

## PLAGIARISM RULES AWARENESS STATEMENT

### **Fraud and Plagiarism**

Scientific integrity is the foundation of academic life. Utrecht University considers any form of scientific deception to be an extremely serious infraction. Utrecht University therefore expects every student to be aware of, and to abide by, the norms and values regarding scientific integrity.

The most important forms of deception that affect this integrity are fraud and plagiarism. Plagiarism is the copying of another person's work without proper acknowledgement, and it is a form of fraud. The following is a detailed explanation of what is considered to be fraud and plagiarism, with a few concrete examples. Please note that this is not a comprehensive list!

If fraud or plagiarism is detected, the study programme's Examination Committee may decide to impose sanctions. The most serious sanction that the committee can impose is to submit a request to the Executive Board of the University to expel the student from the study programme.

### **Plagiarism**

Plagiarism is the copying of another person's documents, ideas or lines of thought and presenting it as one's own work. You must always accurately indicate from whom you obtained ideas and insights, and you must constantly be aware of the difference between citing, paraphrasing and plagiarising. Students and staff must be very careful in citing sources; this concerns not only printed sources, but also information obtained from the Internet.

- The following issues will always be considered to be plagiarism:
- cutting and pasting text from digital sources, such as an encyclopaedia or digital periodicals, without quotation marks and footnotes;
- cutting and pasting text from the Internet without quotation marks and footnotes;
- copying printed materials, such as books, magazines or encyclopaedias, without quotation marks or footnotes;
- including a translation of one of the sources named above without quotation marks or footnotes;
- paraphrasing (parts of) the texts listed above without proper references: paraphrasing must be marked as such, by expressly mentioning the original author in the text or in a footnote, so that you do not give the impression that it is your own idea;
- copying sound, video or test materials from others without references, and presenting it as one's own work;
- submitting work done previously by the student without reference to the original paper, and presenting it as original work done in the context of the course, without the express permission of the course lecturer;
- copying the work of another student and presenting it as one's own work. If this is done with the consent of the other student, then he or she is also complicit in the plagiarism;
- when one of the authors of a group paper commits plagiarism, then the other co-authors are also complicit in plagiarism if they could or should have known that the person was committing plagiarism;
- submitting papers acquired from a commercial institution, such as an Internet site with summaries or papers, that were written by another person, whether or not that other person received payment for the work.

The rules for plagiarism also apply to rough drafts of papers or (parts of) theses sent to a lecturer for feedback, to the extent that submitting rough drafts for feedback is mentioned in the course handbook or the thesis regulations. The Education and Examination Regulations (Article 5.15) describe the formal procedure in case of suspicion of fraud and/or plagiarism, and the sanctions that can be imposed.

Ignorance of these rules is not an excuse. Each individual is responsible for their own behaviour. Utrecht University assumes that each student or staff member knows what fraud and plagiarism entail. For its part, Utrecht University works to ensure



that students are informed of the principles of scientific practice, which are taught as early as possible in the curriculum, and that students are informed of the institution's criteria for fraud and plagiarism, so that every student knows which norms they must abide by.

<b>I hereby declare that I have read and understood the above.</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Anouk Vos
<b>Student number:</b>	5498228
<b>Date and signature:</b>	27 June 2017

Submit this form to your supervisor when you begin writing your Bachelor's final paper or your Master's thesis.

Failure to submit or sign this form does not mean that no sanctions can be imposed if it appears that plagiarism has been committed in the paper.

# **Dutch Actors Speaking English**

BA Thesis English Language and Culture  
Utrecht University

Anouk Vos

5498228

British English

First Examiner: Allison Kirk

Second Examiner: Deborah Cole

Date: 27 June 2017

Word count: 4308

## **Abstract**

The aim of this study was to investigate whether Dutch actors can be perceived as native speakers of English, and if so, to what extent. It is stated by many studies that it is difficult to become native like when one starts learning a second language from an older age. But it is not clear if this is also the case for actors, who can practice their film lines and so their pronunciation of English. The findings of this study suggest that it is possible for Dutch actors to be perceived as native speakers of English, while acting. However, when the Dutch actors were speaking rather than acting, not all were perceived as native speakers. This suggests that context plays a role in the extent to which actors are judged as native or non-native speakers of English. Furthermore, both Dutch native speaking listeners and English native speaking listeners had the same perceptions of the actors in this study.

