at a classical French collège in Montreal. Their average age was 18.2 years, and they were of about the same educational level as the EC sample. Their primary language was French with a distinctive French-Canadian accent. When the tapes were played to the EC audience they rated the speakers in the EC guises as being better looking, taller, more intelligent, dependable, kind, ambitious and as having more character than the speakers in FC guises. More interesting than this, however, is the fact that the FC students rated the EC guises even higher above the FC guises on nearly every trait. These results were interpreted to mean that people who speak Canadian French are considered to be second-class citizens by both EC's and at least certain subgroups of FC's.

In 1964, Lambert, Frankel and Tucker did a follow-up study of the above in order to investigate the development of bias among FC's against their own dialect (5). They chose for speakers six "perfect" bilinguals who spoke
educated versions of EC and FC. Two 15-year-old girls, two adult females and two adult males recorded two tapes each for a total of twelve tapes. The listeners were 373 FC schoolgirls from both public and private schools. They were placed into four age groups, with the average ages for the groups being 10, 12, 14, and 16. They listened to the twelve taped voices and were told to make judgments about the speakers' personalities. They were asked to rate each guise on fifteen traits with bipolar labels for each placed on the end of five-point rating scales. The personality traits being judged were consideration, intelligence, self confidence, wisdom, friendliness, interestingness, disposition, kindness, gentleness, trustworthiness, sense of humor, pleasantness, good looks, height, and religiousness. The listeners did not know they were listening to bilingual speakers.

The results indicate that the upper-class schoolgirls from the private schools began preferring EC to their own FC near the age of 12. This bias seems to continue strongly throughout the teen years. The lower-class girls from the public schools showed much less bias.

One of the first American studies of this kind was done by Anisfeld, Bogo, and Lambert in 1961 (1). They investigated how gentile and Jewish subjects reacted to "pure" English (E) and English with a Jewish accent (EJ). Four Jewish speakers recorded two readings each of a philosophical passage, one in E and one in EJ. The four
speakers were chosen by a panel of judges looking for an E
guise that sounded flawless in English expression and an EJ
guise that sounded genuinely Jewish rather than caricatured.
The eight recordings were played to mixed groups of Jewish
and non-Jewish college students enrolled in second and third
year psychology courses. The listeners were told that they
were being tested for their ability to judge personality
from voices. The listeners judged the speakers on humor,
self confidence, dependability, entertainingness, sociabil-
ity, character, general likeability, religiousness,
height, good looks, leadership, kindness, ambition, and
intelligence. They were also requested to guess the religion
of each speaker and to indicate what emotional reactions
each voice raised in them.

It was found that Jewish and gentile subjects rated
the E more favorably than the EJ on height, looks and leader-
ship. Only the Jewish subjects rated the EJ higher on sense
of humor, entertainingness, and kindness. There were no
significant differences for the Jewish subjects in their
ratings of the other eight traits nor on the quality of
emotional responses aroused by the different speakers. The
gentiles did not rate EJ more favorably than E on any trait.
The Jewish subjects incorrectly identified many more voices
using E as being EJ than did gentile subjects. As compared
with the Canadian studies this study seems to indicate that
Jewish people are not as biased against their minority
dialect as the FC in Canada are prejudiced against their own.
In 1967, Markel, Eisler, and Reese investigated the effects of dialect differences between native speakers on judgments of personality from voice (6). Thirty-one female college students between the ages of 18 and 21 who had been born and raised in Buffalo, New York, served as judges. Twelve female college students enrolled in an introductory psychology course and ranging in age from 18-21 were used as speakers. Six of the speakers were also born and raised in Buffalo. The other six were natives of New York City.

The researchers assumed that each speaker would possess the dialect of the region from which she came and that this dialect would be noticeable in her reading of a paragraph from a dialect test passage. The judges listened to the tapes and rated each speaker on a slightly modified form of the semantic differential. Instead of the standard seven-point scale, a six-point scale was employed which eliminated the "neutral" category. The adjective pairs used were kind-cruel, nice-awful, pleasant-unpleasant, strong-weak, loud-quiet, rugged-delicate, fast-slow, active-passive, and sharp-dull.

