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Introduction

- Loanword variation

[source pronunciation]

[more source-like adaptation]  [less source-like adaptation]

e.g., Iraq [ʔiˈraq]

[ɪˈɾɑk]  [aɪˈræk]
Introduction

- Loanword variation
  - production
    - social indexations
    - indexical order (Silverstein 2003)
  - perception
    - social indexations and evaluations
    - comparison to production
    - different methods of elicitation (considering metalinguistic awareness)
Background

- Variation in production
  - Intensity of language contact
    - degree of bilingualism of the individual (Kang 2010, de Jong and Cho 2012)
Background

- Variation in production
  - Intensity of language contact
  - Other social factors related to language contact
    - receptiveness to language contact
      - purist ideology (Poplack et al. 1988, Thomason 2001)
      - self-reported multilingualism (Silva et al. 2011)
Background

- Variation in production
  - Intensity of language contact
  - Other social factors related to language contact
  - Further disconnected indexations
    - socioeconomic status and prestige (Boberg 1999)
    - political identity (Hall-Lew et al. 2010, 2012)
    - global-/national-ist ideology and persona (Silva et al. 2011*, Jaggers 2016, 2017)

*my interpretation
Background

- Variation in production
  - Indexical order
    (Silverstein 2003)
Background

- Variation in production
  - Indexical order
    (Silverstein 2003)

(Hall-Lew et al. 2010)
Background

- Variation in production
  - Indexical order
    (Silverstein 2003)

Language contact receptiveness

Attitude

Globalism

(Jaggers 2016)
Background

- Variation in production
  - Indexical order
    (Silverstein 2003)

language contact receptiveness

globalism

Ir[æ]q Chil[i] [kwə]bec

Ir[a]q Chil[e] [kɛ]bec

(Jaggers 2016)
Background

- Considering perception
  - Are the same indexations activated for the listener?
    - perception may line up with production (e.g., Campbell-Kibler 2007, Staum Casasanto 2009)
    - or it may not (e.g., Niedzielski 1999, Boughton 2006)
Background

- Considering perception
  - Are the same indexations activated for the listener?
  - Does this variable carry additional evaluations?
    - ‘pleasantness’ and ‘correctness’ (Preston 1999)
    - possible impacts or ramifications (e.g., Rubin and Smith 1990, Purnell, Idsardi, and Baugh 1999)
Background

- Considering perception
  - Are the same indexations activated for the listener?
  - Does this variable carry additional evaluations?
  - Do aspects of the listener influence perception?
    - listener variety or social group (e.g., Kerswill and Williams 1999, Hay et al. 2006, Yuasa 2010)
    - context/assumptions (e.g., Niedzielski 1999, Hay et al. 2006)
Background

- Considering perception
  - Are the same indexations activated for the listener?
  - Does this variable carry additional evaluations?
  - Do aspects of the listener influence perception?
  - Does method matter (and how)?
    - matched-guise vs. metalinguistic commentary (comb'd: e.g., Coupland et al. 1999)
      - Lambert et al. 1960
      - Preston 1989
    - How might differences in the results reflect nuances of indexicality?
Methods

- Online survey
- Participants
  - 400 participants (recruited via MTurk)
  - only eligible if native, monolingual speakers of American English
Methods

Task 1: Matched-guise

- Framing
  - Listen to news report; answer questions about report and reporter.
  - Instructed to listen with headphones in quiet area.
## Methods

### Task 1: Matched-guise

- **Framing**
- **Stimulus**
  - News report (~1min)
  - Mainstream US English
  - Re: international commerce
  - Variable placenames throughout
  - **Manipulation:**
    - hear all *unnatived* variants
    - or all *nativized* variants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Unnativized (Source-like)</th>
<th>Nativized (‘nativized’)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>[ˈbudəpɛʃt]</td>
<td>[ˈbudəpɛʃt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>[ˈʧile]</td>
<td>[ˈʧi-li]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>[koˈlɔmbiə]</td>
<td>[kəˈlɔmbiə]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>[ɪˈrək]</td>
<td>[ərˈæk]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>[ˈpaːkɪstən]</td>
<td>[ˈpaːkɪstæn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>[ˈpaːɾəgwai]</td>
<td>[ˈpaːɾəgwæ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>[kəˈbɛk]</td>
<td>[kwəˈbɛk]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>[ʃænhaɪ]</td>
<td>[ʃænhaɪ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>[tænzə'niə]</td>
<td>[tænzə'niə]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>[ˈtokjo]</td>
<td>[ˈtokio]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methods