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
1. Theoretical background.....	3
1.1. Current study.....	5
2. Research question and Hypotheses.....	6
3. Method .....	7
3.1. Participants.....	7
3.2. Materials & Procedure.....	8
4. Results.....	9
4.1. Construct.....	9
4.2. Grades.....	11
4.3. Native Speaker.....	12
5. Discussion and conclusions.....	13
6. References.....	17
7. Appendices.....	19
7.1. Appendix 1 .....	19
7.2 Appendix 2.....	23

## 1. Theoretical background

There are many theories on learning a second language (L2). Multiple factors play a role in L2 learning. The most commonly used theory is the Critical Period Hypothesis. This hypothesis implies that the acquisition of a language needs to take place before a certain age in order for a speaker to become native like (Hummel, 2014). To obtain the best result of learning a second language, it is believed that people should start as soon and young as possible. That age and foreign language acquisition are intertwined, comes from the brain plasticity theory. This theory states that young children find it easier to learn a language, because of the differences in the brain functions. When becoming older, the brain becomes more organized and so it becomes more difficult to learn a language (Olsen & Samuels, 1973). Starting age has a significant effect on the success of learning a language. However, there has been much discussion concerning the precise connection between the age at which acquisition begins and ultimate proficiency in the L2. It is said that when people get older, it gets more difficult to become native like (Muñoz & Singleton, 2011).

Muñoz and Singleton (2011) state that success in an L2 is often related to the speech and performance of native speakers. Others believe that the speech of L2 users should not be compared to the speech of native speakers, but it should focus on the speech on its own (Muñoz & Singleton, 2011). This is supported by Piller (2002), who states that comparing the L2 to the L1 of a native speaker is not correct, since the native speakers are often conceived as monolinguals, while the L2 speakers are multilingual.

The area of L2 that is found to be most difficult to learn, is pronunciation. Late learners of an L2 tend to be less native like than the people who start in early childhood (Hummel, 2014). Early starters tend to be more indistinguishable from the native speakers of a language than late starters (Muñoz & Singleton, 2011). According to Muñoz (2006), the learning rate is much higher for older learners than for younger learners. Explicit skills such

as morphology and syntax are easier to learn for older learners than the implicit skill such as accent.

Hummel (2014) states that some learners have more success than others. Motivation, amount of input and training are suggested factors that play a role in this diversity among speakers. This is also supported by Piller (2002). Davies (2003) states that although it is difficult and rare, it is possible for L2 speakers of a language to become native like when learning the language at an older age. Piller (2002) found that passing as a native speaker depends on the context in which and the people to whom L2 speakers are talking, but that it is indeed possible.

According to Graham (1969) it is also noticed in the acting of performers, that coming across as a native speaker of a language is very difficult. The pronunciation of actors can help them transfer a story, so it is important for an accent to be convincing and native like (Pao, 2004). This is also supported by Lippi-Green (1997). She points out that the accent of a character is sometimes important, because it creates a more convincing feeling to the character's story. It can also be an indication that the story is taking place in a certain place or country. A foreign accent in the L2 sometimes restrict the roles an actor can play, but these accents are occasionally used for roles that suit the accent.

Graham (1969) states that being native like is achieved by being perseverant and having a great ability to imitate. Some performers can master a foreign language very well and others cannot. Also, Bongaerts (1999) explains that people that have a high motivation for professional reasons are more likely to become native like in an L2. For this to happen, actors go to accent training and hire dialect coaches, which is very expensive; however, it does not work for all actors (Lippi-Green, 1997). In contrast to Bongaerts, Neuhauser and Simpson (2007) point out that it can be very difficult to become native like, even when having a high motivation. It has been demonstrated that it is possible to determine if someone is a native or

non-native speaker of the language, even by untrained listeners (e.g., Munro et al., 2003; Neuhauser & Simpson, 2007). Flege (1984) found that listeners only need short speech recordings to recognize a foreign-accent.

### *1.1 Current Study*

There have been many studies that say that it is difficult to become native like when an L2 is learned at an older age. No studies have been conducted focussing solely on the accent of actors in working contexts versus more casual contexts. Therefore, the current study extends the issue to the field of acting. There is a question of whether actors can be perceived as native speakers of a language when they need to learn it for their work, or not. For this study, the attention will lay on the English pronunciation of the actor Michiel Huisman, and the actress Carice van Houten. They are both native speakers of Dutch and started acting in English films from a relatively older age.