There was found to be a significant difference between the ratings for the Buffalo natives and the New York natives. These results indicate that untrained listeners are sensitive to a dialect variation of their language and may have stereotyped images of the personalities of speakers of dialects. Therefore, regional dialects are a significant factor in judging personality from voice.
In 1969, Tucker and Lambert conducted a study of white and Negro listeners reactions to various American dialects (8). Samples of taped speech of representatives of six American-English dialect groups were played to groups of Northern white, Southern white and Southern Negro college students. The six dialects used were:

- Network - Dialect of mass media;
- EWS - Educated white Southern;
- ENS - Educated Negro Southern;
- Mississippi Peer - Speech similar to the speech of the students from a small Negro college in Mississippi who were used as subjects;
- New York Alumni - Speech of the former students of the abovementioned college who have been living in New York since graduation; and
- Howard University - Speech of former students who are now at Howard University.

The listeners were told to rate the speakers on fifteen personality traits such as upbringing, intelligence, friendliness, ambition, etc. The findings show that all three groups of listeners clearly differentiated between the various dialects. All three groups found Network dialect to be the most favorable. Northern white and Southern Negro audiences both preferred ENS next. The Southern white group favored the EWS second with ENS third. The least favored dialect to the Negroes was EWS while the Northern and Southern whites both rated the Mississippi Peer the least favorably.

The most substantial American study of this type to
date is "The Effects of Negro and White Dialectal Variations upon Attitudes of College Students" by Joyce Buck of New York City Community College (2). In this study the researcher used four speakers reading the same passage from *Alice in Wonderland*. Standard white (SW), Standard Negro (SN), Non-Standard white (NW) and Non-Standard Negro (NN) speakers were used. The SW and SN were defined as speakers of the speech used by educated New York natives. The NW was the "New Yorkese" dialect characterized by dental [t], [d], [ŋ] ~ [ŋ], [æ] ~ [ɛə] and [a] ~ [ɔ]. The NN was defined as very similar to the Southern Negro dialect and was characterized by [ŋ] ~ [ŋ], [æ] ~ [æə], and [ɛ] ~ [ɛ] before [ŋ]. Two female classes in introductory voice and diction courses at Hunter College were the audiences. One class was asked to evaluate the dialects and the other class was asked to evaluate the speakers on competence and trustworthiness.

The results showed that standard dialect was favored over non-standard dialect with no preference shown between SW and WN. Standard speakers were rated more competent than non-standard speakers. This consistency breaks down on the trustworthy scale. NW was considered less trustworthy than SW, SN, and NN. In other words the NN was considered as trustworthy as the SW and SN. This inconsistency is the most intriguing part of the study. What if this kind of study were done in the South? Would white Southerners, who are much more exposed to Negro speech, react differently
from the New York natives? How would they evaluate an NN as compared to an NW dialect? Would they be more willing to accept non-standard speech from a Louisiana-Frenchman or from a Louisiana Negro?

One weakness of the Buck study was that the audience had been more exposed to the New Yorkese dialect all of their lives than to the Negro dialect. They had probably been cautioned by parents and teachers not to use it because of the low status it carries. Few of these upper-middle class women had ever heard a quantity of Negro speech, since they had little reason to engage in a speaking situation with a Negro. Because of this they may have had a built-in repulsion to the New Yorkese that was absent in their attitudes toward the Negro dialect.

Another weakness of the Buck study is also present in other studies of this nature. That is the use of a written message which is read by the speakers. Reading a written message creates an artificial speaking situation that is not encountered in daily circumstances. When a person applies for a job or meets his new neighbors, he not only uses the phonetic features peculiar to his dialect but also the phraseology, idioms, and verb constructions of it. So, in order to measure listeners' reactions to a particular dialect correctly, it is necessary to use the dialect in its entirety and not just the phonetic peculiarities.

