

RACIAL IDENTITY AS A FACTOR IN PRESERVICE AND INSERVICE  
TEACHERS' EVALUATIONS OF STUDENTS WHO SPEAK STANDARD  
AMERICAN AND AFRICAN AMERICAN VERNACULAR ENGLISH DIALECTS

by

BROOKE DENISE CHAPMAN

(Under the direction of Donald Rubin, Ph. D.)

ABSTRACT

This study examines teachers' linguistic stereotypes of their students and the impact of those stereotypes on teachers' expectations of student academic achievement. Specifically, the study focuses on the teachers' evaluations of students who speak Standard American English (SAE) versus African American Vernacular English (AAVE). Matched guise technique was used to create the dialect samples, which were presented through a web-based data collection process. The study also incorporates teaching experience and racial identity of the teacher as independent variables. Results show that students who speak AAVE are evaluated more negatively with regard to superiority and classroom expectations than are students who speak SAE. Euro American teachers of lower levels of racial identity development harbor especially negative attitudes toward speakers of AAVE. Teaching experience had no effect on these linguistic stereotypes.

INDEX WORDS: African American Vernacular English (AAVE), Standard American English (SAE), Teachers' Expectations, Language Attitudes

RACIAL IDENTITY AS A FACTOR IN PRESERVICE AND INSERVICE  
TEACHERS' EVALUATIONS OF STUDENTS WHO SPEAK STANDARD  
AMERICAN AND AFRICAN AMERICAN VERNACULAR ENGLISH DIALECTS

by

BROOKE DENISE CHAPMAN

B. A., Auburn University, 2000

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2002

© 2002

Brooke Denise Chapman

All Rights Reserved

RACIAL IDENTITY AS A FACTOR IN PRESERVICE AND INSERVICE  
TEACHERS' EVALUATIONS OF STUDENTS WHO SPEAK STANDARD  
AMERICAN AND AFRICAN AMERICAN VERNACULAR ENGLISH DIALECTS

by

BROOKE DENISE CHAPMAN

Approved:

Major Professor: Donald Rubin

Committee: Tina Harris  
Jerold Hale

Electronic Version Approved  
Gordhan L. Patel  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
August 2002

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank the following people for their assistance and support during the course of this project:

Dr. Donald Rubin, for his patience, insights, and constant reminders to me of the importance of this project, and for pushing for my improvement,

Dr. Sean Hendricks, for the incredible amount of work he did on the technological aspects of this project and for teaching me a little bit of his trade,

Dr. Tina Harris, Dr. Shawn Glynn, and Dr. Jerold Hale, for their interest, enthusiasm, and understanding during the completion of this project,

My friends in Athens, GA, for supporting me through the entire graduate school experience,

My family, especially my mother, for never ceasing to believe in my potential, Stephen Wadsworth, for listening to my brainstorming, complaining, frustrations, elations, and loving me through it all.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Research Questions.....	2
2 TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS AND THE ACHIEVEMENT OF MINORITY STUDENTS.....	4
Language Attitudes Theory and Research.....	5
Racial Identity.....	13
Hypotheses.....	17
3 METHODS.....	21
Participants.....	21
Stimulus Materials.....	23
Procedures.....	26
Dependent Measures.....	28
Analysis.....	33
4 RESULTS.....	36
Hypotheses.....	37
Open Ended Responses.....	45

5	DISCUSSION .....	48
	Limitations of the Study.....	51
	Implications for Further Research .....	52
	Significance of this Study .....	56
	REFERENCES .....	59
	APPENDICES .....	70
A	CONSENT FORM.....	70
B	DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE.....	72
C	SPEECH EVALUATION INSTRUMENT AND INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT.....	73
D	BLACK RACIAL IDENTITY ATTITUDES SCALE.....	76
E	WHITE RACIAL IDENTITY ATTITUDES SCALE.....	79
F	OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS.....	82
G	DEBRIEFING FORM.....	83
H	MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR FIVE DEPENDENT VARIABLES AND MARKER VARIABLE – DIALECT BY VOICE...85	

## LIST OF TABLES

## TABLES

1	Means and Standard Deviations for Five Dependent Variables for the Total Sample.....	36
2	Means and Standard Deviations for Five Dependent Variables for Euro-American Sample Only.....	37
3	Summary of ANOVAs for Three SEI Subscales.....	38
4	Means and Standard Deviations for the Six White Racial Identity Subscales.....	39
5	Zero Order Correlations among the Six White Racial Identity Subscales.	40
6	Stepwise Multiple Regressions of White Racial Identity Subscales on Three SEI Variables.....	41
7	Summary of ANOVAs for Two Indicators of Academic Achievement...	42
8	Crosstabulation of Student Dialect by Predicted Diploma Track.....	42
9	Crosstabulation of Student Dialect by Predicted Diploma Track for Preservice Teachers Only.....	44
10	Crosstabulation of Student Dialect by Predicted Diploma Track for Inservice Teachers Only.....	44
11	Stepwise Multiple Regressions of White Racial Identity Subscales on Two Indicators of Academic Achievement.....	45

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

On December 18, 1996, the Oakland, California, school board passed a resolution which recognized Ebonics, or Black English, as a separate language and recommended that it be used as a tool to teach African American children to speak Standard American English (SAE) (Oakland School Board, 1998; Williams, 1997). This proposal sparked controversy among educators, members of the media, and members of the African American community. Many people felt that it was important to train educators in how to teach students to speak SAE without belittling their use of African American Vernacular English (AAVE), or Ebonics, while others criticized the resolution, claiming that calling attention to this language was ridiculous or simply a stereotype of African Americans (Boyce, 1996; Haberman, 1996; Holmes, 1996; Lewis, 1996; Williams, 1997).

Ideally, such stereotyping should not play a role in educational decisions (e.g., classroom activities and student assessments), but unfortunately, there is reason to believe that it does. In the United States, people of different regions, races, and ethnicities are educated in the same classrooms, yet they are not always treated equitably. In particular, there exists a gap between the performances of black and white Americans in the education system (Oakland School Board, 1998; Persell, 2000). According to Persell (2000), the National Assessment of Educational Progress and the College Board's Advanced Placement Program exams show that, with the exception of Asian students,

minority students are outperformed by white students. This performance gap may be due in some part to teachers' linguistically mediated attitudes and expectations.

The purpose of this study is to investigate one dimension by which teachers create perceptions of their students. Specifically, this study will focus on language attitudes. Based on the dialect in which a student speaks, either SAE or AAVE, it is anticipated that the teacher will make certain assumptions about the student's level of intelligence, competence, social status, and other variables. Moreover, it is anticipated that this linguistic stereotyping process will be mediated by the teachers' racial identities - not only their demographic race, but their degree of identification with their racially defined reference group. Thus, this study will synthesize two constructs which are closely related and yet have not previously been studied together. Combining the concepts of language attitudes and racial identity will possibly result in a more fine grained understanding of social judgment processes, including those that come into play in many public school classrooms.

### Research Questions

RQ1: How do teachers evaluate speakers of SAE and AAVE with respect to (1) superiority, (2) social attractiveness, and (3) dynamism?

RQ1a: How do these evaluations differ for experienced and inexperienced teachers?

RQ1b: How do Euro American teachers' measured racial identities affect their evaluations of SAE and AAVE speaking students?

RQ2: What are teachers' expectations for school achievement for SAE speakers and AAVE speakers?

RQ2a: How do these expectations differ for experienced and inexperienced teachers?

RQ2b: How do Euro American teachers' measured racial identities affect their evaluations of SAE and AAVE speaking students?

## CHAPTER 2

### TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS AND THE ACHIEVEMENT OF MINORITY STUDENTS

The achievement gap between minority and majority students in U. S. public schools has been a concern for many educators. In their classic Pygmalion in the classroom study, Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) did not examine language factors per se, but they did ascertain powerful effects of teacher expectancies on student achievement. The research design manipulated teacher expectancies regarding students' labeled as "spurters" - actually randomly selected sample of 20% of the students in an ethnically mixed elementary school. One goal of this research was to discover if expectancy advantages interacted with the students' age, purported ability (fast, medium, or slow track), sex, and minority group status. In their study, Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) found that all students had an advantage when their teachers expected them to bloom intellectually. Lower-class students who were experimentally identified to teachers as "spurters" were likewise advantaged over those who were not thus labeled. These teacher expectations acted as self fulfilling prophecies. Rosenthal and Jacobson believed that the mechanism by which teacher expectations affected student achievement related to the attention which teachers bestowed on the students. They gave students for whom they had high expectations extra attention in the classroom, whereas those for whom they had no such expectations were relatively ignored.

Although the Pygmalion study was replicated by Rosenthal and his associates and garnered wide acceptance, it also received many criticisms. Other researchers failed to replicate Rosenthal's results, pointing to an abundance of methodological errors (for a review of literature see Elashoff & Snow, 1971; Grieger, 1971; Rubovits & Maehr, 1971; Spitz, 1999). What the Pygmalion studies do point out, however, is that there may very well be other factors besides a student's scholastic ability that may put him or her at a disadvantage in the classroom. Any such factor which puts any student at a disadvantage due to teacher attitudes, including the student's use of the English language, should be addressed.

#### Language Attitudes Theory and Research

Since language variety is a major marker of group identity, judging speakers according to their dialects has probably been a fact of social life for as long as humans have differentiated themselves by clan. For example, the Bible records that the early Israelites required strangers to utter the word "shibboleth" to determine who was an in-group and who was an out-group member. Those who could not pronounce it as the Israelites did were slaughtered (Judges 12:5-6). This phenomenon of judging a person based on the sound of his or her voice is still relevant today. In the 1995 O. J. Simpson trial, the prosecution brought forth a witness who did not see Simpson on the night of the murders but claimed to hear the voice of a black man. Also, ABC News reported in February that two African Americans who were inquiring about an apartment were discriminated against by the realtor because they sounded black over the telephone. When the St. Louis Equal Housing Opportunity Council (EHOC) received a complaint from Rosa Rice, one of the two people involved in the discrimination, they conducted an

informal experiment to find out if her claim was true. EHOOC found that, when Euro Americans called the realtor, they were all given an appointment to see the apartment, whereas the African American callers were told that there was nothing available to rent. Other studies have shown that listeners do typically evaluate people who use nonstandard forms of English, especially those who “sound black,” more negatively than those who speak standard American English (SAE) (Purnell, Idsardi, & Baugh, 1999).

When humans interact with one another, they form attitudes about each other based upon personal characteristics. These attitudes are in part the result of stereotypes that people hold about certain groups to which they attribute membership to the person with whom they are interacting. One of the many sources of information that people process to form such attitudes about each other is the other’s use of language. Specifically, people form stereotyped attitudes based on social dialects, the grammar usage, word choice, verbal style, and pronunciation associated with particular social groups. This is known as “linguistic stereotyping” (Seligman, Tucker, & Lambert, 1972).

Edwards (1999) further refined a theory about language attitudes. He distinguished three possible explanations for differing attitudes about language. The first possibility holds that one language variety may actually be superior to another. Although this may be a popular argument against slang and highly stigmatized dialects or languages, Edwards points out that we know very little about the grammatical structures of these languages and dialects (in particular, black English) and that there are no scientific bases to justify beliefs about linguistic superiority. Second, although a language may not be superior to another as far as development and grammar is concerned, it may simply be more aesthetically pleasing. Aesthetic qualities, however,

are not intrinsic to a language variety; rather, they reflect cultural learning (Cargile & Giles, 1997). Finally, the most convincing argument is that a language variety produces stereotypes about the groups that speak it. Edwards also states that, because of the previous work done in the field, we should already have some idea as to how speakers of any English dialect (in the United States of Great Britain) will be perceived.

Much research has been done on diverse aspects of the linguistic stereotype hypothesis over the past half century (see reviews in Bradac 1990; Edwards 1982; Giles & Powesland, 1975). The seminal social scientific research on language and attitude, however, was conducted by Canadian researchers interested in stereotypes associated with Francophone and Anglophone speakers in Quebec (Lambert & Tucker, 1972). Their primary method of research, known as the Matched Guise Technique, required participants to listen to different speech samples spoken by the same speaker in different languages, dialects, or accents. The Matched Guise Technique allowed the researchers to draw conclusions about how people evaluate the use of language without other variables (e. g. vocal quality, physical appearance, etc.) creating an interaction effect. Upon hearing the speech samples, participants were asked to evaluate the speakers using a semantic differential scale.

Lambert and his associates were motivated in part by their concerns about the impact of language attitudes on educational outcomes. In particular, they were concerned - in light of other contemporaneous research on teachers' self-fulfilling expectations of students (e.g., Rosenthal, 1992) - that teachers might be biased against students who spoke low prestige language varieties. Indeed, their subsequent research on this topic (Seligman, Tucker & Lambert, 1972) did indeed demonstrate that Francophone students

who were otherwise equivalent to Anglophone students were expected by listeners to do more poorly in school. Moreover, their otherwise equivalent academic work products received lower evaluations. Similar language and attitude research in the U.S. confirmed that speakers of low prestige varieties of English were evaluated as incompetent, not trustworthy, unambitious, disorganized, disagreeable, and uncooperative (Buck, 1968; de la Zerda & Hopper, 1979).