Michiel Huisman said in an interview (Huisman, 2015, May) that he needed new challenges in his career, and so made the decision to go to the United States and live there. He states that, for professional reasons, he put much time and effort into becoming more native like and that he hired a dialect coach. This caused his Dutch accent to become less noticeable while talking English and it gave him the opportunity to play certain roles in big productions like *Game of Thrones* and *Age of Adaline*. Carice van Houten on the other hand, seems less motivated to be perceived as a native speaker of English. In an interview (van Houten, 2013, April) she claims that since she is not a native speaker of English, she understands that she will not get certain roles in English films. Also, if a director tells her to work on her accent, she will, but does not show the same motivation as Michiel Huisman does. To see if the Dutch actors can be perceived as native speakers of English, the following research question was formed:

To what extent are Dutch actors perceived as native speakers of English, specifically

in terms of pronunciation?

Both actors do not only speak English in their films, but also in interviews. Since they can train and practice the pronunciation of their film lines, there may be a difference between these two contexts. Talking in interviews is work related, but the setting is much more naturalistic than the acting context. What is not yet clear is whether the L2 pronunciation of actors differs between contexts. To assess whether context plays a role in the pronunciation of actors, the following subordinate question was shaped:

Is there a difference between the English accents of Dutch actors when acting and when talking freely in interviews?

Since the actors who are analysed here are Dutch, two different participant groups play a role in this study. There is a group with native speakers of English and a group with native speakers of Dutch to see if there will be a different perception between non-native speakers of English and native speakers of English. The second subordinate question is:

Is there a difference in the perception of the pronunciation of the actors between the native speaking listeners and non-native speaking listeners?

## **2. Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The following research questions and hypotheses were formulated in the present study:

1. To what extent are Dutch actors perceived as native speakers of English, specifically in terms of pronunciation?

To date, many studies have found mixed results regarding the possibility to become native like from an older age. Bongaerts (1999) states that it is possible, especially if one has high motivation. In contrast to his view, Neuhauser and Simpson (2007) write that it is almost not possible, even if the motivation is high. Thus, the null hypothesis was assumed, because it is not clear whether they will be able to be perceived as native speakers or not.

2. Is there a difference between the English accents of Dutch actors when acting and



when talking freely in interviews?

The hypothesis of this question is based on the findings of Piller (2002). She found that pronunciation depends upon the contexts and that L2 speakers tend to perform better in situations where they speak with someone they personally know. Since the actors work with people they know when they are filming, which is not the case while doing interviews, it is hypothesised that the English of the Dutch actors will be perceived more often as native in the acting contexts than in the interview contexts.

3. Is there a difference in the perception of the pronunciation of the actors between the native speaking listeners and non-native speaking listeners?

Based on the findings of Neuhauser and Simpson (2007) and Munro et al. (2003), it is hypothesised that the native speaking listeners will be able to identify the actors who are non-native speakers of English. As for the non-native speaking listeners, a null hypothesis is assumed, since this specific context has not been tested before.

### **3. Method**

#### *3.1 Participants*

In this study, a total of 86 individuals participated and completed a questionnaire. The participants were separated into two groups. Group 1 consisted of 34 native speakers of English; 52.9% (N = 18) were women and 47.1% (N = 16) were men. The participants' mean age was 40.88 years old (SD = 17.21), ranging from 18 years to 70 years old. The only condition was that they were native speakers of English. The accent and origin of the participants did not matter for this study.

Group 2 was formed by 52 native speakers of Dutch. 76.9% (N = 40) of these participants were women and 23.1% (N = 12) were men. The mean age of the participants in group 2 was 33.87 years old (SD = 14.944). The youngest participant was 16 years old and the oldest was 65.

### *3.2 Materials and Procedure*

Both groups of participants were asked to fill in a questionnaire. Group 1 got an English questionnaire (see appendix 1) and group 2 was asked to fill in a Dutch questionnaire (see appendix 2); the only difference between the questionnaires was the language. Both questionnaires contained five audio fragments. There were two audio fragments of Michiel Huisman, one of him speaking English while acting and one of him speaking English freely in an interview. The same types of the audio fragments were added for Carice van Houten. An extra audio fragment was added of a native speaker of English, namely a sound file of Aidan Gillen, who is an Irish actor. This actor was added as a control, to see if the participants would perceive him as a native speaker of English.

