

NON NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKING TEACHERS' SELF PERCEPTIONS OF
THEIR PRONUNCIATION AND PRONUNCIATION TEACHING PRACTICES

The Graduate School of Education
of
Bilkent University

by

Nihal Yapıcı Sarıkaya

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

in

The Program of
Teaching English as a Foreign Language
Bilkent University
Ankara

May 2013

Dedicated to My Beloved Husband,

Alper Utku Sarikaya

BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
MA THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

May 24, 2013

The examining committee appointed by The Graduate School of Education
for the thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Nihal Yapıcı Sarıkaya

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Thesis Title: Non Native English Speaking Teachers' Self
Perceptions of Their Pronunciation and
Pronunciation Teaching Practices

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Committee Members: Asst. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Asst. Prof. Dr. Enisa Mede
Yeditepe University, Faculty of Education

ABSTRACT

NON NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKING TEACHERS' SELF PERCEPTIONS OF
THEIR PRONUNCIATION AND PRONUNCIATION TEACHING PRACTICES

Nihal Yapıcı Sarıkaya

M.A., Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe

May 24, 2013

Native English speaking teachers (NESTs) and non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) have been studied by many researchers in the literature in regards to the similarities and differences between these two types of teachers, their perceptions of teaching English, as well as their language proficiency levels (Al-Omrani, 2008; Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Ezberci, 2005; Lipovsky & Mahboob, 2007; Merino, 1997; Shen & Wu, 2007; Tajino & Tajino, 2000). Yet, there is still a lack of in-depth studies that solely focus on NNESTs' teaching of a specific skill and their

perceptions of their own language skills and the relationship between these two aspects.

In this respect, the present study with 140 Turkish NNESTs aimed to examine self perceptions of NNESTs about their pronunciation skills, their pronunciation teaching practices and the relationship between their self perceptions of their English pronunciation and their pronunciation teaching practices. The self perceptions and pronunciation teaching practices of the NNESTs were also examined in regards to the following factors; 1) Teaching Experience, 2) Degree of Education, 3) Taking Phonology Classes, 4) Having a Native English Speaking Teacher, and 5) Time Spent in English Speaking Countries. The data were collected through a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed quantitatively by means of statistical measures.

The results revealed that having a native English speaking instructor, taking phonology classes and spending time in English speaking countries are the factors that affect NNESTs' perceptions and their teaching practices. While having a native English speaking teacher and spending time in English speaking countries are the factors that led the NNESTs rate their own pronunciation skills low, in terms of classroom practices, the most influential factor is taking phonology classes which positively affects the pronunciation teaching occurrence in their classes. The study also revealed that there is no significant relationship between the self perceptions of NNESTs and pronunciation teaching practices.

Concerning the results above, this study implied that NNESTs a) should not be underestimated about their pronunciation teaching; b) should be encouraged to take phonology classes as part of their professional development.

Key words: NNESTs, pronunciation teaching, self perception, phonology.

ÖZET

ANADİLİ İNGİLİZCE OLMAYAN İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN KENDİ
TELAFFUZLARINI ALGILARI VE TELAFFUZ ÖĞRETİMLERİ

Nihal Yapıcı Sarıkaya

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe

24 Mayıs 2013

Ana dili İngilizce olan İngilizce öğretmenleri (NEST) ve ana dili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmenleri (NNEST) birçok araştırmacı tarafından bu iki öğretmen grubunun benzerlikleri ve farklılıkları, İngilizce öğretimi algıları, ve dil yeterlilikleri açısından incelenmiştir (Al-Omrani, 2008; Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Ezberci, 2005; Lipovsky & Mahboob, 2007; Merino, 1997; Shen & Wu, 2007; Tajino & Tajino, 2000). Ancak, literatürde hala sadece ana dili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin belirli bir dil becerisini öğretmesini ve bu dil becerisindeki

öz algılarını, ve bu iki faktörün arasındaki ilişkiyi inceleyen çalışmalar az sayıda bulunmaktadır.

Bu bağlamda, 140 Türk İngilizce öğretmeni ile gerçekleştirilmiş olan bu çalışma, ana dili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin telaffuz becerileri ile ilgili öz algılarını, telaffuz öğretimlerini ve bu öğretmenlerin öz algıları ile öğretimleri arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Aynı zamanda, bu öğretmenlerin öz algıları ve öğretimlerinin aşağıdaki faktörler ile ilişkileri de incelenmiştir; 1) Öğretmenlik Deneyimi, 2) Eğitim Düzeyi, 3) Sesbilim dersi eğitimi, 4) Anadili İngilizce olan İngilizce Öğretmeninden eğitim almış olması 5) Ana dili İngilizce olan ülkelerde bulunma süresi. Veriler 5 dereceli Likert ölçekli anket aracılığıyla toplanmış ve istatistiksel ölçümler yolu ile niteliksel olarak çözümlenmiştir.

Çalışmanın nitel bulguları, ana dili İngilizce olan bir İngilizce öğretmeni tarafından eğitim görmek, ana dili İngilizce olan ülkelerde geçirilen süre ve sesbilim eğitimi alma faktörlerinin ana dili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin öz algılarında ve öğretimlerinde etkileri olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Anadili İngilizce olan İngilizce öğretmeninden eğitim almak ve İngilizce konuşulan ülkelerde bulunmuş olmanın katılımcıların kendi telaffuz becerilerini düşük olarak değerlendirmelerine yol açarken, sınıf uygulamaları bağlamında en önemli faktörün ses bilim dersi almak olduğu ve bu dersleri alan öğretmenlerin derslerinde telaffuz öğretimine, ses bilim dersi almayan öğretmenlere kıyasla daha fazla yer verdikleri sonucu ortaya çıkmıştır. Çalışma aynı zamanda, ana dili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin öz algıları ile telaffuz öğretimleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir ilişki olmadığını kanıtlar niteliktedir.

Yukarıdaki sonuçlar doğrususunda, bu çalışma ana dili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin a) telaffuz eğitimi konusunda azımsanmamalarının, b) profesyonel gelişimlerinin bir parçası olarak ses bilim dersleri almaları konusunda teşvik edilmelerinin gerekliliğini vurgulamaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Ana dili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmenleri (NNESTs), telaffuz eğitimi, öz algı, ses bilim.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It would not have been possible to write this thesis without the help and support of the kind people around me.

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Deniz Oratçtepe, for her guidance, patience and encouragement. If it was not for her, this thesis would not have been completed at all.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Asst. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı and Asst. Prof. Dr. Enisa Mede, for their support and enlightening feedback.

I owe much to Asst. Prof. Dr. Abdullah Ertaş, former director of Gazi University School of Foreign Languages, for believing in me and giving me the opportunity to take part in this program. He had been a great director and I will always remember him as one of the greatest people I have ever met and had the chance to work with.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Sarıkaya, my father-in-law, for teaching me every single detail about data analysis. Without his wisdom and constant support, everything about this thesis would have been more difficult to handle.

I am indebted to Asst. Prof. Dr. Neslihan Özkan who has always been more than an instructor for me. She not only encouraged, supported, and inspired me to go on writing this thesis, but also was there for me no matter when and where. It is a privilege to know her.

I also wish to thank my classmates at the MA TEFL program, Figen İyidoğan, Ebru Gaganuş, Yıldız Albostan, Ayça Özçınar Durrant, and Elizabeth

Pullen, for their invaluable friendship. They have always been at the end of the phone to support me and help me with anything I needed. The days we spent together throughout the year will be remembered as the most enjoyable ones.

I am grateful to my mother Süreyya Yapıcı and my father Mehmet Yapıcı who have always been there for me from the very beginning of my life. They have always believed in me and done everything for me to go on my education. Words are not enough to express my gratitude for their sacrifices and love. I would also like to thank my sister İclal Yapıcı Önal. She is the first and the most valuable friend I have ever had. I will always appreciate her faith in me.