#### Teachers' Attitudes Toward Nonstandard Speech

Researchers were likewise concerned about the educational impact of language attitudes for the achievement of speakers of nonmainstream English. In particular, Williams (1976) conducted a number of studies exploring the linguistic attitudes of teachers, and the impact these might have on their expectations for student achievement. Specifically, he examines attitude formation as it relates to standard American English, African American English, and English with a Mexican accent. The first such study, known as the Chicago research, focuses on standard American English and African American English. In this study, black and white teachers listened to samples of speech given by 20 black and 20 white students. The speech samples were then rated on a semantic differential scale. The results of this semantic differential scale produced two major factors which Williams (1976) labeled "confidence-eagerness" and "ethnicity-nonstandardness" (p. 31). These two factors showed that listeners tended to associate sounding disadvantaged or lower class with the child being "unsure in the speech situation, but even more so with his sounding ethnic and nonstandard in his language usage" (Williams, 1976, p. 39). Based on these findings, we can assume that standard

American English is positively related to his perceived status, and that this social-evaluative dynamic is replicated in public school classrooms every day.

Effects of Race of the Listener. Of particular interest in Williams' (1976) study were findings that examined differing reactions to nonstandard dialects with respect to the race of the teachers, as their race had significant impact on the results of the study. For instance, "ratings of a child's race were more of a central correlate of factor II (ethnicity-nonstandardness) for White teachers than for [Black] teachers" (Williams, 1976, p.39). Ratings of race were also more correlated with status judgments for white teachers than for black teachers, as white teachers identified more white students as high status and mistakenly identified many black children in the high status category as being white.

In William's (1976) Texas research, participants were shown videos of a child belonging to one of six groups: Anglo middle status, Anglo low status, Black middle status, Black low status, Mexican American middle status, and Mexican American low status. Each video showed the children speaking on the same subject, and participants were also given background information on the children's families in order to manipulate status. The study incorporated a similar semantic differential scale that produced the same two factors (confidence-eagerness and ethnicity-nonstandardness) that the Chicago research did. Participants were white and black teachers. Teaching experience was also a factor in this study, as participants were asked how many years they had been teaching. This study re-emphasized results of past studies. It also revealed that teacher's expectations of student performance were influenced by language attitudes, with students

speaking nonstandard English being evaluated more negatively. Teaching experience, however, had no effect on the two factors.

A major contribution of Williams' work was to examine not just the race and dialect of the speaker, but also the race of the listener who was evaluating the speaker. It is important to recognize that attitudes of mainstream speakers might differ considerably from those of members of minority communities. However, only a few other studies have examined language attitudes of minority group members (e. g., Garner & Rubin, 1986; Hoover, 1990; Linn & Piche, 1982).

#### African American Vernacular English

Taylor's (1999) study on Ebonics, also termed African American Vernacular English (AAVE) or Black English (BE), reinforces much of what has been previously studied on the subject. Although much is not known about the structure and development of AAVE, it is stated that the dialect does have legitimate linguistic roots in African languages and various other American dialects (Smitherman, 1994; Taylor, 1999). However, many white listeners perceive the dialect as being "slang, mutant, lazy, defective, ungrammatical, or broken English" (Linguistic Society of America, cited in Taylor, 1999, p. 38). These assertions about Black English are both false and demeaning to those who speak it. Yet many people, even educators, believe that AAVE is substandard, and this apparently negatively affects their expectations for AAVE speaking students. Based on this and other research (e.g., Harris, 1997; McWhorter, 2000; Smitherman, 1994; Williams, 1997), the following can be asserted about AAVE:

1. AAVE has legitimate historic roots, as do other languages,
2. AAVE is capable of expressing high level mental capacities,

3. AAVE has a well-described and regular linguistic structure, with distinctive features including the verb ending “in” and the word “be,”
4. AAVE is socially stigmatized, but there is no linguistic basis for that stigma.

Although SAE is considered to be superior to AAVE, there is at least one group of people who prefer AAVE to SAE. A recent study showed that African American children find AAVE speakers more likeable and more competent than speakers of SAE (Koch & Gross, 1997). In this study, African American children listened to tapes of AAVE and SAE speakers which were made using the Matched Guise Technique (Lambert & Tucker, 1972). These findings show that African American children who use AAVE at home are more comfortable hearing and using AAVE in other settings. Children who are corrected when they use AAVE, then, may feel embarrassed and unsure of him or herself and will therefore withdraw from classroom interaction (Dandy, 1991).

How, then, can educators be more sensitive to the needs of AAVE speakers? Dandy (1991) suggests that students should still be allowed to speak AAVE in the classroom without fear of reprimand, as correcting them in front of their peers can have a negative effect on their self esteem. Teacher education and awareness about AAVE could be the key to improving methods of teaching SAE to students (Dandy, 1991; Harris, 1997); however, whether such a program is successful or if it has even been implemented is yet to be seen. Students who engage in code switching, or the ability to speak both SAE and AAVE, have the greatest advantage in the classroom because, although they have not given up their dialect, they can also speak correct English that makes them “appear intelligent” to their teachers (Harris, 1997; McWhorter, 2000;).

## Effects of Social Identity of the Listener

Race, both of the speaker and of the listener, has been shown to be an important factor in determining linguistic attitudes. However, more important than race is the social identity that is carried along with membership in a racial or ethnic group. This is because any aspect of one's social identity may be more salient or important to different people, demanding different sets of social rules be followed (Collier, 1988).

Cargile and Giles (1997) have conducted one of the few studies of language and attitude that includes the listener's social identity. They focused their study on perceptions of Standard American English (SAE) as it is spoken with varying degrees of a Japanese accent. Not only did they manipulate the speaker's accent, but they also had each of the four speakers deliver an aggressive and non-aggressive message. Social identity of the listener was treated as an outcome of listening to the accented speech rather than as an independent variable that might affect how the listener would respond to accented speech. They found that the nature of the message, not the accent in which it was spoken, caused emotional arousal in listeners. Aggressive speakers were viewed more negatively than non-aggressive speakers. Participants also reported feeling more pleasure when listening to the speaker with a standard American accent, and they perceived the American speakers as more attractive.

A key element of this study is that it recognizes that social identities are not fixed and homogenous, but rather individuals even within a single demographic category may vary in the strength with which they affiliate with that social group. That is, a person may be demographically categorized as "Italian-American" or "Southern," but some people feel more Italian-American than others, and a Southerner may feel her Southern

identity more strongly at some times than at others. Cargile and Giles (1997) reasoned that “the salience of one’s social identity is determined by the *accessibility* of any given social identity, and the degree of *fit* between a social identity and the situation (context)” (p. 198). Salience was operationalized by asking the participants if they felt American while listening to the speech samples and if the speech samples made them conscious of the fact that they were American. Results about social identities were mixed, as the listeners reported more salient identities after listening to Japanese accented speech but no increase in the strength of their identities with exposure to the more pronounced Japanese accents.

### Racial Identity

Racial identity is a psychological state in which a part of a person’s self concept is created based on their race (Helms, 1990). For the purposes of this study, the effects of racial identity on the language attitudes of teachers will be examined. Because both black and white teachers will be used as participants, it is necessary to implement measures of both black and white racial identity.

#### Black racial identity

The process of developing black racial identity is a complicated one. According to many scholars (Cross, 1991; Dubois, 1903/1993; Gaines & Reed, 1995; Helms, 1990; Orbe & Harris, 2001; Sampson, 1999), African Americans operate under a dual identity. That is, “the process of becoming an African American involves becoming both an American and not an American, being both successful and unsuccessful, and being both proud and ashamed of the same acts and abilities because of the fundamental rift created by membership in a group socially defined as negative” (Gaines & Reed, 1995, p. 97).

Dubois (1903/1993) explains African American dual identity by stating that the group that disparages blacks also defines them. This duality is the result of the history of slavery. African Americans believe in American ideals of individuality and equality; however, they may also be faced with feelings of inferiority as a result of slavery in America. They also embrace African ideals such as collectivism which contradict with their American identity. Because of this complexity, black identity can be difficult to establish.

Because of this dual identity, many African Americans have an interesting view of achievement, including academic achievement. Fordham (1988) points out that African Americans “do not view the accomplishments of individual members of the group as evidence of the advancement of the entire group; instead, they more often define Black achievement in terms of the collectivity” (p. 54). Because the classroom is an arena where individual, not collective, achievements are preferred, African American students must reject their group’s views in order to be successful academically (Fordham, 1988). African Americans who wish to succeed in the classroom as well as in other competitive arenas do so at the risk of being accused of “trying to be white” by their black peers, that is, denying their black racial identity (Bell, 1990; Fordham, 1988; Harris, 1997; Hoberman, 2000; Persell, 2000). These educated blacks hold a “tenuous position located somewhere between [their] fellow blacks and the dominant whites” (Hoberman, 2000, p. 50).

Helms (1990a) argues that black identity is formed through a four-stage process. An African American may or may not progress through all of the stages, and he or she may remain at one stage indefinitely or pass through it more quickly than others. This

model, developed from Cross' (1978, 1991) earlier model of Nigrescence as well as Thomas' model, on which Cross' model was built. Thomas and Cross' models attempt to explain the process by which someone "becomes black." Although the two models do not deal with the same points of transition in the process of becoming black, they "both place considerable importance on understanding the dynamics of the [Black] personality and/or worldview... and on the need for temporary withdrawal into Blackness" (Cross, 1978, p. 19).

Helms closely adapts her stage model to that of Cross. Her model is made up of four stages which she calls preencounter, encounter, immersion/emersion, and internalization. In the preencounter or conformity stage, African Americans shape their identity by what white society tells them they are. Most in this stage even believe in the negative stereotypes about the black population, devaluing blackness and valuing things that are considered white. In the encounter or dissonance stage, African Americans have some salient experience with racism which causes them to question their original self identity and to embrace their blackness. This stage is exciting yet confusing, as the individual is learning more about what it means to be black while at the same time questioning the racist views of society. The immersion/emersion stage occurs when African Americans withdraw themselves psychologically and/or physically from white society and attempt to define their black identity. The final stage, internalization, occurs when one's identity becomes well defined. Here, African Americans develop a positive racial group commitment that is not based on society's beliefs about their group.

Helms' Black Racial Identity Scale has been subjected to criticism, as black identity theory is formed in conjunction with European development theories (Johnson,

2001). Johnson (2001), for example, says that a true Black Identity theory “must be brought forth from the ideas that address the distinct psychology of African Americans as a whole that are directly linked to their culture” (p. 408). Phinney (1992, 1993) gives us another stage type theory that explains black (as well as other “microcultural”) identity development. These stages include unexamined identity, conformity, resistance/separation, and integration. Each stage parallels Helms’ (1990) stages, although the resistance/separation stage includes more of the conflict that Gaines and Reed (1995) describe between two conflicting identities. Orbe and Harris (2001) also point out that this stage model is not linear but instead operates as a continuous loop. It is possible that individuals will repeat stages at different points in their lives.

#### White Racial Identity

Unlike black identity, white identity is not defined by involvement in the ingroup. In fact, many white people do not realize they are white (Helms, 1990a). Helms and Carter (1990) identify white identity in terms of the racist attitudes of the majority (white) group. Because white Americans are the majority, they perceive whiteness as being “normal” and therefore do not take race into account when defining their self-concept. Race only becomes salient for whites when they are aware of a person of color (Helms & Carter, 1990; Nakayama & Martin, 1999; Sampson, 1999). It is also important to note that America’s move towards a color blind society does not necessarily mean equality and disappearance of racism but instead a lack of contact between white individuals and people of color as well as continuation of white dominance in American society (Nakayama & Martin, 1999).

Helms and Carter (1990) have developed a stage model that illustrates how white identity is developed. The model is made up of five stages: contact, disintegration, reintegration, pseudo-independence, and autonomy. Whites in the contact stage are the least likely to view themselves as white. They are oblivious to race and other cultural issues and may have limited interaction with people of color. They are also most likely to be unaware of their participation in racism and feel satisfied with the racial status quo. In the disintegration stage, individuals become aware of racial issues. This stage may produce some feelings of guilt about discrimination, and individuals may deny that they are involved in the discrimination process. However, they still have limited interactions with African Americans and therefore have limited understanding of black culture. The reintegration stage produces feelings of anger and possibly overt acts of racism. Whites begin to idealize white culture and react negatively towards black culture. The fourth stage, pseudo-independence, occurs when whites begin to understand black culture and “the unfair benefits of growing up White in the United States” (Helms & Carter, 1990, p. 68). Finally, in the autonomy stage, the individual has developed a non-racist white identity and a more complete understanding of other cultures. At this point in white identity development, white people feel the need to rid the world of racism and discrimination.

### Hypotheses

There is no question that people make judgments about one another based on the way that those others talk. Coupling this information with a psychological variable, namely racial identity, may help educators to understand better some factors about how they evaluate their students and encourage those educators to take measures to treat their

students more fairly. Using the research questions posed in the introduction, the following hypotheses have been developed.

H1: Both preservice and inservice teachers will evaluate speakers of SAE higher on the superiority scale, more socially attractive, and more dynamic than speakers of AAVE.

Past research (Buck, 1968; de la Zerda and Hopper, 1979; McWhorter, 2000; Seligman, Lambert, & Tucker, 1972; Taylor, 1999; Williams, 1976; Zahn & Hopper, 1985) has shown that people evaluate speakers of nonstandard English more negatively than they do speakers of SAE. These same results are expected to be replicated in the present study.

H1a: Preservice teachers will evaluate speakers of AAVE as higher on the social superiority scale, more socially attractive, and more dynamic than will inservice teachers.