In the present study the speakers were asked to reply to the question "What would you do if you had a flat tire?"
The use of such a message has the advantages of both a prepared written message and normal conversation with none of the disadvantages of either. As in a prepared written message, the effect of content is eliminated as a variable. Also, as in a written message, subjects are forced to use many of the same words. Words such as "car," "tire," "flat," "lug," "jack," and "trunk" are used by all of the speakers and are therefore available for phonetic comparison. But simultaneously, such a message has the phrasing, sentence structures, and grammar of the individual speakers. Because it is a sample of spontaneous speech, it more closely approximates conversational speech than would a written message.

Stated in null forms the hypotheses for this study are as follows:

1. The majority of Louisiana natives cannot correctly identify Black dialect or Cajun dialect.

2. Attitudes of Louisiana natives towards the competence of a Black speaker do not differ significantly from the attitudes toward the competence of a Cajun speaker.

3. Attitudes of Louisiana natives towards the trustworthiness of a Black speaker do not differ from the attitudes towards the trustworthiness of a Cajun speaker.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

*Louisiana native* was defined as any person who considered himself to be one. If a person had not lived all of his life in Louisiana and was in doubt as to his status,
it was decided on the basis of where he lived the first five years of his life.

**Non-standard Southern Negro speech** (Black) was defined according to the characteristics given in C. M. Wise's *Applied Phonetics* (9). These characteristics are \([θ, ʃ] \sim [ʃ, ν], [ɛ] \text{ before } [d] \sim [eɪ], [ai] \text{ before } [r] \sim [a]\) and other such features attributed to Black dialect.

**Louisiana-French dialect** (Cajun) was likewise defined according to the features described by Wise. These characteristics include \([s] \sim [z]\), plural \([s]\) often omitted, \([er] \sim [e]\), \([ou] \sim [o]\) and other features commonly used to distinguish Cajun dialect.
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METHODOLOGY

SPEAKERS

For this study only two speakers were needed. It was necessary to have a 2-3-minute speech sample from typical and identifiable representatives of the Black and Cajun dialects. In order to get one satisfactory representative of each dialect, several speakers of each dialect were recorded. The researcher then sent tapes of three Blacks and three Cajuns to a panel of three Speech professors who work with dialects. The panel consisted of Dr. M. F. Hopkins, Assistant Professor of Speech; Dr. C. L. Shaver, Professor of Speech and Dr. J. D. Ragsdale, Associate Professor of Speech at Louisiana State University. After listening to the tapes, the panel recommended that more extreme or characteristic representatives of the dialects should be sought. The researcher finally decided upon a freshman from Delcambre, a small settlement near Abbeville, for the Cajun representative. He was 20 years old and learned English after he enrolled in elementary school. His grandparents spoke only French and his parents learned English after reaching adulthood. Since no student could be found with Black dialect strong enough for the purposes of
the study, the Black representative used was a 35-year-old Baton Rouge native employed as a janitor by the University. The final decision as to the fidelity of the tapes to the two dialects was made by Dr. Ragsdale.

MESSAGE

A major weakness in previous studies of this nature concerns the message. All previous studies have used written messages that were read aloud by the speakers. As mentioned earlier, such a performance eliminates the use of the speaker's own phraseology, idioms, and verb constructions. It reduces dialect differences to merely phonetic differences. A speaking situation was, therefore, desired in which each speaker would be relating the same information in his own style. The most obvious solution was to have each speaker describe the same event, process, or object. In order to obtain a constant flow of conversational speech it was decided to have the speakers describe a process. Since all of the subjects were male it was decided that they would all describe the process of changing a flat tire.