Above all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the love of my life, my husband, Alper Utku Sarıkaya. He has been my most enthusiastic supporter during this long and challenging journey. His existence in my life makes me feel special and lucky every day, and I count myself fortunate for having such a great soul mate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZET	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	x
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xii
LIST OF TABLES	xv
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	1
Background of the Study	2
Statement of the Problem	5
Significance of the Study.....	5
Research Questions	6
Conclusion.....	7
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	8
Introduction	8
Students' Perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs.....	8
Teachers' Perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs	13
Students' and Teachers' Perceptions of NNESTs	16
Pronunciation and NNESTs	18
Conclusion.....	24
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	25
Introduction	25
Setting and Participants	26
Data Collection.....	26

The Construction of the Questionnaire.....	26
The Pilot Study.....	29
Data Analysis.	30
Conclusion.....	31
CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS	32
Introduction	32
Findings	33
Analysis of Research Question 1.....	33
Analyses of Research Questions 1.1 and 1.2.....	35
Teaching Experience.....	35
Degree of Education.....	38
Having a Native English Speaking Teacher	40
Taking Phonology Classes	43
Time Spent in English Speaking Countries	45
Analysis of Research Question 2.....	48
Conclusion.....	49
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION	50
Introduction	50
Findings and Discussion.....	51
Pedagogical Implications of the Study	57
Limitations of the Study	60
Suggestions for Further Research.....	60
Conclusion.....	61

REFERENCES.....	63
APPENDIX 1: FOCUS GROUPS QUESTIONS	70
APPENDIX 2: INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	71
APPENDIX 3: QUESTIONNAIRE.....	72
APPENDIX 4: SELF PERCEPTION SCALE ITEMS.....	75
APPENDIX 5: PRONUNCIATION PRACTICE SCALE ITEMS	76
APPENDIX 6: NORMALITY TESTS RESULTS.	77

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Results of the Descriptive Statistics on PPrS.....	33
2. Results of the Descriptive Statistics on SPS.....	34
3. Results of the Descriptive Statistics on PPrS and Teaching Experience	36
4. Results of One-Way ANOVA Related to PPrS and Teaching Experience	36
5. Results of the Descriptive Statistics Related to SPS and Teaching Experience.....	37
6. Results of One-Way ANOVA Related to SPS and Teaching Experience.....	37
7. Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to PPrS and Degree of Education.....	39
8. Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to SPS and Degree of Education.....	40
9. Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to PPrS and Having a Native English Speaking Teacher.....	41
10. Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to SPS and Having a Native English Speaking Teacher	42
11. Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to PPrS and Taking Phonology Classes.....	43
12. Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to SPS and Taking Phonology Classes.....	44
13. Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to PPrS and Time Spent in English Speaking Countries.....	46
14. Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to SPS and Time Spent in English Speaking Countries.....	47

15. Results of the Pearson Correlation Analysis Related to Research Question 2.....48

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

In English language teaching contexts, a teacher whose L1 is English is called a native English speaking teacher (NEST) and those whose L1 is not English are called non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs). “A native speaker of English is traditionally defined as someone who speaks English as his or her native language, also called mother tongue, first language, or L1” (Medgyes, 2001, p.430). These teachers have been compared and studied by many researchers in the literature and differences between these two types of teachers, as well as their similarities, their perceptions of teaching English, and their language proficiency levels have been the main focus of these studies. (Al-Omrani, 2008; Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Ezberci, 2005; Lipovsky & Mahboob, 2007; Merino, 1997; Shen & Wu, 2007; Shirvani Shahenayatani, 1987; Tajino & Tajino, 2000).

As well as the comparison of these two types of teachers, there have also been many studies which have focused on only NNESTs and various aspects of their teaching experiences such as their self perceptions of proficiency and employability. Yet, the literature on NNESTs still lacks in-depth studies on the teaching of specific skills such as pronunciation, teachers’ perception of their own pronunciation skills and the relationship between these two aspects. The aim of this study is to reveal a picture of NNESTs’ styles of teaching pronunciation, their perceptions of their own pronunciation skills, and the relationship between their perceptions and their reported pronunciation teaching styles.

Background of the study

English as a Foreign Language (EFL) has widely been taught by non-native English speaking teachers (NNEST) in many countries, including Turkey. Widdowson (1994), Crystal (1995) and Graddol (1997) state that with the spread of English as a lingua franca, the number of non-native teachers has been steadily increasing (as cited in Arva & Medgyes, 2000). There have been several studies comparing native English speaking teachers (NESTs) to NNESTs (Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Ezberci, 2005; Merino, 1997; Shahenayati, 1987; Tajino & Tajino, 2000), and some differences have been put forth in terms of language competence and teaching English in both foreign language (EFL) and second language (ESL) situations, as well as comparing the roles they are likely to assume in team teaching situations. NESTs and NNESTs are represented as ‘two different species’ in terms of their language proficiency and teaching behaviours and there are perceived differences in teaching behaviour between NNESTs and NESTs (Arva & Medgyes, 2000). Medgyes (1983) claims that NNESTs generally feel insecure using the language they have to teach and as a result of this feeling they become either pessimistic or aggressive. He states that this insecurity leads to NNESTs’ focusing too much on grammar and ignoring pronunciation and vocabulary. In addition to feeling insecure, NNESTs have the disadvantage of still being learners of English themselves. In their study comparing NESTs to NNESTs, Arva and Medgyes (2000) found that in all four skills NNESTs lagged behind NESTs.

Other studies have focused solely on NNESTs; many looking at NNESTs' self-perceptions, their perceptions of teaching English as a foreign language in general, and students' perceptions of non-native language teachers. Tang (2007) discusses that NNESTs realize the need to improve themselves in language proficiency and they are aware that their inadequate language proficiency negatively affects their confidence in teaching English. In line with Tang's discussion, Choi (2007) claims that some NNESTs believe being non-native is the most difficult part of their professions and they feel uncomfortable about being non-native while some others do not see it as a barrier at all. NNESTs' self perceptions have been revealed in the context of several issues such as vocabulary knowledge, cultural knowledge, pronunciation and grammar knowledge. With respect to pronunciation in particular, Silva (2009) found that NNESTs think that students want NESTs in classrooms because they have better pronunciation; therefore, they are better models for students. This statement clearly shows that NNESTs who participated in the study mentioned above, did not feel proficient in pronunciation. In terms of self perception of pronunciation and sounding native like, there have been studies which show that there is a relationship between teachers' self perception of their own pronunciation and their teaching practice preferences. According to Tang's (1997) findings, NNESTs thought that their native English speaking colleagues were better in pronunciation and speaking thus associated themselves with accuracy rather than fluency. In other words, these NNESTs focus on accuracy in their classes rather than fluency, which automatically crosses out the teaching of pronunciation. Similarly, in Ozturk and Atay's (2010) study, NNESTs stated their desire to have a better command of English in terms of speaking fluently and without hesitation and these

NNESTs' felt inefficient when they compared themselves to their native English speaking colleagues.

However, NNESTs' perceptions of their own language skills do not always show lack of confidence signs and this confidence obviously affects the way they teach. In a recent study conducted by Kamhi-Stein, Aagard, Ching, Paik and Sasser (2004), NNESTs, who work at primary and secondary school level, recorded that they are confident in their pronunciation skills and language proficiency in general (as cited in Moussu & Llurda, 2008). In a similar study, Llurda and Huguet (2003) pointed out that NNESTs show confidence in their language proficiency in general if they spent some time abroad. Those who had not spent time abroad seemed to think that a NEST would be a better model for the students (as cited in Moussu & Llurda, 2008). Moreover, a similar study conducted by Arva and Medgyes (2000) showed that NNESTs' lack of confidence in teaching pronunciation was in vain as they defined their pronunciation as 'at near native level' when they observed those NNESTs during classroom practices.

When a context that includes only NNESTs is considered, it is important to explore their self-perceptions about being non-native. There are studies on self-perceptions of language proficiency in general. However, there are not studies on perceptions of NNESTs about the issue of being non native and teaching pronunciation in an EFL context. Moreover, in their article Moussu and Llurda (2008) stated that the largest part of the literature is related to North American situation and ESL contexts. At this point, it is important to look at the relationship between the self-perception of Turkish NNESTs on pronunciation and oral

communication skills and their teaching practices in a specific area, namely pronunciation.