Although inservice teachers have had more classroom experience than preservice teachers, this experience will not give them a more positive view of students who speak AAVE. Preservice teachers will no doubt be more sensitized to AAVE as well as other cultural differences among students because they will have more recently studied them in their teacher education classes in college. It should be noted, however, that previous research comparing preservice and inservice teachers on language attitudes have found no differences (Piché, Michlin, Rubin & Sullivan, 1977; Williams, 1976). Other studies have found that some students support multicultural education while others are resistant to it (Caudill, 1998).

H1b: There will be a direct linear relationship between racial identity development and evaluations of speakers of AAVE. That is, the higher a white teacher scores on a more advanced measure of racial identity development, the more positive will be her/his rating

of African American students in regards to superiority, social attractiveness, and dynamism.

As noted by Helms and Carter (1990), as white people progress from stage to stage along the white racial identity model, they become more aware of cultural issues facing both blacks and whites. They recognize that racism is a problem in the United States and learn about both black and white culture. This allows them to more fully recognize the differences between the cultures without using them as a means of prejudice or discrimination. A white person in the advanced stages of racial identity development, therefore, would be more likely to view AAVE not as a substandard way of speaking but as a valid cultural marker.

H2: Both inservice and preservice teachers will evaluate speakers of SAE as having higher grades, having fewer absences, and more likely to be pursuing a more academically-oriented diploma than speakers of AAVE.

Hypothesis 2 and its related hypotheses parallel the predictions set forth in Hypothesis 1. Shuy (1973) discovered that many school systems were putting extra emphasis on learning one standard version of English. He says that “[i]t was generally asserted that inadequate language meant the absence of accepted school language and the first step toward learning required the acquisition of school English” (p. 301). In other words, students who did not speak SAE would be unable to perform well in school. Williams (1976) found significant differences for academic achievement between Mexican and Euro American students based on their speech patterns. In his studies, he discovered that teachers assigned higher grades to Euro American students in language arts and language arts related subjects that they did to Mexican American students.

Another alarming study showed that businessmen who heard audio samples of professional African Americans thought that they worked in lower status jobs such as salesmen and mechanics, when in fact these men were doctors and professors (Shuy, 1970, cited in Williams, 1976).

H2a: Preservice teachers will evaluate speakers of AAVE as having higher grades, having fewer absences, and pursuing a more advanced diploma than will inservice teachers.

As mentioned earlier, prior research (Piche, Michlin, Rubin & Sullivan, 1977; Williams, 1976) does not support this claim. However, changes in teacher education curriculum over the years should indicate that preservice teachers are receiving proper training on how to teach students who speak nonstandard English and on how to better understand their own attitude formation.

H2b: There will be a direct linear relationship between racial identity development and evaluations of speakers of AAVE. That is, the higher a white teacher scores on a more advanced measure of racial identity development, the more positive will be her/his rating of African American students in regards to GPA, attendance, and diploma track.

These assertions follow the same logic as those made in H1b. Euro American teachers whose scores are high in the lower levels of white racial identity are more likely to hold racist attitudes and therefore judge AAVE speakers more negatively. On the other hand, those teachers whose white racial identity has progressed will have a better understanding of African American culture and will therefore not view AAVE as a nonstandard way of speaking.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODS

#### Participants

Although the exact number of respondents who logged onto the data collection website cannot be ascertained, a total of 63 K-12 teachers completed the surveys and submitted their data and therefore served as participants. Of these, 54 identified themselves as Caucasian, 7 identified themselves as African American, 1 was identified as Hispanic, and one did not identify a race.

Twenty-one of the participants were inservice teachers. That is, these teachers had their own classrooms and had a large range of classroom experience, from one to twenty-one years leading their own classes, with one teacher not indicating level of experience (mean = 8.94, sd = 8.95, N = 20). The other 42 participants were preservice teachers. These participants were teacher education students whose only classroom experience was in the form of volunteer work, teaching practicum, or internships. Most members of this group had no supervised classroom teaching experience at all. One rationale for comparing preservice and inservice teachers was to determine whether preservice teachers were receiving sufficient preparation to enable them to assess students fairly based on their level of cultural sensitivity. Although inservice teachers may have more experience dealing with students of different races and ethnicities, preservice teachers are still in their training process and are exposed to multicultural appreciation in their college courses. Therefore, preservice teachers might be more aware

of their biases and knowledgeable in how to correct these biases. Such differences due to the experience of preservice teachers might disappear with increasing multicultural experience among in-service teachers.

Participants were solicited directly from school systems and colleges of education in Alabama and Georgia, Historically Black Colleges and Universities throughout the Southeast, and also on relevant computer list serves including National Education Association Education Support Professionals list, the National Middle School Association discussion board, the National Council of Teachers of English K-6, middle school, high school, and multicultural education list serves, and the Kappa Kappa Psi - Tau Beta Sigma Honorary Band Fraternity and Sorority national and southeast district list serve. Originally, no incentives were provided to participants.

Online participation would potentially allow for a larger, more diverse participant pool, allowing teachers of all races, levels of experience, and areas of the country to participate. It would also allow for randomization of the speech samples that were used as stimuli in this study. In addition, online participation would eliminate any bias created by researcher interaction. Because of the method of their recruitment and participation (unsupervised, on-line, self-administration), there is no way of knowing the true universe from which these participants were drawn, nor is there any way to verify that they were indeed the individuals they self-identified as. There was also a possibility that participants would not have access to the latest computer technology and that they would become bored waiting for each page of the survey to load. These disadvantages of internet-based recruitment and task administration is one limitation of this study, but it is

a limitation deemed worth accepting in exchange for the advantages offered by this method of recruitment and administration.

Due to difficulties in recruiting a sufficient number of participants, class credit was offered to University of Georgia education students during the end of data collection. These students were recruited from a basic foundations of education class that is required of all preservice education majors, a course on second language acquisition required for ESoL endorsement, and a course on teaching for cross cultural understanding which was also part of the ESoL endorsement requirement.

### Stimulus Materials

Matched guise AAVE/ SAE speech samples were used in this study. The advantage of the matched guise technique is that idiosyncratic speaker characteristics that affect listener judgments--such as vocal quality or rate of speech-- are held constant across the two language varieties, since each speaker produces a sample of each dialect variety (citation). In order to avoid the interference of other variables extraneous to the research questions, gender of the speaker and topic discussed in the speech sample were held constant.

Six male students at a large primarily white Southeastern university volunteered to tape record speech samples in which they retold the plot of an episode of “The Simpsons,” a humorous and popular cartoon show. College students were used as the source of the speech samples after initial efforts failed to locate younger males who were able to engage in credible code switching under the speech sampling conditions. Speakers viewed a short video clip and then spoke about what they saw in the clip for

about one minute. Each speaker recorded several samples, at least one in SAE and at least one other in AAVE.

To select and validate the speech samples to be eventually presented to the study participants, the speech samples were first subjected to a pilot test. Fifty-nine students at a large Southeastern university responded to them on a series of attitude/identification scales. A paired sample t-test was used to determine if participants were able to detect a difference between the SAE and AAVE samples. Responses to 7-interval semantic differential items relating to race (“sounds African American/sounds European American” and “probably a black person/probably a white person”) were analyzed. Two pairs of guises (i.e., two dialects samples produced by each of two different speakers) were eventually selected for presentation to study participants. They were selected such that one set was produced by a native speaker of AAVE (mean difference =  $-.85$ ,  $sd = 1.61$ ,  $t(38) = -3.27$ ) and one by a native speaker of SAE (mean difference =  $-3.80$ ,  $sd = 2.34$ ,  $t(19) = -7.26$ ). In the case of both selected voices, the mean difference between SAE and AAVE guises on the pilot testing were statistically significant at  $p < .05$  and in the appropriate direction (i.e., AAVE guise rated more likely to be a black person than the SAE version). No linguistic analysis of these speech samples was conducted. Two voices, each of which made one speech sample in AAVE and one sample in SAE, were used in this study. Using two speakers rather than one would ensure that the findings were not confounded by some other variable (e. g. pitch, rate of speech, volume) and therefore would increase the generalizeability of the findings. However, because of the small sample size, speaker was not factored out in the ANOVAs as a third variable along with dialect and teaching experience.<sup>1</sup>

Speech samples were presented to study participants on the internet via audio channel only. It was desirable, however, to provide listeners with photographs to help focus their attention on the speech judgment task while sitting at their computer consoles. On the other hand, it is known that the physical attractiveness of students powerfully affects teachers' judgments (Chia, Allred, Grossnickle, & Lee, 1998; Kenealy & Frude, 1991; Seligman et. al., 1972), and therefore it was necessary to devise a visual focus that would not introduce physical attractiveness as a contaminating variable. Accordingly, a different photograph of an ethnically diverse group of students was presented with each sample. The photographs depicted both black and white young adolescents in classroom settings. The photographs were blurred by means of photo editing software to further avoid introducing physical attractiveness as a variable.

To determine whether stimulus voices were being ethnically identified as intended, marker scales were inserted into the questionnaire and a manipulation check analysis was performed. The reliability of the marker scale as ascertained as follows: Three marker scales ("sounds African American/Black...sounds European American/White;" "nonstandard speech....standard speech;" "probably a black person.....probably a white person") were inserted into the SEI to ensure that speakers identified the speech samples as intended and as indicators of the degree of nonstandardness each listener ascribed to the speech samples. Items were presented in a random order with polarities also randomized to avoid item response bias. The final composite variable, which can be labeled "dialect/ethnicity," initially resulted in  $\alpha=.65$  for the AAVE speaker and  $\alpha=.62$  for the SAE speaker. However, when the item "nonstandard speech...standard speech" was removed, reliabilities increase to

.81 for the AAVE speaker and .95 for the SAE speaker. Therefore only two items were retained for this scale. This variable was used as a manipulation check to ensure that the speech samples were interpreted as intended. Mean scores for “dialect/ethnicity” did indicate that this was the case ( $M_{AAVE}=2.01$ ,  $M_{SAE}=4.94$ ;  $F_{1,56}=157.85$ ,  $p<.01$ ). There was no interaction effect between dialect and teaching experience ( $F_{1,56}=1.01$ ,  $p=.32$ ), which indicates that the dialect manipulation worked for both preservice and inservice teachers.

### Procedures

One variable that was problematic in the study was the race of the primary investigator. Race-of-interviewer effects have been found in previous studies (e.g., Koch & Gross, 1997; Power, Murphy, & Coover, 1996). In the case of this study, race of the researcher may be especially potent in soliciting sensitive information such as racial identity. This problem was alleviated by administering the survey online. Through resources of the University of Georgia’s Digital Language Lab, we were able to post the survey and speech samples on a web page that participants could access at their leisure. (In the spring of 2002 the web page could be accessed as <http://www.uga.edu/dlrl/Survey/UGALangProj.html>) A web-based study also allowed data to be collected in other areas of the country besides the Southeast. Because of automatic data capture, it also eliminated any errors due to data entry.

Accordingly, participants self-administered the survey to themselves while sitting at computer terminals with internet access. They engaged in the task at a time and place and under circumstances of their own choosing. Without doubt, this method of

administration introduced unknown variation in the results. However the advantages of on-line web-based administration were deemed to outweigh those disadvantages.

Participants went to the web page and were first greeted by a letter explaining the nature of the study in general terms (see Appendix A). They then authorized informed consent by clicking on an icon so labeled. Next, a demographic questionnaire appeared on the screen (included in Appendix B). After submitting this, participants listened to a 1-minute digitized speech sample, either AAVE or SAE. To keep their visual attention focused on the computer, participants were simultaneously presented with a photo of a classroom containing both black and white students, but with the faces indistinct. The CGI script that drove the on-line presentation of stimulus materials randomly selected which photograph would be paired with which speech sample for each participant. Similarly, the CGI script randomly selected which of the two voices the participant heard, and the participant heard both the SAE and AAVE sample of that voice.

At the end of the speech sample, the survey form which included the SEI and measures of academic achievement appeared on the screen (included in Appendix C). After completing the survey for speech sample 1, the process was repeated for the second speech sample (different dialect than the first, but the same speaker). After submitting the survey for speech sample 2, participants saw a version of the Racial Identity Questionnaire (version determined by their racial self-identification on the demographic questionnaire, see Appendices D and E). The participants were then given the opportunity to voice their opinions about other relevant issues by answering a set of open ended questions (Appendix F). Finally, a debriefing statement and thank you appeared

on the screen. The debriefing, which also directed participants to other resources relating to dialect and education, appears in Appendix G.

## Measures

### Demographic Questions

As their first task, participants completed a brief questionnaire to obtain some personal information. Questionnaire items included gender, race, age, and about their years of teaching experience at various grade levels. The race of the participant was of special importance, as it determined whether or not they were presented with the Black Racial Identity Scale, White Racial Identity Scale, or no racial identity scale at all.

### Measuring Language Attitudes

Immediately after listening to each speech sample, instructors completed a series of semantic differential scales known as the Speech Evaluation Instrument (SEI; Zahn & Hopper, 1985). The SEI has become perhaps the most commonly used language attitudes scales and has also been tested in a number of different scenarios to assure that it is generalizable to many situations. This 30-item scale has been used in numerous other language and attitude studies (e.g., Greene, 1989; Rubin, 1992), and seems to have attained the status as the standard measurement instrument in the field (Bradac, 1990). It includes three subscales: superiority, social attractiveness, and dynamism. Reliabilities for each factor were assessed using Cronbach's alpha and were reported in the original scale development as .95, .93, and .91, respectively (Zahn & Hopper, 1985, p. 118).