When a subject arrived to be taped he was told that his speech sample would consist of his answer to the question "What would you do if you had a flat tire?" The subject was given time to organize his thoughts and orally present the steps in changing a flat tire before actually taping his answer. Due to this practice speech a number of hesitancies, pauses, and stutterings were eliminated from the taped
speech. However, the speech was still fresh and spontaneous with many individual differences in phrasing, rate, and length. In general, the Black speakers spoke at a slower rate, were less repetitious, and less wordy than the Cajun speakers. The Cajuns talked at a much faster rate in general but used a considerable amount of rephrasing and self-correcting so that they spoke for a longer period of time than the Blacks. Such differences would not have existed had the subjects been asked to read a written message.

LISTENERS

The listeners chosen for the study were members of a Marketing class, Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge. The fifty-nine class members were Seniors in Business Administration, Personnel Management, Office Administration, and other business-related fields. Such a class was chosen because of the probability that many of the members would eventually be employers and the assumption that they had been exposed to little, if any, dialect study. An audience of speech majors was specifically avoided because of a possible above-average sensitivity to dialect differences.

MEASURING INSTRUMENT

Each listener received two sets of the semantic differential scales as discussed in J. C. McCroskey's "Scales for the Measurement of Ethos" (7) plus a cover sheet of directions. The semantic differential scale was used to
record the listeners' attitudes toward the speaker and thereby to measure the speakers' ethos or credibility. The test employs 12 pairs of adjectives with each pair on a seven-point bipolar scale. The listeners rate the speaker by marking the blank that best describes the speaker's ranking on the particular characteristic being measured. Six of the adjective pairs pertain to the speaker's perceived authoritativeness. They are:

- Reliable-Unreliable
- Informed-Uninformed
- Qualified-Unqualified
- Intelligent-Unintelligent
- Valuable-Worthless
- Expert-Inexpert

The other six adjectives pertain to the speaker's character. They are:

- Honest-Dishonest
- Pleasant-Unpleasant
- Friendly-Unfriendly
- Unselfish-Selfish
- Nice-Awful
- Virtuous-Sinful

By having listeners fill out such a rating scale a researcher can compare the ethos ratings of speakers. By removing all variables except dialect differences between the two speakers, it is possible to determine the effect of dialects on a speaker's ethos.

On the cover sheet of directions a blank was provided for each listener to indicate whether or not he considered himself to be a Louisiana native. A place was also provided for the listeners to identify the dialects of the speakers, but this was not explained until after all of the rating was completed.
PROCEDURE

The instructor of the class informed the students that they would participate in an experimental study instead of hearing a lecture. The researcher was introduced as a Master's candidate involved in thesis research. Neither the department nor the field of study were mentioned. While the researcher was setting up the tape recorder, an assistant distributed the rating scales to the audience. The researcher then read aloud the directions printed on the cover sheet of the scales. The listeners were told that they would hear two speakers tell how to change a flat tire. They were cautioned to focus their attention on the voices rather than on the material presented. They were encouraged to use their imaginations as to what the speakers were like just from hearing the voices. At no time were terms such as accent or dialect mentioned. After it was determined that all of the listeners understood their task they were asked to indicate on the blank provided whether or not they considered themselves to be Louisiana natives. If a student expressed doubt, he was told to decide upon the basis of where he lived the first five years of his life.

Introduced only as Speaker Number One, the tape of the Black subject was played to the audience. After listening, the audience rated the speaker on the first rating blank. The tape of the Cajun, introduced as Speaker Number Two, was played and afterward the listeners marked the second rating blank. When everyone had completed the rating sheets, the
audience was asked to identify the dialects they had heard. The sheets were collected and the purpose of the study was explained to the class.
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RESULTS

The 59-member audience consisted of 47 Louisiana natives and 12 non-natives. Of the Louisiana natives, only 15 of the 47 (34 per cent) could correctly identify both the Black and the Cajun dialects. Assuming that the audience was a random sample, then it may also be assumed that only 34 per cent of all Louisiana natives could correctly identify both of the dialects in question when given no other clue as to the identity of the speakers. Three of the twelve (25 per cent) non-natives in the audience correctly identified the two dialects. However, since this study was mainly concerned with the reaction of Louisiana natives to Louisiana dialects the responses of the non-natives were considered as one group.