Statement of the Problem

The place of non native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) and native English speaking teachers (NESTs) in EFL and ESL contexts, the comparison of their language proficiency, self-perceptions, and students' perceptions about NESTs versus NNESTs, have received great attention in recent literature and a great deal of studies have been conducted on these issues (Al-Omrani, 2008; Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Ezberci, 2005; Lipovsky & Mahboob, 2007; Merino, 1997; Shen & Wu, 2007; Shirvani Shahenayatani, 1987; Tajino & Tajino, 2000). There are also a number of studies which focus on only NNESTs, including those looking at their self-perceptions of their proficiency in language and their pedagogical knowledge in general, as well as their identities, status, experiences and employability (Choi, 1993; Clark & Paran, 2007; Cook, 1999; Griffler & Samimy, 1999; Hayes, 2009; Kim, 2009; Lee, 2010, Mahboob, 2003; Öztürk & Atay, 2010; Sahib, 2005; Silva, 2009; Tang, 2007; Wen, 2009). However, the discipline still lacks studies investigating the relationship between NNESTs' self-perceptions on a specific skill, namely pronunciation, and their styles of teaching in this specific area.

Significance of the Study

There is a lack of research in the literature about NNESTs on the relationship between their perceptions about being non native and teaching speaking and pronunciation. The results of this study may contribute to this literature by revealing a picture of NNESTs' perceptions on being non native teachers of English, and teaching an important part of a skill, pronunciation, which is arguably the most

distinctive skill that one is more likely to find a difference in being native or sounding native-like. In that, how they perceive their own pronunciation of English as a NNEST and to what extent their perceptions affect their classroom practices regarding pronunciation teaching may explain the issue of NNESTs regarding teaching pronunciation.

At the local level, this study attempted to reveal the picture of NNESTs' perceptions of their own pronunciation skills and teaching pronunciation at a Turkish state university. This information is essential for the institution as it will help the institution see the extent to which its staff feels proficient and comfortable teaching pronunciation. It will also be of great use in considering the needs, limits and ideas of the instructors while adjusting the objectives of the institution.

Research Questions

1. What are the NNESTs' perceptions of teaching pronunciation as a non native English speaker?
 - 1.1. Is there a significant difference between teachers' reported practice of teaching pronunciation and these factors separately: their years of experience, their degree of education, whether or not they had a native English speaking teacher, whether or not they took phonology classes, and the time they spent in English speaking countries?
 - 1.2. Is there a significant difference between teachers' self-perceptions of pronunciation and these factors separately: their years of experience, their degree of education, whether or not they had a native English speaking teacher, whether or not they took phonology classes, and the time they spent in English speaking countries?

2. What is the relationship between NNESTs' perceptions of their own pronunciation and their reported teaching practices?

Conclusion

This chapter briefly explained the state of NNESTs and the studies which reflect their situation in the literature. This chapter described the NESTs and NNESTs specifically, introduced the topic of the study, described the statement of the problem and the significance of the study. The second chapter will present the literature review; the third chapter will describe the methodology of the study and in the fourth chapter quantitative data analysis will be presented. In the fifth chapter, the conclusions drawn from the data will be presented.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In spite of the fact that English teaching in EFL contexts is mostly conducted by non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs), research exclusively on NNESTs' self-perceptions and students' perceptions of NNESTs have been studied for less than a decade. Braine (2005) explains this short period of research on NNESTs as a consequence of NNEST issue's being sensitive as previous research on native English speaking teachers (NESTs) vs. NNESTs has often been favouring NESTs and the results of these studies showed that NESTs have advantages over NNESTs in terms of knowledge and performance. The studies comparing NESTs to NNESTs have also been conducted in terms of cultural advantage, language proficiency in general, comparison of self-perceptions of these teachers as well as language learners' perceptions of these two different types of teachers. However, NNESTs' perceptions of their own pronunciation and their classroom practices of teaching pronunciation have not been studied yet.

Students' Perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs

Research on NNESTs include studies that focused on only the perceptions of students and examined their perceptions of NNESTs and NNESTs by looking at many different aspects. Shen and Wu (2007) conducted a study with 357 university students in Taiwan and sought for their perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs. Their results suggested that students favoured NNESTs because they are good learner models, their teaching methods are better than NESTs, they are more sensitive to the students and they use the students' mother tongue. Participants also indicated that NESTs should teach speaking rather than reading, writing or linguistics. The results

also show that according to these students NNESTs provided better vocabulary and grammar knowledge. In the light of these results, Shen and Wu (2007) concluded that NNESTs were persistent on grammar and vocabulary because they focused on accuracy whereas NESTs focused on fluency. The study sheds a light on the NEST vs. NNEST issue and addresses an important point which is NNESTs' focusing on grammar and vocabulary more than speaking.

Similarly, in his doctoral dissertation, Al-Omrani (2008) studied 100 Saudi ESL/EFL students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs. He focused on these students' ideas about the advantages and disadvantages of studying English with teachers who have different backgrounds. His findings, gathered through questionnaires and interviews, revealed that students' perceptions of these two different types of teacher differed in terms of the teaching areas. Participants' statements revealed that they believe NESTs are more qualified at teaching oral skills as it is their mother tongue and NNEST are more successful at teaching in general because they themselves had been learners of this language before and they can make connections more easily than their native speaking colleagues. Furthermore, the results of this study showed that, according to the students, the negative features of NNESTs are their oral skills and pronunciation as well as their overall language proficiency.

Students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs were also the focus of Murahata and Murahata's (2000) study on Japanese university level students' expectations from NESTs and NNESTs. Researchers questioned if there was a difference between the expectations from both types of teacher and if there was such a difference, where the difference stemmed from. They conducted the study with 79

Japanese university students who were in their first or second year at university and had both NESTs and NNESTs. The results revealed that these students expect NESTs to focus on speaking and listening whereas they expect NNESTs to focus on grammar and reading. These results show parallelism with Medgeys' (1992) claims about NESTs' being more proficient in English and NNESTs' focusing more on grammar or being obsessed with grammar (Medgyes, 1983). However, this parallelism between the students' perceptions and Medgyes' claims should be tested from the perspective of the NNESTs themselves. Another important point mentioned by the researchers is that the NNESTs in the Japanese context have difficulties in being a good role model in a communicative class since they may easily make mistakes while speaking and expressing themselves. The question which was about the expectation of students from their NNESTs in terms of oral proficiency in English has an interesting result that these students expect their NNESTs to try for a 'near-native' oral fluency with good pronunciation and intonation. However, whether this expectation is fulfilled by NNESTs was not answered in this study. Another analysis of NNESTs' strengths and weaknesses in an EFL context was made by Ling and Braine (2007). The main focus of their study was to examine the students' perceptions of NNESTs in Hong Kong. They conducted a study with students from 7 different universities. Sixty students from each university answered a questionnaire which included statements about the students' feelings about learning from NNESTs and communication with NNESTs. The results of this study showed that these students' perceptions of their NNESTs are mostly positive. The students' responses were also positive in the follow-up interview and NNESTs' were described as being

knowledgeable in English language as well as having the ability to use mother tongue in teaching, effective pedagogical skills and positive personality traits.

In their study, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2002) asked seventy-six university students to complete questionnaires to find out these students' opinions about NESTs and NNESTs' language skills, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, learning strategies, culture and civilization, attitudes and assessment. They had four hypotheses and two of them were quite related to the results found in the studies mentioned in this literature review. One hypothesis was that there would be a preference for NESTs in vocabulary, pronunciation, speaking, culture and civilization, attitudes and assessment areas and the other hypothesis was that the preference for NNESTs would be in grammar, listening, reading and learning strategies areas. Their hypotheses were supported by the results since the preference for NNESTs was in grammar and reading teaching areas and for NESTs the preference was for speaking, vocabulary and pronunciation.

With an attempt to see if there is a correspondence between the students' and teachers' perceptions of the different teaching behaviours of NNESTs and NESTs, Benke and Medgyes (2005) looked at the students' perceptions of these two types of teachers in Hungary. Their starting point was to see whether the results of Arva and Medgyes's (2000) previous study, which was conducted with teachers would correspond with their study which was conducted with students. Four hundred and twenty-two students were included in the study and their perceptions of these teachers were asked in a five points Likert-scale questionnaire in addition to an open ended section in which the students explained the advantages and disadvantages of both teachers. The results of this study revealed that there is a correspondence

between the students' and teachers' perceptions of weaknesses/strengths of NESTs and NNESTs. Moreover, when the answers given to the questions about NNESTs were examined, participants mostly disagreed that NNESTs focus primarily on speaking skills whereas this item has the highest percentage in the NESTs questionnaire. Among the open ended questions, the researchers stated that they were not surprised to see that according to the students the NNESTs are great grammar teachers, but they criticized these teachers because of their poor pronunciation skills. On the other hand, the students clearly stated the advantage of NESTs as they are quite successful at teaching conversation classes and these teachers can serve as ideal models for imitation. According to one of the participants, the advantage of NESTs is this simple; "Pronunciation, pronunciation, pronunciation!" (p. 207) and another quotation in the research clearly shows that these students love listening to NESTs; "It is an acoustic delight to listen to them..." (p. 207). Both of these quotations clearly indicate that the students' preference of NESTs is their pronunciation and speaking skills.