When assessing reliabilities for the SEI in the present study, constituent items for each of the three subscales were taken directly from Zahn and Hopper (1985). This was done separately for responses to each of the two dialects, so that it would be possible to

determine whether the scales appeared to be working equally well for the two types of stimuli. For the AAVE speaker, reliability alphas were initially calculated as .88 for superiority, .93 for social attractiveness, and .75 for dynamism. The reliability measure for dynamism increased to .84 when the item “aggressive-unaggressive” was deleted from the factor. For the SAE speaker, reliability alphas were calculated as .90 for superiority, .95 for social attractiveness, and .77 for dynamism. Again, the reliability score for dynamism rose when the item “aggressive-unaggressive” was deleted, resulting in a coefficient of  $\alpha = .87$ . Thus the item “aggressive-unaggressive” was omitted from all subsequent analyses. The composite scales superiority, dynamism, and social attractiveness were then computed by summing for each scale its remaining constituent items. The complete rating instrument appears in Appendix C.

### Measuring Racial Identity

After listening to all speech samples, participants completed a Racial Identity Questionnaire. Measuring black and white racial identity posed a challenge because, as noted earlier, what it means to be white is so different from what it means to be black. Helms (1990a) has created two separate scales for measuring black and white racial identity. In both cases, identity is seen as developing in stages. This process of black identity development is measured by the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Helms, 1990b). Helms' scale has been used in numerous studies in a variety of contexts (e.g. Carter, 1991; Carter & Helms, 1992; Ervin, 2001; Helms & Carter, 1991; Munford, 1994; Plummer, 1995; Richardson & Helms, 1994), and seems to have attained a higher level of acceptance than any similar instrument. The black identity scale used in this study is a shorter form of the original scale that was presented in her work (Helms, 1990c) and

consists of 30 items that can be divided into four distinct attitude types, corresponding to four stages of development: preencounter (8 items), encounter (3 items), immersion/emersion (6 items), and internalization (9 items). Four filler items were also included in the scale. Although most items on the scale still have contemporary relevance, some are outdated. For example, one item says, "I often find myself referring to White people as honkies, devils, pigs, etc." (Helms, 1990b, p. 42). This item was changed to read "I often find myself referring to White people in derogatory terms." The Black RIAS appears in Appendix D.

Helms and Carter (1990) have also developed a White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS). Helms and Carter's (1990) white identity scale is based more on reactions to and against minorities instead of affiliation with white culture. This is consistent with Helms' theoretical stance, which proposes that whites attain racial self-knowledge as a result of coming to terms with people of color. Although the WRIAS is used in many studies, Behrens (1997) argues that it may not be a valid measure. His metaanalysis of studies on white identity indicates that the measure of disintegration and reintegration are actually the same scale. He also claims that pseudo-independence and autonomy are the same scale. This assertion leads to the belief that a five-stage model of white identity is not accurate. Helms (1997) responded to these claims by pointing out many weaknesses in Behrens's (1997) metaanalysis, including researcher bias and different sample sizes across studies. Despite Behrens' criticism, the Helms & Carter WRIAS and the construct from which it derives remains the most commonly accepted formulation, as it has been used in many studies (e.g., Carter & Helms, 1992; Gushue, 1993; Helms & Piper, 1994; Swanson, Tokar, & Davis, 1994). This scale used in this

study is a shorter form of the complete scale that was presented in her work (Helms, 1990b) and is composed of 30 items that are which are divided into contact (6 items), disintegration (3 items), reintegration (3 items), pseudo-independent (6 items), emersion (6 items), and autonomy (6 items) attitudes and behaviors. The White RIAS appears in Appendix E.

Self-identified African American participants were administered the BRIAS, and self-identified Euro-American participants were administered the WRIAS. Using Cronbach's alpha, reliability of the Black RIAS has previously been reported as .69 for preencounter, .50 for encounter, .67 for immersion/emersion, and .79 for internalization (Helms, 1990b). Reliability of the White RIAS ranged in previous studies from .55-.67 for contact, .75-.77 for disintegration, .75-.82 for reintegration, .65-.77 for pseudoindependence, and .65-.74 for autonomy (Helms & Carter, 1990).

The racial identity scales in the present study yielded lower reliabilities than those reported by Helms and Carter (1990). Reliabilities for the black racial identity scale could not be determined because of the low number of African Americans serving as participants. For the white racial identity scale, reliabilities were  $\alpha=.53$  for contact,  $\alpha=.27$  for disintegration,  $\alpha=.28$  for reintegration,  $\alpha=.63$  for pseudo-independence,  $\alpha=.63$  for immersion/emersion, and  $\alpha=.59$  for autonomy. When the item "American society is sick, evil, and racist" is deleted, the reliability for disintegration increases to  $\alpha=.59$ . When the item "I believe that White culture or Western civilization is the most highly developed, sophisticated culture ever to have existed on earth" is omitted, the reliability for reintegration increases to  $\alpha=.32$ . When the item "My whiteness is an important part of who I am" is deleted, the reliability for

autonomy increases to  $\alpha=.61$ . These items were therefore deleted from their respective composite scales.

#### Measuring expectations of academic achievement

To obtain some indication of participants' expectations for the speakers' school success, teachers completed a mock report card for each simulated student. They were asked to give their best guess of each student's end-of-year grade in 8<sup>th</sup> grade Language Arts, Reading, Social Studies, Math, Health, and Science. The report card grades for the six subject areas were averaged into one academic achievement variable—Grade Point Average (GPA). Reliabilities for the resulting GPAs of the AAVE and SAE speakers were  $\alpha=.94$  and  $\alpha=.95$ , respectively. Participants were also asked to guess the number of days each student would be absent over the course of a school year, and to make a recommendation for freshman high school placement level (advanced, college track, general diploma track, or vocational diploma track). This scale is included in Appendix C.

#### Open-ended Questions

The final part of the survey consisted of four open ended questions where participants could record their own knowledge and opinions about AAVE. This allowed the researcher to determine whether or not participants had received cultural training in their teacher education programs, whether or not they viewed AAVE as a problem in their classrooms, and their opinions on how to improve cultural training for educators. This qualitative data could be as valuable or even more valuable than the quantitative data because it allows the researcher to discover possible problems within the teacher education system with language and cultural training. The computerized format of the

survey provided unlimited typing space, allowing them to share as much or as little information as they wished. A list of these questions appears in Appendix F.

### Analysis

Dependent variables were the three SEI social evaluation scales—superiority, dynamism, and social attractiveness and the three academic achievement variables—GPA, absences, and academic track. Because the latter of these was an ordinal level variable with only 4 levels, it was analyzed using a nonparametric statistic (Chi-square), whereas the other variables were analyzed parametrically.

Although the number of African American participants was too small to permit statistical significance testing, an informal assessment of their effect on the data patterns was conducted. Each dialect by ethnicity cell was inspected first for the total sample and then for the sample of Euro-Americans only. For each pair of corresponding cells, it was noted whether the inclusion of the seven African American participants increased or decreased the variance, and whether the cell mean shifted more or less than one standard deviation from the mean of the homogenous Euro-American sample. These informal comparisons are reported in the results in lieu of race-of-teacher cell means contrasts.

Two primary parametric statistical procedures were used to analyze the data. First, separate 2 x 2 repeated measures ANOVAs for each of the five continuous dependent variables were used to examine mean differences due to the factors dialect (the repeated measure) and teaching experience. [Note that there were two different voices used for each dialect. A participant heard either Speaker A or Speaker B performing both the AAVE and the SAE speech samples. Potentially it would have been possible to extract “speaker voice” as a third factor in the ANOVAs, however the sample size was

too small to permit this. Since “speaker voice” was not extracted as a separate factor, it is likely that the between-subjects error term was slightly inflated, and the subsequent ANOVAs may as a result have been slightly conservative.] Any significant interactions in the ANOVAs were to be examined by means of Sheffé tests for pair-wise contrasts of cell means.

The second statistical treatment was a series of stepwise multiple regressions. The regressions utilized the same criterion or dependent variables as the ANOVAs: the three SEI scales, expected grade, and expected number of absences. The predictor variables were in each case were six racial identity subscores.

The sole nonparametric dependent variable, expected diploma track of the students, was assessed using cross-tabulations and tested via the Chi Square statistic. One such analysis cross-tabulated expected diploma track (at four levels) with the student’s dialect (at two levels). The second cross-tabulated expected diploma track with dialect separately for each of the two levels of teacher experience.

Significance levels for all statistical analyses were set a priori at  $p < .05$

Open ended data were analyzed by examining each question individually and looking for common themes among their answers. Comments were also evaluated by comparing African American participants and Euro American participants. These findings allowed for more clarity in understanding how the race of the teacher interacted with the student’s dialect/ethnicity to affect evaluations of students.

#### Chapter Endnote

1. To determine whether the findings of the main ANOVAs really could be generalized across the two voices, the researcher ran 2 x 2 speaker by dialect ANOVAs on the five

interval level dependent variables as well as on the manipulation check variable, dialect/ethnicity. Dialect by speaker cell means for all six variables appear in Appendix H. Significantly significant interactions were examined for disordinal effects of the voices. There were found to be significant interaction effects between speaker and dialect only for dynamism ( $F_{1,45}=19.36$ ,  $p<.01$ ,  $\eta^2=.30$ ) and dialect/ethnicity ( $F_{1,45}=54.62$ ,  $p<.01$ ,  $\eta^2=.55$ ). Four post hoc Bonferroni comparisons were made for each of these two dependent variables. Speaker one's AAVE guise was compared with speaker one's SAE guise and with speaker two's AAVE guise. Speaker two's AAVE guise was also compared with speaker two's SAE guise. Finally, speaker one's SAE guise was contrasted with speaker two's SAE guise. For dynamism, there were significant differences among all cells at the .05 level except between speaker one's AAVE sample and SAE sample. This causes the subsequent findings regarding dynamism difficult to interpret, as results appear to be largely an artifact of speaker two's lack of dynamism in his SAE sample (see Appendix H). For dialect/ethnicity, all pairwise cell contrasts were significant at the .05 level except the contrast between speaker one's AAVE sample and speaker two's AAVE sample. Although speaker two's SAE sample was viewed by participants as being more standard than speaker one's SAE sample, each speaker's AAVE sample and SAE sample were perceived as being different from each other, and both AAVE samples were perceived as being equally nonstandard. This pattern of differences – equivalent AAVE samples and consistent differences across speakers between SAE and AAVE – were deemed satisfactory for justifying the claim of generalizability across speakers in the context of this study.

## CHAPTER 4

## RESULTS

Table 1 shows the dialect by experience level cell means and standard deviations for each of the 5 interval-level dependent measures. Data from all participants appear in Table 1 and were subsequently submitted to ANOVA. To informally inspect possible changes in variance due to inclusion of the seven African American participants, Table 2 displays cell means and standard deviations for the two dialect guises when only Euro-American data are presented. Results of comparing these two tables are indicated when relevant to the hypotheses.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Five Dependent Variables for the Total Sample

			Superiority	Social Attractiveness	Dynamism	GPA	Attendance
Inservice Teachers	AAVE	Mean	4.16	5.22	5.46	2.53	11.00
		(SD)	(1.02)	(1.25)	(1.29)	(.90)	(5.86)
		N	19	19	19	19	15
	SAE	Mean	4.78	4.91	4.16	3.07	6.47
		(SD)	(1.10)	(1.10)	(1.16)	(.82)	(3.41)
		N	19	19	19	19	17
Pre-service Teachers	AAVE	Mean	4.14	5.20	5.42	2.99	8.60
		(SD)	(.79)	(.74)	(.81)	(.50)	(4.25)
		N	42	42	42	41	35
	SAE	Mean	5.13	5.11	4.44	3.41	5.83
		(SD)	(.66)	(.84)	(1.01)	(.42)	(3.02)
		N	40	40	40	39	35

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Five Dependent Variables for Euro-American Sample Only

			Superior- ity	Social Attractiveness	Dynamism	GPA	Attendance
Inservice	AAVE	Mean	4.25	5.32	5.65	2.57	10.08
		(SD)	(.68)	(.77)	(.73)	(.71)	(4.92)
		N	14	14	14	14	13
	SAE	Mean	5.06	5.08	4.24	3.16	6.46
		(SD)	(.64)	(.59)	(.89)	(.34)	(2.33)
		N	14	14	14	14	13
Pre- service	AAVE	Mean	4.08	5.16	5.41	2.98	8.47
		(SD)	(.76)	(.69)	(.76)	(.52)	(4.24)
		N	38	38	38	37	34
	SAE	Mean	5.09	5.04	4.34	3.39	5.82
		(SD)	(.61)	(.82)	(.96)	(.34)	(3.08)
		N	36	36	36	35	33

### Hypotheses

H1: Across all groups of teachers, teachers will evaluate speakers of SAE as higher on the superiority scale, more socially attractive, and less dynamic than speakers of AAVE.

Table 3 summarizes the ANOVAs for the three SEI scales. As shown in Table 3, Dialect Guise exerted statistically significant main effects on two of the three social evaluation variables; however Hypothesis 1 was only partially supported because the directionality of one of those effects was not as predicted. Across all teachers, the SAE speaker ( $M_{SAE}=5.05$ ) was viewed as equally socially attractive as the AAVE speaker ( $M_{AAVE}=5.20$ ); the main effect for dialect was not statistically significant for this dependent variable ( $F_{1,45}=1.76$ ,  $p=.19$ ,  $\eta^2=.04$ ). The SAE speaker was viewed higher in superiority ( $M_{SAE}=5.02$ ) than the AAVE speaker ( $M_{AAVE}=4.15$ ;  $F_{1,45}=34.76$ ,  $p<.01$ ,  $\eta^2=.44$ ). However, the SAE speaker ( $M_{SAE}=4.35$ ) was judged to be less dynamic than the AAVE speaker ( $M_{AAVE}=4.83$ ;  $F_{1,45}=33.34$ ,  $p<.01$ ,  $\eta^2=.43$ ).