The responses of the audience on the ethos scales were compared by the use of \( t \) tests and the results are shown in Table 1. On the scales used by the listeners in this study, the most favorable adjective in each pair was on the left so that low scores mean more favorable ratings. As the chart indicates, the 12 non-natives in the audience rated the Cajun speaker slightly more favorable than the Black speaker on both authoritativness and character. However, in neither case was the difference significant at the .05 level. The
Table 1
The Mean Values and t Values of the Listeners' Responses to the Measurement of Authoritativeness and Character of a Black Speaker (X₁) and a Cajun Speaker (X₂)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X₁</th>
<th>X₂</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Natives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritativeness</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.476 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.06 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natives Who Did Not Recognize Dialects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritativeness</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>2.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.23 (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natives Who Recognized Dialects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritativeness</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.108**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.84 (ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05
** P < .01
main concern of this study was the responses of the Louisiana natives and these are examined in detail below.

In the group of 32 natives who did not recognize the dialects there was a slight but insignificant preference for the Black dialect shown on the character scale. The mean for the Black was 3.02 while the mean for the Cajun was 3.45, resulting in a $t$ value of 1.23 which was not significant at the .05 level. There was, however, a significant difference in the ratings of the authoritativeness of the two speakers. The mean value for the Black was 4.26 as compared to 5.01 for the Cajun, resulting in a $t$ value of 2.27 which was significant at the .05 level.

As is to be expected from the findings of previous studies, the most significant difference in the ratings of the two speakers came from the 15 natives who recognized the two dialects. They rated the Black slightly higher ($\bar{x} = 3.25$) than the Cajun ($\bar{x} = 3.60$) in character but the difference was not significant. On the authoritativeness scale, however, the mean value for the Black was 4.30 as compared to 5.43 for the Cajun resulting in a $t$ value of 2.27 which was significant at the .01 level.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In view of the results stated above the following statements can be made:

A. The majority of Louisiana natives cannot correctly identify Black and Cajun dialects on the basis of short,
conversational speech samples.

B. Among natives who cannot recognize the two dialects there is a slight tendency to prefer the Black dialect over the Cajun dialect. That such a preference would occur among people who cannot identify the dialects in question seems to indicate that there are features within the dialects that may affect the listeners' responses to the speakers.

C. The tendency to prefer the Black dialect is increased greatly among natives who can correctly identify both dialects. The difference is still insignificant on the character rating but on the rating of a speaker's authoritativeness it is significant at the .01 level. This finding supports the findings of previous studies that listeners who are sensitive to dialect variations of their own language may have stereotyped images of the personalities of speakers of dialects.

The findings of this study support the findings of previous studies that a speaker's dialect produces an effect on his audience independent of the effect of the message. The earlier studies found that listeners have stereotyped images of the personality and intelligence of users of dialects and that a speaker's credibility is to some extent determined by his dialect. This study went further in its examination of the reactions of listeners who were unable to identify the dialects being used. The fact that such listeners also discriminated between the two dialects
indicated that a dialect itself, even when not associated with a stereotyped image, produces an effect on the audience. Therefore, speakers of some non-standard dialects may be more hindered by their speech than are speakers of other non-standard dialects. The findings of this study indicate that in Louisiana, a user of Cajun dialect is at more of a disadvantage than is a user of Black speech.

Any generalizations made from this study should be limited to college audiences. Future studies in this area should include the use of non-college audiences as well as student audiences. It is possible that an audience of college students would have more liberal attitudes toward a Black speaker than would an audience of plant workers or housewives. Studies using other dialects such as New Orleans or North Louisiana speech are possible. Every state has social dialects available for use in such a study. Spanish in Texas and Chinese in San Francisco are examples. More research is needed in this area because the United States has such a large variety of dialects and as this study and previous studies have discovered, dialects do affect listeners' attitudes towards speakers.
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