In light of these studies, it is possible to have a broad idea about the perceptions of the students exclusively. They also give a clear explanation of the advantages and disadvantages of having an NNEST in the classroom from the students' point of view. However, since all these studies included both NESTs and NNESTs, students' perceptions reflect the results of their comparison rather than the evaluation of NNESTs' strengths and weaknesses separately. Furthermore, the conclusions made by the researchers which showed that NNESTs were more interested in accuracy than fluency and preferred to teach grammar rather than speaking for the same reason were the result of the students' responses and

preferences rather than NNESTs' themselves (Al Omrani, 2008; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2002; Shen & Wu, 2007).

Teachers' Perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs

In addition to focusing solely on students' perceptions, many other researchers studied NESTs and NNESTs by focusing on the teachers' perceptions. In his book dedicated to NNESTs, Braine (2010) cited many studies focusing on many aspects of NNESTs research such as student and teacher perceptions, self-perceptions and professional development. In his chapter about self-perceptions of NNESTs, he cited Kamhi-Stein, Aagard, Ching, Paik, and Sesser's (2004) study which compared NESTs to NNESTs teaching at different levels in California. The non native English speaking participants of this study marked their own language skills "very good". However, the lowest rated-skill of these NNESTs was marked as pronunciation. Moreover, one of the participants stated that NNESTs were afraid of making mistakes while speaking. Rajagopalan (2005) states that as a result of NESTs were claimed to be as reliable models for the people who are willing to learn English as a second language, NNEST admitted their places and inferiority to NESTs. He also states that these NNESTs got used to living with low self confidence rates and job-related stress in accordance with this low self esteem.

Another comparison of NESTs to NNESTs was conducted by Arva and Medgyes (2000) in Hungary. Their study included ten teachers and five of them were NNESTs. The aim of the study was to find out the differences between NESTs and NNESTs in terms of teaching behaviour and the difference between teachers' perceptions and classroom realities. The study's results do not show a different perspective about either type of teachers. NNESTs reported that their native speaking

colleagues were far better than themselves in terms of colloquial expressions, idioms and phrasal verbs. Moreover, NNESTs stated that they feel far more comfortable in teaching grammar and they admitted that they had difficulties especially with pronunciation, vocabulary and colloquial expressions. Surprisingly, in spite of NNESTs' lack of confidence signs in pronunciation, the classroom realities of these teachers showed that they were quite fluent and some of them were even described as 'at near-native level' by the researchers.

In her master thesis, Ezberci (2005) also studied the comparison of NESTs to NNESTs in terms of their own perceptions of ELT as a career, the most important qualifications of an English language teacher and their views about job opportunities, strengths and weaknesses. In order to get answers to her questions, she conducted a study with 172 participants from 10 different universities in Istanbul. The answers regarding the strengths and weaknesses of NNESTs showed that 'command of English' is the weakness of NNESTs as perceived by both NESTs and NNESTs. Furthermore, the NNESTs who were involved in this study stated that NESTs' strengths were their speaking skills and command of English. In the framework of a comparison, this study gives clear information about NNESTs' perceptions. NNESTs' responses to the weaknesses/strengths related questions indicate that they are aware of the fact that there is a difference at the command of English level.

In her survey study, Tang (1997) asked NNESTs about their perceptions of proficiency and competency of NESTs and NNESTs. Her results also showed that NNESTs believed that NESTs were superior to NNESTs in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary and reading. The percentage of the teachers (92%) who believe that NESTs are superior in pronunciation clearly reveals the picture of NNESTs' self-

perceptions of pronunciation. In addition, those NNESTs stated that they were associated with accuracy rather than fluency. In light of these results, one can assume that NNESTs may feel inferior in the aspects which are defined as strengths of NESTs.

Ozturk and Atay (2010) also tried to show the challenges of being a NNEST in their case study. Their subjects were three female Turkish teachers of English who were all novice, at their first or second years in their professions. Their study was a follow-up of Atay's (2007) study which was carried out in Turkish setting and the results of that study clearly showed that NNESTs believed that they cannot compete with NESTs. Moreover, these teachers stated that they all wanted to have native-like competence in English. The most important skill for them was to speak in English 'fluently and without hesitations' (as cited in Ozturk & Atay, 2010). Therefore, their main focus was to find out NNESTs' opinions about NEST/NNEST dichotomy and if there had been any change in the opinions of these novice teachers when they started to teach in different environments. According to these three novice teachers' answers in interviews, there had been times that they felt their situation in teaching would be totally different if they were native speakers. As the study looks from employability perspective, the results indicated that these NNESTs felt inferior to their native colleagues and believed that their employability situation is mostly affected by NESTs' being chosen by the institutions and also parents. The researchers state that these NNESTs accept themselves as inefficient teachers even without questioning and something should be done to help these teachers be aware of themselves.

Literature from the teachers' perceptions of these two types of teachers the results of these studies indicated that NNESTs somehow feel inferior when they compare themselves to their native English speaking colleagues. Therefore, the results of a study which focuses on the self perceptions of NNESTs who work in a NNEST environment in an EFL context would be different from this comparison as it will include NNESTs only and they will be considering their own proficiency in pronunciation and their teaching styles instead of comparing themselves to a native English speaking colleague (Arva & Medgyes, 2000).

Students' and Teachers' Perceptions of NNESTs

When it comes to perceptions of NNESTs, students' and teachers' perceptions have been studied both in isolation and together and the results of these studies mostly show that there is a lack of confidence of language proficiency in general, speaking and pronunciation in particular. When Liu's (1999) participants who worked in a major university in U.S. in terms were asked whether they saw themselves as native or non-native speakers of English, they described themselves as NNESTs in spite of the fact that they were in an ESL context, hence in a surrounding which included native English speakers. However, according to Liu's (1999) description these participants spoke English like native speakers.

In her survey study, Nemtchinova (2005) sought for host teachers' perceptions of NNEST trainees' strengths. She defines host teachers as "teachers in various educational settings with whom MA TESOL students are paired to teach their practicum classes." (Nemtchinova, 2005, p. 236). The NNESTs evaluated in this study were mostly novice teachers whose practicum teaching was their first experience in teaching. Host teachers' answers to the personal quality questions

showed that these NNESTs were mostly welcomed by the students and they had a good rapport. The host teachers' evaluations of these NNESTs in terms of personal qualities, command of language, teaching organization, lesson implementation, cultural awareness, feedback to students and self-evaluation were positive in general. The negative evaluations of the host teachers were based on being novice rather than being non native. They stated that these NNESTs were very willing to get feedback – especially on pronunciation- and they were eager to make changes in their styles according to the feedback. When they were asked about the overall strengths of these NNEST trainees, host teachers indicated that they were very good at identifying cultural and linguistic needs of ESL learners, therefore; they were able to develop positive relationships with their students. Being a successful learner model is another strength stated by the host teachers. However, when they were asked about what NNEST trainees could have done better, most of the host teachers said 'pronunciation' as well as teaching skills and classroom behaviour. However, these native speaking host teachers stated earlier in the study that the pronunciation issue was not that important for classroom setting as the students already had a native speaking model in the classroom. In this respect, the pronunciation issue was not given that much importance and their suggestions did not go beyond focusing on oral communication not necessarily for students but for themselves.

In his study conducted in Brazil, Rajagopalan (2005) found out that his NNEST respondents agreed with the idea that spending time/living in a native speaking environment is an important issue for them. Rajagopalan (2005) stated that some of the most fluent teachers in the interviews were the ones who spent time abroad. On the other hand, the ones who claimed having lived in English speaking

environments did not show that much fluency in English. According to Rajagopalan (2005), the main difference came out because of the way NNESTs perceive themselves and rate their own fluency. In addition, his findings revealed that the experienced NNESTs were more worried about being a non-native teacher than their less experienced colleagues and Rajagopalan (2005) also presumed that these less experienced teachers are from a younger generation. The results mentioned in the literature supported Rajagopalan's (2005) emphasis on that a lot of work should be done in order to empower the NNESTs and encourage them to rethink their own roles in EFL contexts.