The audio fragments alternated between the actors, talking freely in interviews and between talking while acting. The order was Michiel Huisman acting (sound file 1), Carice van Houten acting (sound file 2), Aidan Gillen acting (sound file 3). After those, the sound files of Michiel Huisman (sound file 4) and Carice van Houten (sound file 5) being interviewed were added. This way, the participants would not notice that they were listening to the same persons twice and therefore, their answers would not get biased. The participants were not able to see the names of the actors they were hearing, as that could have biased their answers. They also did not know they were going to listen to actors.

Firstly, the participants were asked to listen to a sound file before answering the questions. To gain insight into the participants' general opinion about the pronunciation of the actors, a construct was made, which contained four questions about the interpretability of the pronunciation. A five point Likert scale was used for these questions. After those questions, the participants were asked to give the speaker in the sound file a grade for his/her pronunciation on a scale from 1 to 10. Lastly, a yes/no question was formulated, asking if the speaker in the audio fragment was a native speaker of English or not. These questions were

asked for all the audio fragments individually. The questionnaire ended with some general demographic questions about age, gender, and their own native language.

To analyse the data, SPSS was used to evaluate the overall grades, the differences between the actors and to see if there were any significant differences between the two groups of participants.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Construct

Firstly, it was examined whether there were any significant differences between the groups for the general perception of the pronunciation of the actors. A construct was formed by four questions to measure the interpretability of the pronunciation. Before the four questions could be taken together in a construct, the reliability of the construct was tested with Cronbach's alpha. As shown in Table 1, the construct was reliable for all the sound files, because the Cronbach's alphas were  $> 0.6$ . All four questions could be put together in the construct, and new mean scores were calculated for each of the sound files.

**Table 1** Reliability construct: Cronbach's alpha

<i>Sound file construct</i>	<i>Cronbach's alpha(<math>\alpha</math>)</i>
<i>Sound file 1</i>	0,89
<i>Sound file 2</i>	0,92
<i>Sound file 3</i>	0,91
<i>Sound file 4</i>	0,90
<i>Sound file 5</i>	0,85

Since the construct was reliable for all five audio fragments, the new mean scores were analysed with a t-test.

*Sound file 1*

Group 1 (N = 34) gave Michiel Huisman a mean score of 3.61 (SD = 1.01) and Group 2 (N = 52) gave him a mean score of 3.59 (1.04). The difference between the two groups was not significant;  $t(84) = .11, p = .917$ . These results suggest that Dutch natives and English natives do not have a different perception of the pronunciation in the sound file of Michiel Huisman acting.

*Sound file 2*

For sound file 2, Carice van Houten speaking English while acting, no significant difference was found in the scores of the native speakers of English (M = 4.44, SD = .73) and the native speakers of Dutch (M = 4.23, SD = .85);  $t(84) = 1.21, p = .229$ . This means that there was no difference in the perception of the interpretability between the two groups.

*Sound file 3*

Group 1 (N = 34) gave a mean score of 3.58 (SD = .87) and Group 2 (N = 52) gave Aidan Gillen a mean score of 3.58 (SD = .95). Again, there was no significant difference between the two groups while listening to Aidan Gillen;  $t(84) = -0.004, p = .997$ .

*Sound file 4*

There was no significant difference in the scores of native speakers of English (M = 3.90, SD = .77) and the native speakers of Dutch (M = 4.15, SD = .83);  $t(84) = -1.404, p = .164$ . These results suggest that, once again, native speakers of Dutch and native speakers of English did not have a different perception of the pronunciation of the sound file of Michiel Huisman talking freely in an interview.

*Sound file 5*

Lastly, group 1 (N = 34) gave a mean score of 4.24 (SD = .61), and Group 2 (N = 52) gave the speaker of sound file 5 a mean score of 3.97 (0.81). There was no significant difference in the scores of native speakers of English and the native speakers of Dutch;  $t(84) = 1.701, p = .093$ .

These results indicate that there is no difference between the two groups when it comes to the interpretability of the actors. This suggests that native speaker and non-native speakers of English do not have a different perception of the pronunciation.