Table 3

Summary of ANOVAs for Three SEI Subscales

Source of Variation		Df	MS	F	p-value	Partial eta squared
Experience	Superiority	1	.36	.33	.57	.01
	Social	1	.41	.27	.60	.01
	Attractiveness					
	Dynamism	1	.98	.78	.38	.02
Error <sub>between</sub>	Superiority	45	1.09			
	Social	45	1.51			
	Attractiveness					
	Dynamism	45	1.26			
Dialect	Superiority	1	14.80	34.76	.00	.44
	Social	1	.62	1.76	.19	.04
	Attractiveness					
	Dynamism	1	28.90	33.34	.00	.43
Experience x Dialect	Superiority	1	.43	1.00	.32	.02
	Social	1	.00	.03	.86	.00
	Attractiveness					
	Dynamism	1	.00	.02	.90	.00
Error <sub>within</sub>	Superiority	45	.43			
	Social	45	.35			
	Attractiveness					
	Dynamism	45	.87			

H1a: Preservice teachers will evaluate speakers of AAVE as higher on the social superiority scale, more socially attractive, and more dynamic than will inservice teachers.

As table 3 indicates, this hypothesis is not supported for any of the three social evaluation variables. None of the main effects for teacher experience achieved statistical significance. Moreover, none of the experience by dialect interaction effects achieved statistical significance either.

H1b: There will be a direct linear relationship between racial identity development and evaluations of speakers of AAVE. That is, the higher a white teacher scores on a more advanced measure of racial identity development, the more positive will be her/his rating

of African American students in regards to superiority, social attractiveness, and dynamism.

Means and standard deviations for the white racial identity subscales are listed in Table 4. Zero order correlations were also run among the six racial identity subscales, so as to assess any undue colinearity. These correlations are in Table 5. There are significant positive correlations between contact and pseudo-independence, contact and immersion/emersion, contact and autonomy, pseudo-independence and immersion/emersion, pseudo-independence and autonomy, and immersion/emersion and autonomy. There are significant negative correlations between disintegration and autonomy and reintegration and autonomy. All of these correlations are moderate, falling between the .30 to .70 range with the exception of pseudo-independence and immersion/emersion, which was  $>.70$  and considered a strong correlation.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for the Six White Racial Identity Subscales

		Contact	Dis- integration	Re- integration	Pseudo- Independence	Immersion/ Emersion	Auto- nomy
In- service	Mean	2.31	1.75	2.46	2.18	2.38	2.77
	(SD)	(.33)	(.47)	(.50)	(.41)	(.48)	(.48)
	N	14	14	14	14	14	14
Pre- service	Mean	2.18	1.19	2.50	2.35	2.70	2.73
	(SD)	(.34)	(.48)	(.57)	(.44)	(.39)	(.42)
	N	37	37	37	37	37	36

Table 5

Zero Order Correlations among the Six White Racial Identity Subscales (n= 54)

	Contact	Dis-integration	Re-integration	Pseudo-Independence	Immersion/Emersion	Autonomy
Contact	1.00	.05	-.03	.48*	.35*	.45*
Disintegration	.05	1.00	.23	-.09	-.18	-.33*
Reintegration	-.03	.23	1.00	-.15	-.02	-.34*
Pseudo-Independence	.48*	-.09	-.15	1.00	.74*	.61*
Immersion/Emersion	.35*	-.18	-.02	.74*	1.00	.49*
Autonomy	.45*	-.33*	-.34*	.61*	.49*	1.00

\*significant at  $p < .05$ 

Table 6 summarizes the step-wise multiple regressions for the three SEI outcome variables. Superiority was most strongly predicted by reintegration ( $F_{1,52}=13.35$ ,  $p < .01$ ;  $R^2=.20$ ,  $Beta=-.45$ ), and disintegration was a significant predictor at step 2 ( $F_{1,51}=6.29$ ,  $p=.02$ ;  $R^2$  change=.29,  $Beta=-.30$ ). In both cases the negative Beta weights indicated an inverse relationship

For the regression on social attractiveness, only autonomy emerged as a statistically significant predictor ( $F_{1,52}=5.87$ ,  $p=.02$ ;  $R^2=.10$ ,  $Beta=.32$ ). Its positive Beta weight indicated a direct relationship between autonomy and social attractiveness.

The regression on dynamism revealed that only pseudo-independence was a significant predictor ( $F_{1,52}=7.33$ ,  $p=.01$ ;  $R^2=.12$ ,  $Beta=.35$ ). Its positive Beta weight indicated a direct relationship with perceived dynamism.

Table 6

Stepwise Multiple Regressions of White Racial Identity Subscales on three SEI Variables

Dependent Variable	Variables Entered	Step	R square	F	df	P-value	Beta
Superiority	Reintegration	1	.20	13.35	1,52	.00	-.45
	Disintegration	2	.29	6.29	1,51	.02	-.30
Social Attractiveness	Autonomy	1	.10	5.87	1,52	.02	.32
Dynamism	Pseudo-independence	1	.12	7.33	1,52	.01	.35

H2: Across all groups of teachers, teachers will evaluate speakers of SAE as having higher grades, having fewer absences, and more likely to be pursuing a more advanced diploma than speakers of AAVE.

Hypothesis 2 was supported. Table 7 summarizes the ANOVAs for the two parametric educational outcomes variables. All teachers assigned a higher overall GPA to the SAE speakers ( $M_{SAE}=3.30$ ) than they did to the AAVE speaker ( $M_{AAVE}=2.85$ ;  $F_{1,45}=33.98$ ,  $p<.01$ ,  $\eta^2=.43$ ). Participants also assigned fewer absences to the SAE speaker ( $M_{SAE}=6.04$ ) than they did to the AAVE speaker ( $M_{AAVE}=9.32$ ;  $F_{1,45}=31.43$ ,  $p<.01$ ,  $\eta^2=.01$ ).

Table 7

Summary of ANOVAs for Two Indicators of Academic Achievement

Source of Variation		Df	MS	F	P value	Partial eta squared
Experience	GPA	1	3.77	5.65	.02	.11
	Attendance	1	56.33	2.28	.14	.05
Error <sub>between</sub>	GPA	45	.67			
	Attendance	45	24.71			
Dialect	GPA	1	4.42	33.98	.00	.43
	Attendance	1	235.20	31.43	.00	.01
Experience x Dialect	GPA	1	.00	.14	.71	.00
	Attendance	1	3.12	.42	.52	.01
Error <sub>within</sub>	GPA	45	.13			
	Attendance	45	7.48			

In addition, Table 8 shows the cross tabulation between student dialect and teachers' expectation regarding diploma track assignment. The association between these two variables was statistically significant ( $\text{Chi-square}_{3df}=10.03, p<.03$ ). Inspection of Table 8 shows a trend toward assigning the AAVE speakers to the vocational and general tracks, whereas the SAE speaker was assigned to the advanced and college tracks.

Table 8

Crosstabulation of Student Dialect by Predicted Diploma Track  
Observed Frequencies (Expected Frequencies)

Diploma Track	AAVE	SAE	Row Totals
Vocational	10 (6)	4 (7)	14 (13)
General	21 (16)	14 (16)	35 (32)
Advanced	5 (6)	9 (7)	14 (13)
College	17 (21)	29 (21)	46 (42)
Column Totals	53 (49)	56 (51)	Total 109 (100)

Note: Chi Square (3df) = 10.32,  $p<.025$

H2a: Preservice teachers will evaluate speakers of AAVE as having higher grades, having fewer absences, and pursuing a more advanced diploma than will inservice teachers.

This hypothesis was not supported. There was no statistically significant interaction between teacher experience and dialect for either GPA or attendance. Therefore experienced teachers were not behaving any differently than inexperienced teachers in this respect.

Hypothesis 2a is also addressed by the crosstabulations found in Tables 9 and 10. When each level of teacher experience was examined separately, a similar pattern of statistically significant association between dialect expected degree track was apparent. Both preservice and inservice teachers responded similarly to the dialect variable (Chi-square<sub>3df</sub> = 12.98,  $p < .01$ ; Chi-square<sub>2df</sub> = 49.06,  $p < .01$ , respectively). That is, both appear to have equally devalued the AAVE speakers as more likely than SAE speakers to be attending less academically-oriented tracks. The category advanced diploma track was empty and therefore was eliminated from this analysis.

Table 9

Crosstabulation of Student Dialect by Predicted Diploma Track for Preservice Teachers Only  
Observed Frequencies (Expected Frequencies)

Diploma Track	AAVE	SAE	Row Totals
Vocational	7 (5)	1 (5)	8 (10)
General	13 (12)	7 (13)	20 (25)
Advanced	5 (9)	9 (9)	14 (18)
College	13 (23)	24 (24)	37 (47)
Column Totals	38 (48)	41 (52)	Total 79 (100)

Note: Chi Square (3df) = 12.98,  $p < .01$

Table 10

Crosstabulation of Dialect by Diploma Track for Inservice Teachers Only  
Observed Frequencies (Expected Frequencies)

Diploma Track	AAVE	SAE	Row Totals
Vocational	3 (10)	3 (10)	6 (20)
General	8 (25)	7 (25)	15 (50)
College*	4 (15)	5 (15)	9 (30)
Column Totals	15 (50)	15 (50)	Total 30 (100)

Note: Chi Square (2df) = 49.06,  $p < .01$

\*Expected value for Advanced Diploma for AAVE and SAE was 0.

H2b: There will be a direct linear relationship between racial identity development and evaluations of speakers of AAVE. That is, the higher a white teacher scores on a more advanced measure of racial identity development, the more positive will be her/his rating of African American students in regards to GPA, attendance, and diploma track.

Like H1b, stepwise multiple regressions were run on GPA and attendance for the participants who completed the white racial identity scale only (see Table 11). GPA and reintegration were significantly but inversely related ( $F_{1,52}=4.51$ ,  $p=.04$ ;  $R^2=.08$ ,  $Beta=-.28$ ), while attendance and disintegration were directly related ( $F_{1,52}=4.14$ ,  $p=.05$ ;  $R^2=.07$ ,  $Beta=.27$ ).

Table 11

Stepwise Multiple Regressions of White Racial Identity Subscales on Two Indicators of Academic Achievement

Dependent Variable	Variables Entered	Step	R Square	F	d	P value	Beta
GPA	Reintegration	1	.08	4.51	1,52	.04	-.28
Attendance	Disintegration	1	.07	4.14	1,52	.05	.27

### Open Ended Responses

After completing the survey, participants were asked to answer four open-ended questions. These questions were designed to reveal what most teachers know about SAE and AAVE, their opinions of AAVE, their own preferences on teaching in multicultural classrooms, and what can be done to solve education problems that may arise from students' use of English in the classroom. The answers that the participants gave were varied, and they were analyzed by looking for patterns among answers. Below are the four opened ended questions that appeared at the end of the survey and some of the answers given by the participants.

What do you know about the debate on Ebonics in the classroom?

Most participants had some knowledge on the Ebonics debate, and most inservice teachers were better able to articulate what Ebonics was and how they felt about it. However, all participants' knowledge on the Ebonics debate was varied. Some indicated that Ebonics was a form of slang or laziness, while others acknowledged it as a valid form of language. Others had less of an understanding of Ebonics, saying that they only knew that there was a debate in California. Among African American participants, the three preservice African American teachers had no opinion or knowledge about the debate. The four inservice teachers knew about the debate, but here again there were

some differences in their knowledge about the debate. One of these teachers said that “Ebonics is [basically] slang,” while another said that “[b]lack children traditionally speak Ebonics, which is a valid form of English.”

How do you feel about teaching one standard English dialect?

The majority of participants who answered this question supported the teaching of SAE in schools because the ability to use SAE properly would help their students become successful later in life. Many of the supporters of SAE felt that AAVE or Ebonics still had a place in the classroom. However, they indicated that AAVE should be used in conjunction with social communication and that teachers should not punish students for using AAVE in learning situations. Few participants opposed the teaching of SAE, and fewer still had no opinion. Among the African American participants, the three preservice teachers were in favor of teaching SAE, with one stating, “I don’t know how to feel. Standard English is all that I’ve known.” The four African American inservice teachers also supported the teaching of SAE, with three of them also indicating that AAVE is an important part of an African American students’ cultural heritage and should not be denigrated.

Do you prefer an ethnically diverse classroom? Why or why not?

Most participants indicated that they preferred teaching in an ethnically diverse classroom because it teaches students tolerance, allows them to see other perspectives for problem solving, and teaches them respect for others. Few teachers indicated that they had no preference for teaching in diverse classrooms, saying that they would rather teach students who were intelligent and eager to learn. No participant was against diversity in

the classroom. All African American participants supported diversity in the classroom with the exception of two of the preservice teachers who did not give their opinions.

How can we better train educators to be aware of issues of language in the classroom?