Similarly, in their study which aimed to reveal an international picture of NNESTs, Reves and Medgyes (1994) mentioned that some of the non native speaker participants who had been in frequent contact with native speakers judged their own command of English severely and this interaction made these NNESTs more conscious about the problems that result from their languages deficiencies.

Pronunciation and NNESTs

Kelly (2000) stated that pronunciation is a neglected part of English lessons in most cases since the teachers are mostly uneasy about dealing with sounds and intonation. Another reason he gave was that the teachers think they have too much to do throughout their lessons and pronunciation teaching will make this process worse. In line with Harmer's argument but from a different perspective, Macdonald (2002) also stated that many teachers do not teach pronunciation "because they lack confidence, skills and knowledge" (p. 3). In his study which solely focused on teachers' practices and views on pronunciation, Macdonald (2002) suggested that most of his participants, who worked in adult ESL programs in Australia, indicated

that they were not good at teaching pronunciation and they were reluctant to teach it for several reasons such as formal curricula, learner goals and assessment, teaching in an integrated way and teaching and learning materials. He stated that most of his participants focused on pronunciation teaching only when a need came up in the classroom, otherwise they ignored it, and this reluctant behaviour should be addressed through teacher training. As well as giving specific recommendations related to these areas, Macdonald (2002) highlighted that teacher training in pronunciation is a need both at pre-service stage and as part of ongoing professional development programs. As Derwing and Munro (2005) emphasized in their article about pronunciation teaching, most of the English language teachers are not provided with essential training on teaching pronunciation and they are left with their own intuitions about pronunciation teaching, and because of this lack of training, most of the teachers are reluctant to teach pronunciation in their classrooms. In their study which was aimed to identify how well the English language teachers are trained for teaching pronunciation, Bradford and Kenworthy (1991) found out that most of their participants were not content with phonology and pronunciation training they got during their graduate studies. The participants stated that too little time had been given to these areas and this had not been enough for them to decide the course content and which methods to use in the classroom. (as cited in Lambacher, 2001).

In their article which included a review on several studies about pronunciation teaching, Baker and Murphy (2011) highlighted the importance of the relationship of teachers' knowledge, beliefs and their actual classroom practices. Moreover, they focused on learner factors, curriculum factors and teacher factors as the most frequently recurrent factors in the literature related to the key components

of pronunciation teaching and learning. Their review indicated that in addition to the knowledge of curriculum and learner factors, the language teachers should also have the knowledge of phonology and the techniques to be used to teach pronunciation effectively.

There are also some studies which touched upon the importance of teaching pronunciation in ESL and EFL contexts. Derwing and Munro (2005) stated that teaching pronunciation could be useful in that students who learn L2 pronunciation would benefit from explicit instruction of phonological forms that would help them notice the difference between a proficient speakers' production and their own production. Bradlow, Pisoni, Akahane-Yamad and Takura's (1997) study also stressed the importance of showing the distinction between L1 and L2. Their argument was that showing this difference may lead to automatic improvement in production even if there is no production training (as cited in Derwing & Munro 2005). Yet, Derwing and Munro (2005) cautiously stressed that strategies that teachers develop themselves for the sake of teaching pronunciation may turn out to be useless. In that sense, having pronunciation training during or before their careers becomes important for the language teachers, especially NNESTs who themselves are still the learners of the language they teach (Medgyes, 1992).

In accordance with Derwing and Munro, Levis (2005) also stated that the importance of pronunciation has not been based on research but on ideology and intuition. He explained that most of the teachers have decided which parts of pronunciation have the greatest effect on clarity and which parts are learnable in a classroom setting by their intuition, and this could be dealt with only providing a carefully formulated agenda to define which features of pronunciation affect

intelligibility, hence help the teachers in a more effective way on teaching pronunciation.

Wong (1993) indicated that there are four myths about teaching pronunciation one of which is that non-native speakers of English cannot teach pronunciation. She argued that people have this idea because teaching pronunciation has the exact pronunciation of vowel and consonant sounds as its main concern. However, communicative effectiveness does not solely depend on the pronunciation of these vowels and consonants. Wong (1993) stated that if a speaker is able to use the rhythm and intonation of English, he/she is accepted as much more intelligible than the one who pronounce vowels and consonants perfectly. Wong (1993) indicated that this anxiety of NNESTs about teaching pronunciation can be reduced if they become educated in teaching pronunciation and this will definitely help these teachers feel more confident. In addition, Wong (1993) saw NNESTs as having advantages over the native speaking teachers as they can receive and manipulate more easily rhythm and intonation than the native speakers because the native speakers are not even conscious of these features.

In her study, Jenkins (2005) studied eight NNESTs who have high level of proficiency. She examined these teachers' attitudes towards their own pronunciation and their attitudes towards other NNS English accents. The participants' answers to the question of whether they feel comfortable about their own pronunciation clearly showed that they are quite comfortable. Moreover, when they were asked how they would feel if someone told them that their pronunciation is similar to a native speaker's, they reported that they would be happy or proud of themselves. The results of this study showed that these NNESTs are content with their own

pronunciation indeed, but when asked about sounding ‘native like’, they did not deny its being a good quality for a NNEST.

Medgyes’ (1992) claims about NNESTs and NESTs that their teaching practice and language competence are different and the difference in language competence explains the differences found in teaching practice. However, Medgyes’ (1992) explained that NESTs’ advantage is their mother tongue and this advantage cannot be overshadowed by any other factors such as aptitude, motivation or experience. Moreover, Medgyes (1992) stated that despite all their efforts, non-natives cannot reach a native speaker’s competence. He also stated that non-natives are not able to use English accurately and appropriately. His claim was that their fluency does not and will not come up to natives’ level. Nevertheless, his main point was that there are ideal types of both NESTs and NNESTs. According to Medgyes (1992) the ideal NNEST is "the one who has achieved near-native proficiency in English" (p.348). At this point, the question is how NNESTs perceive themselves in terms of language proficiency and to what extent they agree with Medgyes’ (1992) ideal NNEST definition. Self-perceptions of NNESTs are the key points that will show a broader picture of NNEST situation.

Chiu (2008) pointed out in his study that NNESTs he interviewed showed a certain extent of confidence in terms of their own pronunciation and accent. In addition, these participants stated that a standard accent is equal to the native accent. Similar to Jenkins’ (2005) participants, these Taiwanese instructors asserted that they would feel uncomfortable if someone told them that their English bear a “Taiwanese Flavour” and they actually do not believe that they have this flavour in their accents. They also stated that NNESTs can perform as well as natives in terms of being a

model in the classroom. Moreover, Chui (2008) states that these NNESTs had been able to verbalize their knowledge of the English phonological system better than the NESTs interviewed. They had been able to use more terminology and in a more systematic way, however; they seemed to have more knowledge of the segmental level rather than the super segmental level.

With an attempt to investigate the Thai NNESTs' ideas about hiring NESTs for listening and speaking classes, Suwanarak (2010) studied with 16 Thai NNESTs about their perceptions of and differences between NNESTs and NESTs. Suwanarak (2010) based his study on the choice of Ministry of Education in Thailand which started to hire NESTs for speaking and listening classes for they think that English proficiency level of undergraduate students is important. Thai interviewees of the study stated that NESTs are preferred because it is their native language but they also stated that they would like to teach those skills. Ten out of 16 interviewees agreed the notion which describes the ideal teacher of English as a native speaker of English. Their statements also showed that they think interacting and practicing communication skills with native speakers will be of great help to the students in terms of useful expressions and correct pronunciation. They also think that NESTs would be more accurate in pronunciation as well as the accents. In addition, some participants stated that their English still has a Thai accent; therefore, a NEST would be a better language user. On the other hand, six participants stated that there are many factors that affect the situation of being an ideal teacher such as educational background and teaching experience. They also stated that some NNESTs who can achieve native-like English proficiency can be ideal teachers, too. They also believe

that NNESTs would be more successful in understanding the differences of phonetic systems between two languages.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the literature relevant to NNESTs and NESTs are provided. The studies included in this chapter revealed that many aspects of NNESTs had been studied both from students' perspective and NNESTs perspectives. The studies also touched upon the weaknesses and strengths of NESTs vs. NNESTs. The literature included in this chapter indicate that NNESTs have both strong and weak qualities in terms of language proficiency, both depending upon their own perceptions and their students' and NEST colleagues' perceptions. Moreover, the literature includes many studies conducted in contexts where NESTs and NNESTs worked together. However, the NNESTs' perceptions should also be discovered by looking at their own perceptions of a specific skill, namely pronunciation, and the relationship between their self-perceptions and teaching practices. Thus, the current study aims to provide a clear insight into the self-perceptions of NNESTs on their own pronunciation skills and their teaching practices of pronunciation in their classrooms in a context where there are only NNESTs.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine NNESTs' perceptions of teaching pronunciation in English as a foreign language and to find out the relationship between their perceptions and actual teaching practices. The research questions addressed for this study are as follows:

1. What are the NNESTs' perceptions of teaching pronunciation as a non native English speaker?
 - 1.1. Is there a significant difference between teachers' reported practice of teaching pronunciation and these factors separately: their years of experience, their degree of education, whether or not they had a native English speaking teacher, whether or not they took phonology classes, and the time they spent in English speaking countries?
 - 1.2. Is there a significant difference between teachers' self-perceptions of pronunciation and these factors separately: their years of experience, their degree of education, whether or not they had a native English speaking teacher, whether or not they took phonology classes, and the time they spent in English speaking countries?
2. What is the relationship between NNESTs' perceptions of their own pronunciation and their reported teaching practices?

This chapter presents the research methods used in the study as well as the research design and data collection procedures. Information about the participants and instruments will also be provided.

Setting and Participants

The study was conducted at four different Turkish state universities: Gazi University School of Foreign Languages, Middle East Technical University (METU) Modern Languages Department, Ankara University School of Foreign Languages and Kocaeli University School of Foreign Languages. All of the instructors in these four institutions are non-native speakers of English language. Like many other state universities in Turkey, these institutions give all the responsibility of teaching speaking or pronunciation to their NNEST staff as they do not have native English speaking instructors. Therefore, these NNESTs are the primary role-models for pronunciation in their classrooms. Furthermore, they all follow syllabi that are based on the institution's chosen main course book, and do the speaking and pronunciation activities included in the book - if there are any. Decisions about whether to give extra emphasis to pronunciation, or to skip pronunciation activities altogether, rest exclusively with the instructor. One hundred and forty NNESTs from these four universities took part in the study. Thirty instructors from METU, 12 instructors from Kocaeli University, 51 instructors from Gazi University, and 47 instructors from Ankara University kindly completed the questionnaire.

Data Collection

The Construction of the Questionnaire

In this study, data were collected mainly through a Likert-scale questionnaire developed by the researcher herself. In order to construct the items in the questionnaire, the researcher followed these three steps. First, the researcher used an online survey to construct focus groups and individual interviews. Focus group

discussions and individual interviews were recorded and completed, and then they were transcribed to write questionnaire items.

As stated before, the first step to develop the questionnaire was to conduct an online survey. The aim of this online survey was to group the instructors, and subsequently conduct interviews and focus group discussions, which at the very end helped gather ideas to form the questionnaire items. This online survey consisted of two simple questions in line with the research questions of the study: 1) How do you rate your pronunciation? 2) How much time do you spend teaching pronunciation in class? The participants answered these questions on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 represented the lowest and 10 represented the highest points for each question. The survey was formed and sent using the survey software LimeSurvey to 61 instructors at Gazi University School of Foreign Languages, and 26 instructors filled in the survey. Instructors at this institution were chosen at this stage of the study as they were relatively easier to reach by e-mail since the researcher was able to get hold of the complete e-mail address list of the institution.

After examining the responses to this initial brief online survey, the researcher grouped the participants according to their answers into two main groups. For the two survey items, those who self-reported their pronunciation and teaching practices to be between 8-10 were considered to be reporting high self-confidence about pronunciation and giving more importance to teaching pronunciation. Participants who self-reported their pronunciation and teaching practices to be between 4-7 were considered to be in the middle group. Those who self-reported their pronunciation and teaching practices to be between 1 to 3, however, were considered to be in the low self-confidence group. Group discussions were held with

four participants in the high and middle groups. As for the low group, the participants were not eager to take part in group discussions due to scheduling and personal reasons. Nevertheless, one participant, who also happened to mark the lowest among the participants, agreed to be interviewed individually.

The group discussions were held in Turkish in order to reduce the hesitations which might have arisen due to the questions the researcher posed since they were about pronunciation teaching and the group members might have felt uncomfortable while speaking in English and talking about pronunciation teaching at the same time. In these group discussions four open-ended questions (See Appendix 1) regarding participants' ideas about teaching pronunciation were asked. The questions primarily functioned as rough outlines about where the discussion could go, and participants were free to ponder about their ideas.

According to the same results of the online survey, one instructor whose scores were the highest both in pronunciation and practice in the survey, one instructor whose scores were the lowest on both measures in the survey and one instructor whose scores were in the middle were chosen to be interviewed individually. There were 10 main questions in the interviews (See Appendix 2); however, the researcher asked additional questions depending on the responses. These interviews were mainly about self-perception of these NNESTs about their own pronunciation and about being non native teachers. The interviews were recorded and later transcribed. The responses of the participants both in the focus groups and in the individual interviews served to identify and construct the items included in the final questionnaire.

When the interviews and focus group discussions were completed, the recordings were transcribed and analyzed, and a Likert-scale questionnaire of twenty-nine items was developed. The items were generated according to the responses and ideas that arose from the group discussions and individual interviews. Additionally, some of the items were adapted from some of the studies in the literature (Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Ezberci, 2005; Jenkins, 2005; Medgyes, 1983; Medgyes, 1992; Tang, 1997). The first section of the questionnaire includes questions that help gather background information about the participants. In this section, information about any time spent abroad, the number of years in EFL teaching, age, academic degree, having native English speaking teachers while they were learning the language, and having phonology classes as part of their degree programs was gathered. The second section of the questionnaire included twenty-nine items about pronunciation teaching practices, and self-perception of being NNEST and perception of their own pronunciation skills (See Appendix 3).

The Pilot Study

Before conducting the final version of the questionnaire, the 29 item questionnaire was piloted by the researcher with seventeen participants from Bilkent University, Ankara who were not the participants of the main study, and only the wording of some items was changed according to their feedback. In the pilot study, the reliability and validity of the questionnaire were examined. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was used to check for the internal consistency of items in the questionnaire. The results revealed that cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was .803. The value of .803 was considered as an adequate value for the internal consistency since it was greater than 0.70 according to Nunnally (1978) criteria. The

content validity was assured by referring to the literature as well as receiving expert opinion from the supervisor of the study.

After the necessary changes were made, the researcher distributed printed copies of the final questionnaire to the participants and collected them a week later. The importance of their participating in this study was explained on the first page of the questionnaire along with a consent statement to be signed and dated. Twelve complete questionnaires out of 30 from Kocaeli University, and 47 out of 70 from Ankara University were collected. The other two universities sent back all the questionnaires fully completed – 30 out of 30 from METU and 51 out of 51 from Gazi University. A total of 140 completed questionnaires were received.

Data Analysis

As stated before, the questionnaire items were developed according to the responses and ideas of those who participated in individual interviews and group discussions. Since the online survey, group discussions and individual questions were all focused on two main factors, the end product included statements for both of these main topics – namely, self-perception of pronunciation and pronunciation teaching practice. The questionnaire consisted of twenty-nine statements, which can be categorized in two parts: fourteen of which were about participants' self-perception of their pronunciation, and fifteen of which were about their pronunciation teaching practice. The researcher named these parts as Self-Perception Scale (SPS) and Pronunciation Practice Scale (PPrS) in the data analysis chapter. However, the titles for these two main factors were not made explicit in the distributed questionnaire in order not to affect participants' responses. The results

were analyzed according to these two main topics using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 10.0 (SPSS).

The results of the analysis are presented in Chapter 4 under five variables: 1) Teaching Experience, 2) Degree of Education, 3) Having a Native English Speaking Teacher, 4) Taking Phonology Classes, 5) Time Spent in English Speaking Countries. For each variable, normality tests were conducted through Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests (See Appendix 4). Since the normality assumptions were met for all of the variables, One Way ANOVA and paired sample t-tests were conducted to see if there were any statistical significant differences between each factor and PPrS and SPS. When all these analyses were reported, the correlation between the SPS and the PPrS was presented by using Pearson Correlation Analysis Technique.