#### 4.2 Grades

Next, the mean grades of both groups were calculated for each of the sound files, see Table 2.

**Table 2** Mean grades

<i>Grades</i>	English respondents		Dutch respondents	
	M	SD	M	SD
<i>Sound file 1</i>	7.32	2.156	7.46	1.362
<i>Sound file 2</i>	8.59	1.54	7.79	1.362
<i>Sound file 3</i>	7.18	1.749	7.17	7.53
<i>Sound file 4</i>	7.79	1.771	7.90	1.192
<i>Sound file 5</i>	7.79	1.388	6.65	1.532

The mean grades that were given by the groups were close together. The native speakers of English tended to give higher grades, but the differences were relatively small. The biggest difference can be seen in the grade for Carice van Houten talking freely, sound file 5. The native speakers of Dutch gave her a 6.65, which is 1.14 points lower than the 7.79 grade the English natives gave her. Also, sound file 2, of Carice van Houten acting, got a lower grade by native Dutch speakers than by the native English speakers (by 0.8 points). Another interesting score was the score of the Aidan Gillen. Both groups gave him lower scores for his pronunciation compared to the non-native speakers of English. There were no remarkable differences in grades between the two types of talking situations. Again, the scores for Carice van Houten varied the most between the two types of talking contexts.

Although there were small differences between Michiel Huisman's grades, these results

suggest that the pronunciation is not perceived differently between the two different contexts. For Carice van Houten, there was a difference between the two speaking scenarios.

#### 4.3 Native Speaker

The last thing that was questioned, was whether the speakers in the audio fragments were native speakers of English or not; see Table 3. For three sound files a vast majority of the participants said that the speaker was a native speaker of English.

**Table 3** Is the speaker of the sound file a native speaker of English or not?

Native speaker question	English respondents		Dutch respondents	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
<i>Sound file 1</i>	79.4% N=27	20.6% N=7	71.2% N=37	28.8% N=15
<i>Sound file 2</i>	58.8% N=20	41.2% N=14	34.6% N=18	65.4% N=34
<i>Sound file 3</i>	85.3% N=29	14.7% N=5	71.2% N=37	28.8% N=15
<i>Sound file 4</i>	82.4% N=28	17.6% N=6	63.5% N=33	36.5% N=19
<i>Sound file 5</i>	17,6% N=6	82.4% N=28	1,9% N=1	98,1% N=51

This was the case for sound file 1 (79.4% English yes; 71.2% Dutch yes), Sound file 3 (85.3% English yes; 71.2% Dutch yes) and sound file 4 (82.4% English yes; 63.5% Dutch yes). Those were the sound files of Michiel Huisman and Aidan Gillen.

Carice van Houten was not perceived as a native speaker of English in either sound file. Of the participants of group 1, 58.8% (N = 20) said she was a native speaker of English and 41.2% (N = 14) said she was not. The Dutch participants tended to say *no* even more, namely 65.4% (N = 34). Compared to the results for Michiel Huisman and Aidan Gillen, she was seen as a non-native speaker by much more of the participants. With sound file 5, the

number of people answering with *yes* was much lower than the number of people answering with *no*. Only 17.6% (N = 6) of group 1 said she was a native speaker and 82.4% (N = 28) answered with *no*. Only one person in group 2 saw her as a native speaker of English, and 98.1% (N = 51) did not.

These results suggest that it is possible for some non-native speakers of English to come across as a native speaker, but some do not. Although there were differences between the groups, they were only relatively small, which suggest that the two groups did have similar perception of the speakers in the audio fragments.

### **5. Discussion & Conclusion**

With this study I tried to find out whether Dutch actors can pass as native speakers of English and whether the speaking context plays a role. Firstly, I examined whether there were any differences between the perceptions of the two participant groups. This was in order to answer one of the subordinate questions, which asked whether there was a difference in the perception of the pronunciation of the actors between the native speaking listeners and non-native speaking listeners. Based on the finding that there was no significant difference between the participant groups, it can be said that the perception of the native speaking listeners and the non-native speaking listeners was the same. Overall, the scores that were given were relatively close together, but the Dutch participants tended to give lower grades and scores compared to the native English participants. They were harsher with their judgements of the actors. This might be explained by the fact that Dutch people have a certain image of English. In addition to the Dutch programs, Dutch television channels broadcast many English spoken programs and films. Many European countries dub English shows and films. Countries like Germany, Spain, French etc. tend to dub English television. Compared to those countries, the Netherlands dubs almost none of the films and programs, but uses subtitles. Only television programs meant for children have a tendency to be dubbed into

Dutch. So, Dutch people come across the English language quite often. However, these English programs and films are often spoken with standard accents, such as General American (GA) and Received Pronunciation (RP). This could be the reason that they judged the speakers more harshly than the native English speakers did: a variety that they do not hear as often might not have been perceived as good. Since the actors might not have the exact standard accents of GA or RP, their pronunciation was not assessed as highly as it was by the English participants.