This question elicited the most varied responses. Participants suggested ESoL or language classes, cultural sensitivity training, and continuing education seminars to help educate teachers about language issues. Others said that teachers would learn about these issues themselves through extended classroom experience. Some said that the current trends in teacher education were effective, while others stated that they felt language issues were not as important as other issues. Others gave no suggestions. The African American teachers also had variety in their answers, although most seemed to indicate that there was not much that could be done. One inservice teacher thought that the current educator training programs were effective, while one preservice teacher said that the best way to alleviate language problems in the classroom was to simply correct students who did not speak SAE.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

Hypothesis 1 was partially supported. As expected, the SAE speakers were viewed as more socially superior by teachers. This means that the SAE guise, more so than the AAVE guise, evoked in teachers a sense that the speaker was more intelligent, well educated, and probably upper class. This is consistent with the consensus of language and attitude research (see Bradac, 1990) in that a relatively short speech sample was sufficient to elicit in listeners relatively negative perceptions of speakers of nonstandard speech varieties.

On the other hand, there was no support for the claim that the SAE speakers would be viewed as more socially attractive than AAVE speakers. In other words, dialect guise had no systematic impact on teachers' perceptions of whether a student was viewed as nice, likeable, or honest.

An unexpected finding was that the AAVE speaker received significantly higher scores on dynamism than did the SAE speaker. Williams (1976) found that teachers were more likely to perceive speakers of nonstandard English as being lower in "confidence-eagerness," although the difference was not as strong as that for "ethnicity-nonstandardness." This could be attributed to lack of dynamism in speaker two's SAE sample.

Hypothesis 1a was not supported. Like Williams' (1976) studies and like Piche, Michlin, Rubin & Turner (1978), there was no significant difference found for levels of

teaching experience. Despite these previous findings, it is surprising that differences were not found due to the nature of today's teacher education programs. Many, if not most, educators today have been trained in multicultural appreciation (Banks, 2001). Although the issues surrounding language attitudes were addressed in a great number of studies over 25 years ago, the present study serves as warning that no dramatic changes in these attitudes may have occurred.

Hypothesis 1b was supported. It was expected that teachers with high scores in the more advanced levels of white racial identity would evaluate the AAVE students positively in regard to superiority, social attractiveness, and dynamism. By the same token, it was expected that scores indicating lower levels of racial identity development would be negatively associated with social evaluations of AAVE speaking students. If a teacher scored high in disintegration and reintegration, it was found that he or she would also evaluate AAVEspeakers low in superiority ( $R^2=.29$ ,  $R^2=.20$ , respectively). There was also a positive correlation between autonomy and social attractiveness ( $R^2=.10$ ) as well as between pseudo-independence and dynamism ( $R^2=.12$ ). Because disintegration and especially reintegration are connected with the holding of racist attitudes, it was expected that people in these stages would hold a more negative, view of speakers of AAVE. Pseudo-independence and autonomy, on the other hand, are defined by Helms and Carter (1990) as being a part of defining a non-racist white identity. People in these stages are expected to hold more liberal viewpoints about racial issues. As expected, this study finds that teachers who scored high in autonomy were more likely to view an AAVE speaker as more socially attractive, and teachers who scored high in pseudo-independence were more likely to view an AAVE speaker as being more dynamic.

This study is the first to confirm a role for racial identity in teachers' judgments of minority students. This is important because it helps to understand why educators are making the judgments that they are. It also raises the question of whether educators evaluate other dialects of nonstandard English (e.g., Appalachian English or Spanglish) the same way they evaluate AAVE, or whether their evaluations are based more directly on the race of the speaker, not the dialect which he or she speaks. If teacher racial identity turns out to be such a key factor in replications of the present research, then presumably it would not matter how an African American student spoke; he or she would nonetheless suffer negative evaluations at the hands of Euro-American teachers at low levels of racial identity

H2 was supported. Overall, teachers assigned the AAVE speakers lower grades in all subjects than they did the SAE speakers. This exactly replicates Williams' (1976) findings of more than a quarter century ago, showing that not as much may have changed in multicultural tolerance as we might wish. Teachers also expected the AAVE speaker to have more absences than the SAE speaker, and they tended to place the AAVE speaker on a lower diploma track than they did the SAE speaker. These tendencies were expected; however, they also indicate major problems in the educational system if students are indeed being evaluated this way due solely to the nonstandardness of their dialect.

H2a found no significant differences for indicators of academic achievement and teacher experience. This was expected based on Williams' (1976) findings as well as the results of H1a. It is quite surprising that preservice and inservice teachers should appear so alike in their grading and academic evaluation processes. Learning to evaluate

students is one of the main tasks of the beginning teacher (Sarason, 1978), and with experience ought to come greater precision in discerning the quality of student work. On the other hand, the present task did not actually present any student work products to teachers; they were only speculating based on the students' speech. Future research, then, ought to replicate a study such as the present one in conjunction with teachers' evaluations of actual student work products like essays (Piche et. al., 1980).

H2b was supported. It was expected that teachers who scored high in the early stages of white racial identity development would evaluate the AAVE speaker as having a lower GPA and as having more absences. This is because people in the earlier stages are more likely to hold more racist attitudes. The study supported these claims, as GPA of African American students was found to be negatively predicted by reintegration and expected days of absence was found to be positively predicted by disintegration.

#### Limitations of the Study

Like any other research, this study had problems which may have impacted the results. These drawbacks are further discussed in this section and should be addressed in subsequent studies.

One drawback came from the high technology dependence of the data collection procedure. Some potential participants complained of problems in connecting to the website or downloading the voice samples. With slow connection speeds, it could take up to 20 or more minutes to download the audio samples, and no doubt a large number of participants lost patience before completing the task.

Others participants mentioned that they were confused by some of the items on the SEI, saying that without more information about the speaker it would be impossible

to answer the questions presented. One potential participant even stated that he did not feel comfortable completing the survey due to the nature of the study itself because he felt it forced him to make negative assumptions about the speakers based on their race. Others were made uncomfortable by the assumptions of the WRIAS.

There is also the possibility that the voices used did not present an authentic sample of AAVE. Although participants in both the pilot test and full study identified the AAVE samples correctly, no linguistic analysis of the samples was performed. Also, the participants of the pilot were not speakers of AAVE; had they been speakers of AAVE there may have been different results regarding dialect/ethnicity. Nonetheless, it is apparent that the listeners in both the pilot test and full study did perceive the samples as intended.

#### Implications for Further Research

Like many language attitudes studies before it (Bradac, 1990; Buck, 1968; Cargile & Giles, 1997; de la Zerda & Hopper, 1979; Edwards, 1982; Edwards, 1999; Giles & Powesland, 1975; Seligman et. al., 1972; Smitherman, 1994; Taylor, 1999; Williams, 1976), this one supports the idea that speakers of nonstandard English are evaluated in a more negative light than people who speak Standard American English. Because of the debate over Ebonics in both the black and white communities and its mixed acceptance as a formal language structure and teaching tool, it is necessary that people consider their own attitudes towards the English language and ways to create a nonbiased learning and social atmosphere for people who speak nonstandard dialects.

One important area of research that should be addressed in the future is how the racial identity development of African Americans affects their evaluations of students

who speak AAVE. How do African American teachers' linguistic stereotypes compare to the attitudes of Euro American teachers? Will differences occur at certain stages of black racial identity development as they did in the stages of white racial identity development? Certainly not all African Americans respond to AAVE in the same way (Hoover, 1990). Some respond just as negatively as many Euro Americans (Williams, 1976). Is black racial identity a useful predictor of those varying reactions?

One important question that has been raised by this study is whether teachers' attitudes are reactions to the purely linguistic nonstandardness of AAVE, or if hearing AAVE triggers racial labeling of the speaker and associated racist attitudes or expectations. The latter explanation would tend to support the idea of linguistic stereotyping (Seligman et. al., 1972; Purnell et. al., 1999). Teachers may have heard the AAVE voice, assumed the speaker was African American, and then assigned traits to that speaker that he or she associated with African American students. It is very possible that, because teachers are aware of the differences between Euro American and African American students' performances on standardized tests (Persell, 2000), they would assume that an AAVE speaker would be a worse student than an SAE speaker without being conscious of any feelings of racism. It should be mentioned that the results of this study do not support the idea that African American students are not as intelligent or able as Euro American students, since in this study participants made judgments about the speakers when they actually heard the same person speaking in two different dialects. Instead, the results show that teachers may be inappropriately applying prejudiced expectations concerning African American students' low performances on standardized

tests. They are perpetuating stereotypes about African Americans which place those students at a serious disadvantage in the classroom.

One surprising finding was that there were no differences in teachers' attitudes toward AAVE speaking students based on teaching experience. Later studies may benefit from reconceptualizing the idea of teacher experience. In the present study, the levels "preservice" and "inservice" teacher were operationalized by whether a teacher had his or her own classroom. Yet the intended construct upon which H1a and H2a was based pertained to length of time away from the multicultural training incorporated in teacher education programs. One possible idea for further research would be to create more than two categories for teacher experience. Teachers could be asked how long they had been teaching, and years of experience could be treated as a continuous predictor variable. Participants could also be grouped by type and amount of multicultural training they have received (basic foundations of education classes, advanced education seminars in multiculturalism, graduate level seminars, continuing education/inservice seminars, etc.)

Based on the quantitative findings of this study as well as the comments that were expressed by participants at the end of the survey, there is still a long way to go in training educators to be more aware of AAVE in the classroom the judgments that they make about students who speak it. Perhaps the most important idea for further research and is to identify interventions to increase the effects of multicultural training on teachers' language attitudes. This should be conducted for teacher education students as well as in the context of continued training throughout an educator's career (Bowie and Bond, 1994; Harris, 1997). Many of the participants in this study indicated that they have

received some form of cultural sensitivity training; however, it apparently was not potent enough to reduce their negative linguistic stereotypes. As Caudill (1998) pointed out, there is no guarantee that these courses are being received as intended, and some multicultural education courses may even have negative effects on students. Language attitudes could serve as a valuable outcome measure to assess the impact of various forms of multicultural training.

With respect to public school curricula, Williams (1997) suggests that teachers use AAVE or Ebonics as a tool to teach speakers of AAVE how to speak SAE. That is, contrasting AAVE structures with SAE structures in a positive way could help sensitize AAVE students about the need for code-switching. However, some people feel that labeling Ebonics as a separate language further draws attention to it as being nonstandard and therefore inferior to SAE (Taylor, 1999). Another problem with using AAVE to teach students SAE is that many teachers, especially elementary teachers, do not specialize in language acquisition and instruction. It may be difficult for them, as some research participants noted, to effectively teach SAE without downplaying the cultural importance of AAVE to an African American student.

The next step in this field of research, then, is developing these multicultural training and language instruction programs for both preservice and inservice teachers. These programs should be implemented and their effectiveness compared. Shuy (1973) indicates that, although many ideas have been developed and utilized, they have either proved to be unsuccessful or public reaction to such programs has been negative. Such programs should give educators a more fully developed sense of their own racial identity as well as that of their students. They should also emphasize the importance of

maintaining a strong racial identity and balancing that with their ability to communicate well with others.

### Significance of this Study

Although past language attitudes research has taken into account the race of the listener, this is the first study that takes into account the racial *identity* of the listener, rather than just dichotomous skin color categorization. According to cultural identity theory, racial identity is a more promising construct than simple binary race (white or black) because what it means to belong to a certain race is not universal, as people have different life experiences upon which they draw (Milville, Koonce, Darlington, and Whitlock, 2000). One of the most important findings in this research is that there were indeed effects based on the measured racial identity of the listener. In particular, Euro American teachers who scored high in disintegration and reintegration were more likely to evaluate AAVE speakers as being lower in superiority, having lower grades, and having greater numbers of absences, while teachers with low scores in these categories had more positive evaluations of the AAVE speaker. Because people who have high scores in disintegration and reintegration are likely to hold racist attitudes whether they know it or not, it would be worth noting whether people in these categories would also evaluate speakers of other types of nonstandard English in the same ways. The differences that were found in this study could indicate that teachers made these evaluations about the speaker simply because they thought the speaker sounded like an African American, not because the speaker spoke nonstandard English.

The use of racial identity in this study contrasts with Cargile and Giles' (1997) use of social identity in their research. Cargile and Giles – the only published paper that

considers social identity in the context of language attitudes - measured a listener's social identity as an outcome of listening to accented speech, whereas the present study uses racial identity as an independent variable. It is possible that, as this study shows, racial identity plays a role in determining judgments a listener makes about a speaker; however, it is also possible that listening to speech may also shape a listener's racial identity

How, then, can teachers use this information to improve the quality of education received by African American students? First and foremost, teachers should closely examine their own attitudes about race and how it affects the conscious and unconscious decisions that they make. They may want to examine each stage of racial identity development and see how they fit into them. It is important to remember that all stages should be considered one's racial identity profile and that each person does not fit neatly into only one stage. Second, administrators may also want to know about the attitudes of the teachers in their schools, especially if that school is one in which there are a large number of African American students. The administrators may want to know how much cultural awareness training a teacher had in his or her teacher education program as well as how much experience a teacher has had interacting with people of different ethnicities. Administrators may even benefit from having teachers complete the racial identity scale used in this study or one that is similar in content.

It bears repeating that the findings of the present study support the dire conclusion that teachers' language attitudes over the past quarter century have not changed in any dramatic fashion. Previous research has found that people are likely to form negative attitudes about speakers of nonstandard English. Why does this problem still exist? Is the problem that people hold negative attitudes about speakers of nonstandard English, or

is the problem that there are still many people who do not speak standard English? Is “standard English” defined by grammar usage, the presence of an accent, or the fact that the speaker does not speak the same way that the listener does? If negative judgments based on speech are to be eradicated, why weren’t they addressed when this original literature was presented 25 years ago? The problem should be more clearly defined, and further research should be geared toward correcting the problem.