Conclusion

This chapter provided information about the study's setting, participants, and instruments used as well as the data collection and analysis procedures. The next chapter will report the findings of the data analysis.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This study investigated NNESTs' self perceptions of their pronunciation and teaching pronunciation practices in their classes through a 5 point Likert-Scale questionnaire by addressing the following research questions:

1. What are the NNESTs' perceptions of teaching pronunciation as a non native English speaker?
 - 1.1. Is there a significant difference between teachers' reported practice of teaching pronunciation and these factors separately: their years of experience, their degree of education, whether or not they had a native English speaking teacher, whether or not they took phonology classes, and the time they spent in English speaking countries?
 - 1.2. Is there a significant difference between teachers' self-perceptions of pronunciation and these factors separately: their years of experience, their degree of education, whether or not they had a native English speaking teacher, whether or not they took phonology classes, and the time they spent in English speaking countries?
2. What is the relationship between NNESTs' perceptions of their own pronunciation and their reported teaching practices?

Findings

Analysis of Research Question 1

In order to answer the first research question of the study, which is " What are the NNESTs' perceptions of teaching pronunciation as a non native English speaker?", first, the scores of the NNESTs on Pronunciation Practice Scale, which includes statements about teaching pronunciation, how the NNESTs teach pronunciation, and what parts of pronunciation they prefer to teach were analyzed. Upon conducting descriptive statistics, NNESTs' scores on the PPrS were evaluated according to the McBeth, Hungerford, Marcinkowski, Volk and Meyers' (2008) criterion. In McBeth et al.'s (2008) scale of scores, the range of 0-100 is divided into three categories as low (0-34), moderate (35-69) and high (70-100). The results of the descriptive statistics on English instructors' scores on the PPrS were given in detail in Table 1.

Table 1

Results of the Descriptive Statistics on PPrS

Parameter	Statistic	Standard Error
<i>M</i>	57.34	0.55
Mode	61 (n = 13)	
Median	58.00	
<i>SD</i>	6.55	

As Table 1 shows, NNESTs' mean scores on the PPrS were 57.34 in the scale of 15 – 75, where the highest score for the PPrS is 75 points and the lowest is 15 out of 15 statements, and it corresponded to a score of 76.45 in the scale of 0-100. In McBeth et al.'s (2008) scale of scores, the range of 0-100 is divided into three categories as low (0-34), moderate (35-69) and high (70-100). Therefore, score of 76.45 out of 100 fell in high-range (70-100) in McBeth et al.'s (2008) scale of scores. Thus, according to this result, NNESTs think that they pay attention to teaching pronunciation in their classes.

Another analysis was conducted to find out the scores of the NNESTs on Self Perception Scale (SPS). NNESTs' scores on the SPS were evaluated again according to the McBeth, Hungerford, Marcinkowski, Volk and Meyers' (2008) criterion. The results of the descriptive statistics on English instructors' scores on the SPS were given in detail in Table 2.

Table 2

Results of the Descriptive Statistics on SPS

Parameter	Statistic	Standard Error
<i>M</i>	50.81	0.30
Mode	51 (n = 20)	
Median	51.00	
<i>SD</i>	3.55	

As shown in Table 2, English instructors' mean scores on SPS were 50.81 in the scale of 0-70 and it corresponded to a score of 72.59 in the scale of 0-100. A score of 72.59 out of 100 fell in high-range (70-100) in McBeth et al.'s (2008) scale

of scores. This result indicated that NNESTs believe that their pronunciation of English language is good enough and they feel comfortable with the way they speak in English. In other words, they do not think that being a NNEST is a hindrance in terms of teaching pronunciation and believe that they can teach it without hesitation.

Analyses of Research Questions 1.1 and 1.2

Teaching Experience

One of the variables regarding the demographic information of the participants' was their teaching experience since the study aimed to see if there is a relationship between their teaching experience and their perceptions and their reported teaching practices of pronunciation. First analysis was conducted in order to see if the NNESTs' level of scores on the Pronunciation Practice Scale (PPrS) would change depending upon their teaching experience. Since the normality assumption could be met (See Appendix 4), the data on the PPrS of English instructors' groups of the teaching period were analyzed using a parametric test called One-Way Analysis of Variance (One-Way ANOVA). The results of the descriptive statistics and One-Way ANOVA are given in Table 3 and Table 4, respectively.

Table 3

Results of the Descriptive Statistics on PPrS and Teaching Experience

Group	N	\bar{x}	SD
1-5 years	52	58.21	6.36
6-10 years	45	57.13	7.01
11-15 years	25	57.52	5.14
16 or more years	18	55.06	7.57
Total	140	57.34	6.55

Table 4

Results of One-Way ANOVA Related to PPrS and Teaching Experience

Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	136.16	3	45.39	1.06	.369
Within Groups	5831.06	136	42.88		
Total	5967.22	139			

As seen in Table 4, the results showed no statistically significant difference between the mean scores on the PPrS of NNESTs' groups of the teaching experience, $F(3, 139) = 1.06, p = .369 > .05$. These results indicated that NNESTs give importance to pronunciation teaching as part of learning or teaching English language regardless of their teaching experience. In other words, they do not come to realize the importance of teaching pronunciation through their teaching years but they already think it is important even in their first year of their teaching career.

The second analysis was conducted again using the experience years of the participants to see if their scores on the Self-Perception Scale (SPS) change depending upon their years of experience. Since the normality assumption was met after the normality test (See Appendix 4), data on the SPS of NNESTs' groups of teaching experience were analyzed using One-Way ANOVA. The results of the descriptive statistics and the One-Way ANOVA are given in Table 5 and Table 6, respectively.

Table 5

Results of the Descriptive Statistics Related to SPS and Teaching Experience

Group	N	\bar{x}	SD
1-5 years	52	51.73	4.30
6-10 years	45	51.07	2.61
11-15 years	25	49.40	2.50
16 or more years	18	49.44	3.67
Total	140	50.81	3.55

Table 6

Results of One-Way ANOVA Related to SPS and Teaching Experience

Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p	η_p^2	Tamhane's Test
Between Groups	130.32	3	43.44	3.64	.014	.074	'1-5 years' and
Within Groups	1621.48	136	11.92				'11-15 years'
Total	1751.79	139					p = .022

As Table 6 indicates, the results of the One-Way ANOVA showed that there were significant differences between the mean scores on the SPS of NNESTs' groups of teaching experience, $F(3, 139) = 3.64, p = .014 < .05, \eta_p^2 = .074$. Because the group effect was significant, the effect size (η_p^2) was also reported for this independent variable (Weinberg & Abramowitz, 2002, p. 652) and the results of the One-Way ANOVA yielded a medium effect size ($.06 \leq \eta_p^2 = .074 < .14$). In addition, since the group effect was significant, post-hoc multiple comparison tests following the One-Way ANOVA were conducted. The assumption of homogeneity of variances was tested using Levene statistics. The results of Levene's test indicated that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, $F(3, 136) = 3.89, p = .010$. Since the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, the post-hoc multiple comparisons were conducted using Tamhane's test, which is the most robust post-hoc multiple comparison test in cases in which the assumption of homogeneity of variances is violated (Meyers, Gamst & Guarino, 2006, p. 430). As seen in Table 6, the results of the Tamhane's Test indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the means of the group '1-5 years' and the group '11-15 years' on the SPS, $p = .022$, but not for the other pairs.

Degree of Education

Another question in the first part of the questionnaire was the participants' degree of education. Hence, the level of scores on the Pronunciation Practice Scale (PPrS) was analyzed using this information and it was aimed to see if the scores would change depending upon the teachers' degree of education. The data on the PPrS of English instructors with an undergraduate degree and post graduate degree

groups were analyzed using Independent Samples t-Test. The results of the descriptive statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test are given in Table 7.

Table 7

Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to PPrS and Degree of Education

Group	n	\bar{x}	SD	df	t	p
Undergraduate	89	56.65	6.96	138	-1.64	.314
Post-Graduate	51	58.53	5.63			

As seen in Table 7, there were no statistically significant difference between the mean scores on the PPrS of English instructors' who have undergraduate and post-graduate degrees groups, $t(138) = -1.64$, $p = .314 > .05$. These results indicated that the degree that these NNESTs hold does not affect their ideas about teaching pronunciation in their classes. In other words, the NNESTs are already aware of the importance of teaching pronunciation regardless of the further education they had.