Secondly, to answer the other subordinate question, I analysed whether there was a difference between the English accents of Dutch actors when acting and when talking freely in interviews or not. The results of this analysis indicate that there was a difference between the two actors. For Michiel Huisman, no significant difference was found between the two scenarios, which means that the context does not influence his accent. There was a difference between the contexts for Carice van Houten. The interview scenario was reviewed with a lower grade, and more people said she was not a native speaker of English compared to her speaking in the acting sound file. Only one of the Dutch participants stated that she was a native speaker in sound file 5, and six of the English participants stated this as well. The acting sound file was rated much higher, so the context did influence her pronunciation of English. This could possibly be explained by a finding of Piller (2002). She reports that non-native speakers tend to have more chance to sound native like when they are with people they know or have a relationship with. It is possible that Carice van Houten is able to come across as a native speaker of English while acting, as opposed to while having an interview with a stranger, because she is working with people she knows while acting. This is not necessarily the case for everyone. It might depend on one's command of English. If this is higher for a person, it does not play such a role. It is possible that Michiel Huisman's command of English is higher than that of Carice van Houten, which explains the difference between the two



actors.

We turn now to consider to what extent the Dutch actors can be perceived as native speakers of English. The results show that the Dutch actors can be perceived as native speakers of English, but not always, and not in every context. Overall, the interpretability of the three actors was relatively good. All mean scores were 3.58 or higher on a five point Likert scale, which is above average. The participants then got the question whether the actors were native speakers of English or not. In both scenarios, more participants perceived Michiel Huisman as a native speaker than as a non-native speaker. As for Carice van Houten, she was only perceived as a native speaker of English in the acting context and only by the English group of participants. The Dutch group of participants did not perceive her as a native speaker in either of the contexts. In the interview context, she was not seen as a native speaker by either participant groups.

According to Graham (1969), some people have a greater ability to imitate an accent and because of that become more native like than others. This might explain the difference between the two actors. However, it could also be explained by the amount of motivation, which is an important factor in becoming native like (Hummel, 2014; Bongaerts, 1999). Michiel Huisman claims that he has put much work into his accent and he lives in the United States, so he encounters English much more often. Carice van Houten also did not seem as motivated as Huisman was, which might be the reason why she did not come across as a native speaker in either context. Aidan Gillen was judged to be non-native by some of the participants of both groups. These results are likely explained by the fact that he is Irish, and his accent differs somewhat from the GA and RP varieties, therefore deviation from what most people see as a native speaker.

In further studies, it would be valuable to study only one particular accent, and to examine not only the accent of the speakers, but also that of the listeners. During this study,

the origin of the participants was not a restrictive condition. Some came from the United States, some from the United Kingdom and some from South-Africa. This could have influenced the results. One limitation of this study was that the Dutch participants were partially biased, because they recognized the voice of Carice van Houten in sound file 5, but not in sound file 2. Since they recognized her, the participants knew that she was not a native speaker of English. Another limitation to this study was the number of actors and sound files. In future research, more actors could be tested. Also, components like grammar and lexicon were not taken into account, which are options for further research, because these can also indicate if someone is a native speaker of a language or not.

To sum up, the results of this study indicate that it is possible for Dutch actors to be perceived as native speakers, but there are some limits. The extent to which someone is perceived as native like depends on the person and the context. This confirms the second hypothesis that was based on the findings of Piller (2002). The third hypothesis was disproved. The native speaking listeners were expected to be able to hear that the actors were not native speakers of English, but the majority judged them as natives.