## REFERENCES

- Anisfeld, E. and Lambert, W. E. (1964). Evaluational reactions of bilingual and monolingual children to spoken languages. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 69, 89-97.
- Anisfeld, M., Bogo, N, and Lambert, W. E. (1962). Evaluational reactions to accented English speech. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 65, 223-231.
- Banks, J. A. (2001). Citizenship education and diversity: Implications for teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 52, 5-16.
- Behrens, J. T. (1997) Does the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale measure racial identity? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44, 3-11.
- Behrens, J. T. and Rowe, W. (1997). Measuring white racial identity: A reply to Helms. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44, 17-19.
- Bell, E. L. (1990). The bicultural life experience of career-oriented black women. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11, 459-477.
- Bowie, R. L. and Bond, C. L. (1994). Influencing future teachers' attitudes toward Black English: Are we making a difference? Journal of Teacher Education, 45, 112-118).
- Boyce, J. N. (1996, December 26). Oakland's insult to blacks and equality. Wall Street Journal, p. 6.

Bradac, J. J. (1990) Language attitudes and impression formation. In H. Giles and W. P. Robinson (Eds.) Handbook of language and social psychology (pp. 387-412).

Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Buck, J. F. (1968). The effects of Negro and white dialectal variations upon attitudes of college students. Speech Monographs, 35, 181-186.

Cargile, A. C. and Giles, H. (1997). Understanding language attitudes: Exploring listener affect and identity. Language and Communication, 17, 195-217.

Carter, R. T. (1991). Racial identity attitudes and psychological functioning. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 19, 105-114.

Carter, R. T. and Helms, J. E. (1992). The counseling process as defined by relationship types: A test of Helms' interactional model. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 20, 181-201.

Caudill, S. A. (1998). Multiculturalism in higher education: The rhetoric of resistance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Georgia.

Chia, R. C., Allred, L. J., Grossnickle, W. F., and Lee, G. W. (1998). Effects of attractiveness and gender on the perception of achievement-related variables. Journal of Social Psychology, 138, 471-477.

Collier, M. J. and Powell, R. (1990). Ethnicity, instructional communication and classroom systems. Communication Quarterly, 38, 334-349.

Collier, M. J. (1988). A comparison of conversations among and between domestic culture groups: How intra- and intercultural competencies vary. Communication Quarterly, 36, 122-144.

- Cross, W. E. (1978). The Thomas and Cross models of psychological nigrescence: A review. Journal of Black Psychology, 5, 13-31.
- Cross, W. E. (1991). Shades of black: Diversity in African American identity. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Croteau, J. M. (1999). One struggle through individualism: Toward and antiracist white racial identity. Journal of Counseling and Development, 77, 30-32.
- Dandy, E. B. (1991). Black communication: Breaking down the barriers. Chicago: African American Images.
- De la Zerda, N. and Hopper, R. (1979). Employment interviewers' reactions to Mexican American speech. Communication Monographs, 46, 126-180.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1903/1993). The souls of black folk. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Edwards, J. (1999). Refining our understanding of language attitudes. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 18, 101-110.
- Elashoff, J. D. and Snow, R. E. (1971). Pygmalion reconsidered: A case study in statistical inference: Reconsideration of the Rosenthal-Jacobson data on teacher expectancy. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones.
- Ervin, K. S. (2001). Multiculturalism, diversity, and African American college students: Receptive, yet skeptical? Journal of Black Studies, 31, 764-776.
- Fordham, S. (1988). Racelessness as a factor in black students' school success: Pragmatic strategy or pyrrhic victory? Harvard Educational Review, 58, 54-84.

French, S. E., Seidman, E., Allen, L. and Aber, J. L. (2000). Racial/ethnic identity, congruence, with the social context, and the transition to high school. Journal of Adolescent Research, 15, 587-602.

Fries-Britt, S. L. and Turner, B. (2001). Facing stereotypes: A case study of black students on a white campus. Journal of College Student Development, 42, 420-429.

Gaines, S. O. and Reed, E. S. (1995). Prejudice: From Allport to DuBios. American Psychologist, 50, 96-103.

Garner, T. and Rubin, D. L. (1986). Middle class blacks' perceptions of dialect and style shifting: The case of Southern attorneys. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 5, 33-48.

Giles, H. and Robinson, W. P. (Eds.) (1990). Handbook of language and social psychology. Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Greene, K. L. (1989). Effects of sex of speaker and gender inclusiveness of language on listeners' perceptions of religious speaker as mediated by psychological gender, religiosity, attitudes toward sexist language and women's rights. Unpublished masters' thesis, The University of Georgia.

Grieger, R. M., II (1971). Pygmalion revisited: A loud call for caution. Interchange, 2, 1971.

Gushue, G. V. (1993). Cultural-identity development and family assessment: An interaction model. The Counseling Psychologist, 21, 487-513.

Haberman, C. (1996, December 31). Straight talk in the debate over Ebonics. New York Times, p. B1.

Hall, R. E. (2001). Identity development across the lifespan: a biracial model. The Social Science Journal, 38, 119-123.

Harris, T. M. (1997). Ethnic and racial identity in the classroom: Ebonics as a transitional language system in speech communication. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Convention. Chicago, IL.

Helms, J. E. (1990a). Black and white racial identity: Theory, research, and practice. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Helms, J. E. (1990b). The measurement of black racial identity attitudes. In J. E. Helms (ed.) Black and white racial identity: Theory, research, and practice (pp. 33-47). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Helms, J. E. (1990c). Toward a model of white racial identity development. In J. E. Helms (ed.) Black and white racial identity: Theory, research, and practice (pp. 33-47). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Helms, J. E. (1997). Implications of Behrens (1997) for the validity of the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44, 13-16.

Helms, J. E. and Carter, R. T. (1990). Development of the white racial identity inventory. In J. E. Helms (ed.) Black and white racial identity: Theory, research, and practice (pp. 33-47). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Helms, J. E. and Carter, R. T. (1991). Relationships of black and white racial identity attitudes and demographic similarity to counselor preferences. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38, 446-457.

Helms, J. E., and Piper, R. E. (1994). Implications of racial identity theory for vocational psychology. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44, 124-138.

Hoberman, J. (2000). The price of "Black Dominance." Society, 37, 49-56.

Holmes, S. A. (1996, December 30). Black voice of the street is defined and criticized. New York Times, p. A9.

Holy Bible (1976). King James Version. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.

Hoover, M. R. (1990). A vindicationist perspective on the role of Ebonics (black language) and other aspects of ethnic studies in the university. American Behavioral Scientist, 34, 251-262.

Johnson, V. D. (2001). The Nguzo Saba as a foundation for African American college student development theory. Journal of Black Studies, 31, 406-422.

Kenealy, P. and Frude, N. (1991). Teacher expectations as predictors of academic success. Journal of Social Psychology, 131, 305-306.

Koch, L. M. and Gross, A. (1997). Children's perceptions of Black English as a variable in interracial perception. Journal of Black Psychology, 23, 215-226.

Labov, W. (1972). Language in the inner city. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lambert, W. E., Anisfeld, M, and Yeni-Komshian, G. (1965). Evaluational reactions of Jewish and Arab adolescents to dialect and language variation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2, 84-90.

Lambert, W. E., Frankel, H., and Tucker, G. R. (1966). Judging personality through speech: A French-Canadian example. Journal of Communication, 16, 305-321.

Lambert, W. E. and Tucker, G. R. (1972). Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Leonard, R. and Locke, D. C. (1993). Communication Stereotypes: Is interracial communication possible? Journal of Black Studies, 23, 332-343.

Lewis, N. A. (1996, December 23). Black English is not a second language, Jackson says. New York Times, p. B9.

Linn, M. D. and Piche, G. (1982). Black and white adolescent and preadolescent attitudes toward black English. Research in the Teaching of English, 16, 53-69.

Lippi-Green, R. (1997). English with an accent. New York: Routledge.

McWhorter, J. (2000). Spreading the word: Language and dialect in America. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Milville, M. L, Koonce, D., Darlington, P., and Whitlock, B. (2000). Exploring the relationships between racial/cultural identity and ego identity among African Americans and Mexican Americans. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 28, 208-225.

Munford, M. B. (1994). Relationship of gender, self-esteem, social class, and racial identity to depression in blacks. Journal of Black Psychology, 20, 157-174.

Nakayama, T. K. and Martin, J. N. (1999). Whiteness: The communication of social identity. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Oakland School Board Resolution on Ebonics (original version) (1998). Journal of English Linguistics, 26, 170-172.

Onusabi, S. (7 February 2002). Voice recognition: Can “hello” cost you a home if you’re black? ABC News [Online]. Available: [http://more.abcnews.go.com/sections/wnt/worldnewstonight/linguistic\\_profiling011206.html](http://more.abcnews.go.com/sections/wnt/worldnewstonight/linguistic_profiling011206.html).

Orbe, M. P. and Harris, T. M. (2001). Interracial communication: Theory into practice. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., and Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957). Measurements of meaning. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press.

Parham, T. A. and Helms, J. E. (1985). Relation of racial identity attitudes to self-actualization and affective states of black student. Journal of Counseling Psychology, *32*, 431-440.

Persell, C. H. (2000). Dilemmas of achievement. Society, *37*, 13-18.

Persell, C. H., Catsambis, S. and Cookson, P. W., Jr. (1992). Family background, school type, and college attendance: A conjoint system of cultural capital transmission. Journal of Research on Adolescence, *2*, 1-23.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. Journal of Adolescent Research, *7*, 156-176.

Phinney, J. S., Chavira, V., and Tate, J. D. (1993). The effect of ethnic threat on ethnic self-concept and own-group ratings. The Journal of Social Psychology, *133*, 469-478.

Piche, G. L., Michlin, M., Rubin, D., and Sullivan, A. (1977). Effects of dialect-ethnicity, social class and quality of written compositions on teachers' subjective evaluations of children. Communication Monographs, *44*, 60-72.

Piche, G. L., Michlin, M., Rubin, D., and Turner (1978). Teachers' subjective evaluations of standard and black nonstandard English compositions: A study of written language and attitudes. Research in the teaching of English, *12*, 107-118.

- Powell, R. and Collier, M. J. (1990). Public speaking and a cultural bias. American Behavioral Scientist, 34, 240-250.
- Power, J. G., Murphy, S. T., and Coover, G. (1996). Priming prejudice: How stereotypes and counter-stereotypes influence attribution of responsibility and credibility among ingroups and outgroups. Human Communication Research, 23, 36-58.
- Plummer, D. L. (1995). Patterns of racial identity development of African American adolescent males and females. Journal of Black Psychology, 21, 168-180.
- Purnell, T., Idsarsi, W., and Baugh, J. (1999). Perceptual and phonetic experiments on American English dialect identification. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 18, 10-30.
- Richardson, T. Q. and Helms, J. E. (1994). The relationship of the racial identity of attitudes of black men to perceptions of "parallel" counseling dyads. Journal of Counseling and Development, 73, 172-177.
- Roediger, D. R. (1999). Is there a healthy white personality? The Counseling Psychologist, 27, 239-244.
- Rosenthal, R. (1973). The Pygmalion Effect lives. Psychology Today, 7, 56-63.
- Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Rubin, D. L. (1992). Nonlanguage factors affecting undergraduates' judgments of non-native English speaking teaching assistants. Research in Higher Education, 33, 511-531.

Rubin, D. L. and Hampton, S. (1998). National performance standards for oral communication K-12: New standards and speaking/listening/viewing. Communication Education, 47, 183-193.

Rubovits, P. C. and Maehr, M. L. (1971). Pygmalion analyzed: Toward an explanation of the Rosenthal-Jacobson findings. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 19, 197-203.

Rubovits, P. C. and Maehr, M. L. (1973). Pygmalion black and white. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25, 210-218.

Sampson, E. E. (1999). Dealing with differences: An introduction to the social psychology of prejudice Fort Worth: Harcourt, Inc.

Sarason, S. B. (1978). Again, the preparation of teachers: Competency and job satisfaction. Interchange on Educational Policy, 10, 1-11.

Seligman, C. R., Tucker, G. R., and Lambert, W. E. (1972). The effects of speech style and other attributes on teachers' attitudes toward pupils. Language in Society, 1, 131-142.

Shuy, R. W. (1973). The study of vernacular Black English as a factor in educational change. Research in the Teaching of English, 7, 297-311.

Smitherman, G. (1994). Black talk: Words and phrases from the hood to the amen corner. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Smitherman, G. and Cunningham, S. (1997). Moving beyond resistance: Ebonics and African American youth. Journal of Black Psychologists, 23, 227-232.

Speicher, B. L. and McMahon, S. M. (1992). Some African-American perspectives on Black English Vernacular. Language in Society, 21, 383-407.

Spitz, H. H. (1999). Beleaguered Pygmalion: A history of the controversy over claims that teacher expectancy raises intelligence. Intelligence, *27*, 199-234.

Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. American Psychologist, *52*, 613-629.

Swanson, J. L., Tokar, D. M., and Davis, L. E. (1994). Content and construct validity of the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale. Journal of Vocational Behavior, *44*, 198-217.

Taylor, O. L. (1999). Ebonics and educational policy: Some issues for the next millennium. Journal of Negro Education, *67*, 35-42.

Tucker, G. R., and Lambert, W. E. (1972). White and Negro listeners' reactions to various American-English dialects. Social Forces, *47*, 463-468.

Weis, L. (1985). Without dependence on welfare for life: Black women in the community college. The Urban Review, *17*, 233-255.

William, F. (1972). Language and speech: Introductory perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Williams, F. (1976). Explorations of the linguistic attitudes of teachers. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Williams, R. L. (1997). The Ebonics controversy. Journal of Black Psychology, *23*, 208-214.