Task 1: Matched-guise

- Framing
- Stimulus
- Elicitation
  - Comprehension check
  - 7-point Likert scales re: evaluations of ‘pleasantness’ and ‘correctness’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How pleasant was the reporter to listen to?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How experienced did the reporter sound?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very inexperienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How smart did the reporter sound?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How knowledgeable did the reporter seem regarding international current events?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How likely do you think it is that the reporter is multilingual (i.e., also speaks a language other than English) vs. monolingual (i.e., speaks only English)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>surely monolingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What size station do you think this report might have been broadcast from?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>small/local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What political leaning do you think this station might have?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How well could you understand the report?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>impossible to understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How trustworthy do you think the report was?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Methods

## Task 1: Matched-guise

- **Framing**
- **Stimulus**
- **Elicitation**
  - Comprehension check
  - 7-point Likert scales re: evaluations of ‘pleasantness’ and ‘correctness’;
  
  relevant social indexations: global orientation, political orientation, multilingualism

### How pleasant was the reporter to listen to?
- **Very pleasant**
- **Very unpleasant**

### How experienced did the reporter sound?
- **Very inexperienced**
- **Very experienced**

### How smart did the reporter sound?
- **Very intelligent**
- **Very unintelligent**

### How knowledgeable did the reporter seem regarding international current events?
- **Very knowledgeable**
- **Very unknowledgeable**

### How likely do you think it is that the reporter is multilingual (i.e., also speaks a language other than English) vs. monolingual (i.e., speaks only English)?
- **Surely monolingual**
- **Surely multilingual**

### What size station do you think this report might have been broadcast from?
- **Small/local**
- **Regional/national**
- **Global/international**

### What political leaning do you think this station might have?
- **Very liberal**
- **Very conservative**

### How well could you understand the report?
- **Impossible to understand**
- **Easy to understand**

### How trustworthy do you think the report was?
- **Very reliable**
- **Very unreliable**
Methods

Interim task:

- Self-reported pronunciation

When you say the word ‘Iraq’, which does your pronunciation of the underlined vowel sound more similar to?

- ‘rack’
- ‘rock’
## Methods

### Task 2: Metalinguistic ratings

If you heard someone speaking English pronounce ‘Iraq’, ‘Quebec’ and ‘Chile’, for example, as /eye-rack/, /kwuh-beck/ and /chill-ee/ instead of /ear-rock/, /keh-beck/ and /chee-lay/, how might you think about them along the following factors?

(Half of participants given reverse prompt.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unkind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unintelligent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uneducated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower-class upbringing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle-class upbringing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper-class upbringing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humble</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretentious</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politically liberal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politically conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrow-minded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open-minded</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely monolingual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely multilingual</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Task 1:
Matched-guise
- multilingualism
- global audience orientation
- reporting experience
→ global linguistic market

Results

Task 2:
Explicit ratings
- multilingualism
- open-mindedness
- prestige, linguistic security
+ political identity
Results

Considering factors of the participant:

- (no sig. effects identified in matched-guise results)
- interaction w/ participant political identity
  - political identity – main effect: more source-like = more liberal
    more so for listeners who identify as liberal
  - class/SES – main effect: more source-like = higher class
    more so for listeners who identify as liberal

→ in-group identifier and class/prestige marker
Results

Considering factors of the participant:

- (no sig. effects identified in matched-guise results)
- interaction w/ participant political identity
- condition as target-self match (w/ ‘Iraq’ self-reporting)
  - intelligence: mismatch = less intelligent
  - open-mindedness: mismatch = more narrow-minded

→ in-group preference
Results

Considering factors of the participant:

- (no sig. effects identified in matched-guise results)
- interaction w/ participant political identity
- condition as target-self match (w/ ‘Iraq’ self-reporting)
  - intelligence: mismatch = less intelligent
    interaction: stronger when eval. of less source-like ($p=.054$)
  - open-mindedness: mismatch = more narrow-minded
  - (political identity: mismatch = more conservative)

→ in-group preference (and a hint at linguistic security)
Conclusions

Perception ~ Production:

- similar indexations and evaluations
  - globalism, global orientation, open-mindedness
  - multilingualism
  - prestige and linguistic security
  - political identity

- seeming asymmetries in *activation*
  - political identity activated only explicitly
  - some associations activated stronger for different listeners
Conclusions

Discussion

- Impact
  - The use of more source-like loanword pronunciations appears to carry capital in what might be considered the *global linguistic market*. (Bordieu 1977, Piller 2001, Zhang 2005)
  - However, this could cost capital at the national/local level.
Conclusions

Discussion

- Impact

- Theoretical implications
  - the global linguistic market and the relation of English to it
  - indexical order of loanword variation: political indexicality as a result of global-/national-ism; but not just a mere byproduct
    (indexical order and social reconstrual: Silverstein 2003; Eckert 2008)
  - indexical order and indexical activation
  - methodology and the use of explicit elicitation