## References

- Bongaerts, T. (1999). Ultimate attainment in L2 pronunciation: The case of very advanced late L2 Learners. In D. Birdsong (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and the critical period hypothesis* (pp. 133–159). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: Myth and reality* (C. Baker & N. H. Hornberger, Eds.). (pp. 3-4). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Flege, J. E. (1984). The detection of French accent by American listeners. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 76, 692-707. doi:10.1121/1.391256
- Graham, R. S. (1969). The music of language and the foreign accent. *The French Review*, 42, 445-451.
- Houten, C. van. [hiephoi058]. (2013, April). *Carice van Houten College Tour 2013*. [Video file]. Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v9ZeLGZefy4>
- Huisman, M. [RTL Late Night]. (2015, May). *Michiel Huisman: Nog lang niet op hoogtepunt - RTL LATE NIGHT*. [Video file]. Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6suAVc0-BqA>
- Hummel, K. M. (2014). *Introducing second language acquisition: Perspectives and practices*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States* (pp. 82-85). London: Routledge.
- Muñoz, C. (2006). The effects of age on foreign language learning: The BAF project. In C. Muñoz (Ed.), *Age and the rate of foreign language learning* (pp.1-40). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Muñoz, C. & Singleton, D. (2011). A critical review of age-related research on L2 ultimate attainment. *Language Teaching*, 44, 1–35.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444810000327>

- Munro, M. J., Derwing, T. M., & Burgess, C. S. (2003). The detection of foreign accent in backwards speech. In M-J. Solé, D. Recasens, & J. Romero (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 15th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences* (pp. 535–538). Barcelona, Spain: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Neuhauser, S., & Simpson, A. P. (2007). Imitated or authentic? Listeners' judgements of foreign accents. *International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, 16*, 1805-1808.
- Pao, A. C. Y. (2004). False accents: Embodied dialects and the characterization of ethnicity and nationality. *Theatre Topics, 14*, 353-372. <https://doi.org/10.1353/tt.2004.0008>
- Piller, I. (2002). Passing for a native speaker: Identity and success in second language learning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 6*, 179–206. doi:10.1111/1467-9481.00184
- Olson, L. L., & Jay Samuels, S. (1973). The relationship between age and accuracy of foreign language pronunciation. *The Journal of Educational Research, 66*, 263-268. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27536436>

## Appendix 1

### Survey

Hello,

First of all, I would like to thank you for your participation in this research. I am a student of English Language and Culture. For my Bachelor's thesis, I am conducting research on the pronunciation of English. This survey will only take approximately 10 minutes. There are multiple sound files in this survey, so an audio player is needed. Your responses are completely anonymous.

Thank you for participating in this research.

Kind regards,  
Anouk Vos

Please listen to the sound files first, before answering the questions.

#### Sound file 1 (Michiel Huisman, acting)

1. The speaker of sound file 1 speaks clearly:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

2. The speaker of sound file 1 speaks in an understandable /interpretable way:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

3. The speaker of sound file 1 speaks comprehensibly:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

4. The pronunciation of the speaker in sound file 1 is very good:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

5. Which grade would you give the speaker for his pronunciation in this sound file?

6. Do you think the speaker is a native speaker of English?

-Yes

-No

#### Sound file 2 (Carice van Houten, acting)

1. The speaker of sound file 2 speaks clearly:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

2. The speaker of sound file 2 speaks understandable:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

3. The speaker of sound file 2 speaks comprehensible:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

4. The pronunciation of the speaker in sound file 2 is very good:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

6. Which grade would you give the speaker for her pronunciation in this sound file?

7. Do you think the speaker is a native speaker of English?

-Yes

-No

### Sound file 3 (Aidan Gillen, acting)

1. The speaker of sound file 3 speaks clearly:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

2. The speaker of sound file 3 speaks in an understandable /interpretable way:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

3. The speaker of sound file 3 speaks comprehensibly:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

4. The pronunciation of the speaker in sound file 3 is very good:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

5. Which grade would you give the speaker for his pronunciation in this sound file?

6. Do you think the speaker is a native speaker of English?

-Yes

-No

### Sound file 4 (Michiel Huisman, interview):

1. The speaker of sound file 4 speaks clearly:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

2. The speaker of sound file 4 speaks understandable:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

3. The speaker of sound file 4 speaks comprehensible:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

4. The pronunciation of the speaker in sound file 4 is very good:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

6. Which grade would you give the speaker for his pronunciation in this sound file?

7. Do you think the speaker is a native speaker of English?

-Yes

-No

**Sound file 5** (Carice van Houten, interview):

1. The speaker of sound file 5 speaks clearly:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

2. The speaker of sound file 5 speaks understandable:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

3. The speaker of sound file 5 speaks comprehensible:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

4. The pronunciation of the speaker in sound file 5 is very good:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	agree	Strongly agree

6. Which grade would you give the speaker for her pronunciation in this sound file?

7. Do you think the speaker is a native speaker of English?

-Yes

-No

**General questions:**

What is your gender?