Wolfram, W., Adger, C. T., and Christian, D. (1999). Dialects in school and communities. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zahn, C. J. and Hopper, R. (1985). Measuring language attitudes: The speech evaluation instrument. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, *4*, 113-123.

## APPENDIX A

## CONSENT FORM

## Teachers' Evaluation of Students' Oral Language Production

I agree to take part in a research study titled "Teachers' Evaluations of Students' Oral Language Production," which is being conducted by Brooke Chapman, Department of Speech Communication, (706) 542-3270 under the direction of Donald L. Rubin, Department of Speech Communication, (706) 542-4893. I do not have to take part in this study; I can stop taking part at any time without giving any reason, and without penalty. I can ask to have information related to me returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

1. The purpose of this study is to understand how teachers form impressions about their students.
2. I will not benefit directly from this research. However, my participation in this research may lead to information that could improve the quality of education that students receive in American school systems.
3. If I volunteer to take part in this study, I will be asked to do the following things:
  - Give some information about myself
  - Evaluate students based on a sample of their conversation
  - Complete a survey based on myself and my evaluations
  - Give my opinion about issues that are relevant in American classrooms.
  - The survey will take between 20 and 40 minutes to complete.
4. No discomforts or stresses are expected.
5. No risks are expected.
6. The only people who will know that I am a research subject are members of the research team. No information about me, or provided by me during the research, will be shared with others without my written permission, except if necessary to protect my rights or welfare (for example, if I am injured and need emergency care); or if required by law. There is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself.
7. The researcher will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached by telephone at: (706) 542-3270.

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I will print a copy of this form.

Brooke Chapman  
Researcher

Type Name of Participant [ ]

Please click here to indicate your consent to participate [ ]

If you are ready to begin the activity, click the 'submit' button.

[Submit consent form]

For questions or problems about your rights please call or write: Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D.,  
Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research  
Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-6514; E-Mail Address  
[IRB@uga.edu](mailto:IRB@uga.edu).

## APPENDIX B

## DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questions are about you. Please click next to the answer that is the most like you or fill in the box with an answer. Unless otherwise specified, please check only one answer. Please answer these questions honestly and as accurately as possible.

1. I am currently
  - A student teacher/intern
  - A teacher with my own class
  - Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
  
2. How many years of experience do you have as a teacher (including student teaching and internships)? \_\_\_\_\_
  
3. What grade(s) do you teach (check all that apply).
  - Preschool/Kindergarten
  - 1-3 grades
  - 4-6 grades
  - 7-9 grades
  - 10-12 grades
  - College/university/junior college
  - Graduate students
  - Adult education
  - Other (please specify)\_\_\_\_\_
  
4. What is your gender?
  - Female
  - Male
  
5. What is your race?
  - African American/Black
  - Asian
  - Caucasian/White
  - Hispanic
  - Native American
  - Other (Please specify)\_\_\_\_\_

[Submit form] [Reset]

## APPENDIX C

SPEECH EVALUATION INSTRUMENT AND INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC  
ACHIEVEMENT

Please click on the link below to hear the voice of an eighth grade student. Listen carefully to the student, and then answer the following questions by clicking the answer that best describes the student you just heard.

Downloading files may take a few minutes; please be patient

1.	Illiterate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Literate
2.	Educated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Uneducated
3.	Sour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sweet
4.	Upper Class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Lower Class
5.	Passive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Active
6.	Talkative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Shy
7.	Nice	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Awful
8.	Rich	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Poor
9.	Sounds African American (Black)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sounds European American (White)
10.	Good natured	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Hostile
11.	Unkind	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Kind
12.	Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unintelligent
13.	Unaggressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Aggressive

14.	Nonstandard Speech	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Standard Speech
15.	Unclear	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Clear
16.	Enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Hesitant
17.	Strong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Weak
18.	White collar	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Blue collar
19.	Cold	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Warm
20.	Friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unfriendly
21.	Likeable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unlikeable
22.	Confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unsure
23.	Incomplete	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Complete
24.	Probably a black person	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Probably a white person
25.	Pleasant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unpleasant
26.	Disfluent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fluent
27.	Organized	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Disorganized
28.	Experienced	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inexperienced
29.	Considerate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inconsiderate
30.	Good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bad
31.	Energetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Lazy
32.	Advantaged	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Disadvantaged
33.	Honest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dishonest

[Submit form] [Reset]

Imagine that you are the teacher of this eighth grade student whose voice you just heard. What grades do you think that this student will receive in the following subjects for the year?

- |                   |                                |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Language Arts  | A+ A A- B+ B B- C+ C C- D+ D F |
| 2. Reading        | A+ A A- B+ B B- C+ C C- D+ D F |
| 3. Social Studies | A+ A A- B+ B B- C+ C C- D+ D F |
| 4. Math           | A+ A A- B+ B B- C+ C C- D+ D F |
| 5. Science        | A+ A A- B+ B B- C+ C C- D+ D F |
| 6. Health         | A+ A A- B+ B B- C+ C C- D+ D F |

7. About how many absences do you think this student will have for the year? \_\_\_\_\_

8. What would you recommend as this student's high school placement track?

Vocational diploma    General diploma    Advanced diploma    College track

[Submit form] [Reset]

## APPENDIX D

## BLACK RACIAL IDENTITY ATTITUDES SCALE

Please answer the following questions about yourself by clicking the box next to the answer that best fits you. Please give honest and accurate information and do not leave any questions blank.

1. I believe that being black is a positive experience.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
2. I know through experience what being Black in America means.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
3. I feel unable to involve myself in White experiences, and am increasing my involvement in Black experiences.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
4. I believe that large numbers of Blacks are untrustworthy.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
5. I feel an overwhelming attachment to Black people.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
6. I involve myself in causes that will help all oppressed people.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
7. I feel comfortable wherever I am.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
8. I believe that White people look and express themselves better than Blacks.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
9. I feel very uncomfortable around Black people.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
10. I feel good about being Black, but do not limit myself to Black activities.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
11. I often find myself referring to White people in derogatory terms.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree

12. I believe that to be Black is not necessarily good.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
13. I believe that certain aspects of the Black experience apply to me, and others do not.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
14. I frequently confront the system and the man.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
15. I constantly involve myself in Black political and social activities (art shows, political meetings, etc.)  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
16. I involve myself in social action and political groups even if there are no other Blacks involved.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
17. I believe that Black people should learn to think and experience life in ways which are similar to White people.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
18. I believe that the world should be interpreted from a Black perspective.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
19. I have changed my style of life to fit my beliefs about Black people.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
20. I feel excitement and joy in Black surroundings.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
21. I believe that Black people came from a strange, dark, and uncivilized continent.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
22. People, regardless of their race, have strengths and limitations.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
23. I find myself reading a lot of Black literature and thinking about being Black.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
24. I feel guilty and/or anxious about some of the things I believe about Black people.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree

25. I believe that a Black person's most effective weapon for solving problems is to become a part of the White person's world.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
26. I speak my mind regardless of the consequences (e. g., being kicked out of school, being imprisoned, being exposed to danger).  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
27. I believe that everything Black is good, and consequently, I limit myself to Black activities.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
28. I am determined to find my Black identity.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
29. I believe that White people are intellectually superior to Blacks.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
30. I believe that because I am Black, I have many strengths.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree

[Submit form] [Reset]

## APPENDIX E

## WHITE RACIAL IDENTITY ATTITUDE SCALE

Please answer the following questions about yourself by clicking the box next to the answer that best fits you. Please give honest and accurate information and do not leave any questions blank.

1. There is no race problem in the United States.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
2. Racism only exists in the minds of a few Black people.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
3. I personally do not realize what race a person is.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
4. I have asked or would ask a Black person to help me understand how I might be prejudiced.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
5. I contribute or would contribute money or time to social programs to help Blacks.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
6. I participate or would participate in an activity to help Blacks overcome their poor environment.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
7. I believe that White culture or Western civilization is the most highly developed, sophisticated culture ever to have existed on earth.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
8. I live or would live in a segregated (White) neighborhood.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
9. The people I do my non-business related socializing with either are Whites or Blacks who "act White."  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
10. American society is sick, evil, and racist.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree

11. There is nothing I can do to prevent racism.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
12. I avoid thinking about racial issues.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
13. It is White people's responsibility to eliminate racism in the United States.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
14. Eliminating racism would help Whites feel better about themselves.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
15. White people should help Black people become equal to Whites.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
16. I have boycotted a company or its products because of its racist programs.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
17. For Martin Luther King's birthday, I attend or would attend a commemorative event.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
18. I have tried to help Whites understand Blacks.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
19. White culture and society must be restructured to eliminate racism and opposition.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
20. Whites and White culture are not superior to Blacks and Black culture.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
21. A multi-cultural society cannot exist unless Whites give up their racism.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
22. I have studied the history of White and Western European people.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
23. I meet with Whites to discuss our feelings and attitudes about being White and White racism.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree
24. I have conducted activities to help Whites overcome their racism.  
Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree

25. I accept that being White does not make me superior to any other racial group.

Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree

26. Being a member of a multi-racial group is a must for me.

Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree

27. My Whiteness is an important part of who I am.

Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree

28. I speak up in a White group situation when I feel that a White person is being racist.

Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree

29. I express my honest opinion when a Black person is present without worrying about whether I appear racist.

Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree

30. I attempt to explain to White friends and relatives the relationship or racism to other forms of oppression.

Strongly disagree    Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree

[Submit form] [Reset]

## APPENDIX F

### OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS

The following questions will allow you to give some feedback about your knowledge on subjects facing our schools today. Please write as much information as you can, adding lots of detail if possible. As with the rest of the survey, there are no right or wrong answers.

1. What do you know about the debate on Ebonics in the classroom?
2. How do you feel about teaching one standard English dialect?
3. Do you prefer an ethnically diverse classroom? Why or why not?
4. How can we better train educators to be aware of issues of language in the classroom?

[Submit form] [Reset]

## APPENDIX G

### DEBRIEFING FORM

#### Survey Debriefing Letter Web Survey Participants

Thank you for participating in this research. The following is a summary of the study you have just completed. You may print off a copy of this form for your records, but please do not share it with your colleagues who have yet to participate in this study. You may read it at your leisure.

This study seeks to find how teachers form impressions about their students. Specifically, this study looks at the different attitudes teachers hold about students who speak Standard American English (SAE) and African American Vernacular English (AAVE). Previous research has shown that many teachers base their expectations for student success to come degree on the dialect which students speak. However, it is by no means clear if all teachers do this to the same degree. Language attitudes were measured in this study using the Speech Evaluation Instrument, a scale composed of three factors - superiority, social attractiveness, and dynamism. Teacher expectations of the students' academic performances were also measured via the mock report card you filled out. It is hypothesized that the students' dialects would not be the only factor in determining how language attitudes and teacher expectations would develop. The amount of teaching experience might play a role in forming these attitudes and expectations. Some participants were preservice teachers, while others were experienced teachers with a range of different teaching backgrounds. The race of the teacher might also be an important factor, but race is no longer thought to be a simple matter of black and white. Therefore, each participant was asked not only to select his/her race but was also given a scale of racial identity development. However, if you did not identify your race as either African American or Caucasian, you were not presented with the speech samples and the questionnaires. This is because, at this time, no valid measure of any other racial identity exists. The concept of racial identity development of the listener is the most innovative (and perhaps controversial) aspect of this research study. The racial identity scales used here were developed and validated over the past 15 years by educators who train counselors and psychologists. This study will help determine if these concepts of racial identity and the instruments used to measure them are also useful for classroom teachers. Interactions between two or more of these variables might also prove to be more powerful a determinant in forming language attitudes and teacher expectations than each variable individually.

As data are still being collected, no conclusions have been made based on this research. However, the data from this study will be used to complete the primary researcher's Masters Thesis in May 2002. If you would like more information about this study, or if you would like to receive a summary of the results of this study when they are ready to release, you may contact the primary researcher, Brooke Chapman, at [bchapman@arches.uga.edu](mailto:bchapman@arches.uga.edu) or (706) 542-3270.

If you are interested in additional information and activities relating to dialects and attitudes here are some suggestions:

- [An Interactive Website on Dialect Identification from ABC News.](#)
- [Center for Applied Linguistics Ebonics Information Page](#) which links with numerous resources

## APPENDIX H

## MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR FIVE DEPENDENT VARIABLES

## AND MARKER VARIABLE – DIALECT BY VOICE

			Superior- ity	Social Attractiveness	Dyn- amism	GPA	Atten- dance	Dialect/ Ethnicity
Speaker One	AAVE	Mean	4.15	5.36	5.11	2.97	9.79	1.64
		(SD)	(.88)	(.82)	(.86)	(.51)	(5.74)	(.99)
		N	25	25	25	25	19	25
Speaker Two	SAE	Mean	5.24	5.54	4.99	3.48	6.65	2.52
		(SD)	(.84)	(.75)	(1.02)	(.44)	(3.36)	(1.68)
		N	24	24	24	24	20	24
Speaker Two	AAVE	Mean	4.15	5.10	5.66	2.76	8.97	1.96
		(SD)	(.86)	(.98)	(.99)	(.78)	(4.22)	(1.24)
		N	36	36	36	35	30	36
Speaker Two	SAE	Mean	4.86	4.71	3.91	3.17	5.66	6.21
		(SD)	(.80)	(.89)	(.84)	(.66)	(2.98)	(.94)
		N	35	35	35	34	32	35