- male

- female

What is your age?

---

What is your native language?

---

In which country do you live?

---

END

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this survey. For questions, please contact [a.vos3@students.uu.nl](mailto:a.vos3@students.uu.nl)



## Appendix 2

### Vragenlijst

Hallo,

Ten eerste, alvast hartstikke bedankt voor je deelname aan mijn onderzoek. Voor mijn scriptie doe ik onderzoek naar de uitspraak van Engels. Het invullen van de vragenlijst duurt ongeveer 5 tot 10 minuten. Er zijn 5 geluidsfragmenten, deze zullen beluisterd moeten worden om de vragen te kunnen beantwoorden. De vragenlijst is geheel anoniem.

Met vriendelijke groet, Anouk Vos

luister naar het fragment voor het beantwoorden van de vragen

#### Sound file 1 (Michiel Huisman, acteren)

1. De spreker van geluidsfragment 1 spreekt duidelijk:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

2. De spreker van geluidsfragment 1 spreekt verstaanbaar:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

3. De spreker van geluidsfragment 1 spreekt begrijpelijk:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

4. De uitspraak van de spreker in geluidsfragment 1 is goed:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

5. Welk cijfer zou je de spreker geven voor zijn uitspraak?

6. Denk je dat Engels de moedertaal van de spreker is?

-ja

-nee

#### Sound file 2 (Carice van Houten, acteren)

1. De spreker van geluidsfragment 2 spreekt duidelijk:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

2. De spreker van geluidsfragment 2 spreekt verstaanbaar:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

3. De spreker van geluidsfragment 2 spreekt begrijpelijk:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

4. De uitspraak van de spreker in geluidsfragment 2 is goed:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

5. Welk cijfer zou je de spreker geven voor haar uitspraak?

6. Denk je dat Engels de moedertaal van de spreker is?

-ja

-nee

### Sound file 3 (Aidan Gillen, acteren)

1. De spreker van geluidsfragment 3 spreekt duidelijk:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

2. De spreker van geluidsfragment 3 spreekt verstaanbaar:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

3. De spreker van geluidsfragment 3 spreekt begrijpelijk:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

4. De uitspraak van de spreker in geluidsfragment 3 is goed:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

5. Welk cijfer zou je de spreker geven voor zijn uitspraak?

6. Denk je dat Engels de moedertaal van de spreker is?

-ja

-nee

### Sound file 4 (Michiel Huisman, interview)

1. De spreker van geluidsfragment 4 spreekt duidelijk:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

2. De spreker van geluidsfragment 4 spreekt verstaanbaar:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

3. De spreker van geluidsfragment 4 spreekt begrijpelijk:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

4. De uitspraak van de spreker in geluidsfragment 4 is goed:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

5. Welk cijfer zou je de spreker geven voor zijn uitspraak?

6. Denk je dat Engels de moedertaal van de spreker is?

-ja

-nee

### Sound File 5 (Carice van Houten, interview)

1. De spreker van geluidsfragment 5 spreekt duidelijk:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

2. De spreker van geluidsfragment 5 spreekt verstaanbaar:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

3. De spreker van geluidsfragment 5 spreekt begrijpelijk:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

4. De uitspraak van de spreker in geluidsfragment 5 is goed:

1	2	3	4	5
Geheel mee oneens	Oneens	Neutraal	Mee eens	Geheel mee eens

5. Welk cijfer zou je de spreker geven voor haar uitspraak?

6. Denk je dat Engels de moedertaal van de spreker is?

-ja

-nee

### Algemene vragen:

Geslacht:

- Vrouw

- Man

Leeftijd:

Ik ben..... Jaar oud

Moedertaal:

.....

Hartelijk dank voor je deelname! Voor vragen kan er gemaïld worden naar  
a.vos3@students.uu.nl