The same analysis was conducted to see if NNESTs' levels of scores on the Pronunciation Self Perception Scale (SPS) change depending on their degree of education. The data on the SPS of English instructors' undergraduate and post-graduate groups were computed using the Independent Samples t-Test. The results of the descriptive statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test are given in Table 8.

Table 8

Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to SPS and Degree of Education

Group	N	\bar{x}	SD	df	t	p
Undergraduate	89	51.02	3.86	138	0.95	.345
Post-graduate	51	50.43	2.94			

As seen in Table 8, there was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores on the SPS of NNESTs who hold an undergraduate degree and those with a post-graduate degree, $t(138) = 0.95$, $p = .345 > .05$. These results indicated that English instructors believe that their pronunciation of English language is good whether they have an undergraduate degree or a post-graduate degree.

Having a Native English Speaking Teacher

The effect of having a native English speaking teacher (NEST) at any level of the participants' English language education on their scores on the Pronunciation Practice Scale was also tested. The data on the PPrS of the English instructors' groups of the ones who had a NEST and those who did not have a NEST were analyzed using the Independent Samples t-Test. The results of the descriptive statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test are given in Table 9.

Table 9

Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related PPrS and Having a Native English Speaking Teacher

Group	n	\bar{x}	SD	df	t	p
NEST	105	57.79	6.35	138	1.43	.156
NNEST	35	55.97	7.05			

As displayed in Table 9, there was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores on the PPrS of English instructors' groups of the ones who had a NEST and those who did not have a NEST, $t(138) = 1.43$, $p = .156 > .05$. These results indicated that NNESTs who had NESTs and who did not have NESTs think that pronunciation is an important part of teaching English. In other words, the participants who did not have a native English speaking teacher are also aware of this importance.

The same comparison was conducted in order to see if the participants' level of scores Self Perception Scale (SPS) change depending on whether they had NESTs (Native English Speaking Teachers/Instructors) at any level of their English language education. The data on the SPS of English instructors' groups of the ones who had a NEST and those who did not have a NEST were analyzed using the Independent Samples t-Test. The results of the descriptive statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test are given in Table 10.

Table 10

Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to SPS and Having a Native English Speaking Teacher

Group	n	\bar{x}	SD	df	t	P	η_p^2
NEST	105	50.44	3.54	138	-2.16	.033	.016
NNEST	35	51.91	3.41				

As indicated in Table 10, there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores on the SPS of English instructors' groups of the ones who had NEST and the ones who did not have a NEST, $t(138) = 1.43$, $p = .156 > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .016$. Since the mean score of the group that did not have a NEST was greater than that of the group that had NEST, this difference was in favour of the group which did not have a NEST. Because the group effect was significant, the effect size (η_p^2) was reported for this independent variable (Weinberg, & Abramowitz, 2002, p. 652). The results of the Independent Samples t-Test yielded a small effect size of $.01 \leq \eta_p^2 = .016 < .06$.

These results indicated that NNESTs who had not had NESTs at any stage of their education believe that their pronunciation of English language is good enough and they feel comfortable about their pronunciation skills whereas the ones who had had NESTs feel less confident. This may be the result of having become aware of better pronunciation and feeling inferior when they hear a NEST's pronunciation. In other words, the instructors who had NESTs may be comparing themselves to these

NESTs so they do not feel as confident as the ones who had not had a native English speaking teacher during their education.

Taking Phonology Classes

Another variable, which is whether participants took any phonology classes at any level of their English language education, was analyzed in the study. First, the analysis was conducted to see if the participants' level of scores on the Pronunciation Practice Scale (PPrS) changed depending upon whether they took phonology classes at any level of their English language education. The data on the PPrS of the groups of English instructors who had taken phonology classes and who had not taken phonology classes were analyzed using the Independent Samples t-Test. The results of the descriptive statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test were given in Table 11.

Table 11

Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to PPrS and Taking Phonology Classes

Group	n	\bar{x}	SD	df	t	P	η_p^2
Phonology	104	58.44	5.90	138	3.53	.001	.083
Non- Phonology	36	54.14	7.35				

As shown in Table 11, there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores on the PPrS of English instructors who had studied phonology lessons (phonology group) and those who had not (non-phonology group), $t(138) = 3.53$, $p = .001 < .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .083$. Since the phonology group's mean was greater than

that of the non-phonology group, this difference was in favour of the phonology group. The results of the Independent Samples t-Test yielded a medium effect size of $.06 \leq \eta_p^2 = .083 < .14$.

These results indicated that English instructors who had taken phonology classes at any level of their English language education pay attention to teaching pronunciation in their classes more than the instructors who had not taken phonology classes. This finding may suggest that these NNESTs who took phonology classes teach pronunciation in their classes more than their colleagues who did not take the class because they are more familiar with the English sound system.

The same analysis was conducted using English instructors' level of scores on Self Perception Scale (SPS). It was aimed to see if there would be a change in their self perception scales depending upon whether they had taken phonology classes at any level of their English language education. The data on the SPS of English instructors' groups of the phonology and the non-phonology were analyzed using the Independent Samples t-Test. The results of the descriptive statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test are given in Table 12.

Table 12

Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to SPS and Taking Phonology Classes

Group	n	\bar{x}	SD	df	t	p
Phonology	104	50.60	3.33	138	-1.20	.233
Non-Phonology	36	51.42	4.12			

As seen in Table 12, there was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores on the SPS of English instructors who had taken phonology classes (phonology group) and those who had not (non-phonology group), $t(138) = -1.20$, $p = .233 > .05$. Unlike the results of the PPrS, these results indicated that both groups believe that their pronunciation of English language is good enough and they feel comfortable with being a NNEST and teaching English pronunciation. The reason for this belief might be that they developed their pronunciation of English language also in other learning/teaching environments even if they did not have the chance to take phonology classes.

Time spent in English Speaking Countries

The last question in the first section of the questionnaire was whether the participants spent time in English speaking countries and how long they stayed in these countries. Therefore, the last analysis was conducted using this information. In this part of the analysis, it was aimed to see if the participants' level of scores on the Pronunciation Practice Scale (PPrS) changes depending upon whether they had been in these countries (the Abroad group) at any time or not (the Non-Abroad group). Since the normality assumption could be met (See Appendix 4), the data on the PPrS of English instructors' groups on the Abroad and the Non-Abroad were analyzed using the Independent Samples t-Test. The results of the descriptive statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test are given in Table 13.

Table 13

Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to PPrS and Time Spent in English Speaking Countries

Group	n	\bar{x}	SD	df	t	p
Abroad	58	56.95	6.26	138	0.59	.558
Non- Abroad	82	57.61	6.77			

As indicated in Table 13, there was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores on the PPrS of English instructors who had been abroad and who had not, $t(138) = 0.59$, $p = .558 > .05$. These results indicated that both English instructors who had been in English speaking countries and those who had not stated that they teach pronunciation in their classes.

Another analysis was conducted in order to see if these NNESTs' level of scores on the Self Perception Scale (SPS) changes depending upon whether they had been in English speaking countries (the Abroad group) in any time or had not (the Non-Abroad group). The data on the SPS of English instructors' groups on the Abroad and the Non-Abroad were analyzed using the Independent Samples t-Test, which is a parametric test. The results of the descriptive statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test are given in Table 14.

Table 14

Results of the Descriptive Statistics and the Independent Samples t-Test Related to SPS and Time Spent in English Speaking Countries

Group	n	\bar{x}	SD	df	t	P	η_p^2
Abroad	58	49.90	3.64	138	2.60	.010	.047
Non- Abroad	82	51.45	3.36				

As demonstrated in Table 14, there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores on the SPS of English instructors who had been in English speaking countries and who had not, $t(138) = 2.60$, $p = .010 < .05$. Since the non-abroad group's mean was greater than that of the abroad group, this difference was in favour of the non-abroad group. Because the group effect was significant, the effect size (η_p^2) was reported for this independent variable (Weinberg, & Abramowitz, 2002, p. 652).

These results indicated that English instructors who had not been in English speaking countries believe that their pronunciation of English language is good when compared to the results of the ones who had been in these countries. In other words, NNESTs who had not been in English speaking countries feel comfortable about their pronunciation skills but their colleagues who had been in English speaking countries do not think so about their own pronunciation skills. This may be the result of the fact that these NNESTs feel comfortable because they did not have the chance to see the difference between their own pronunciation skills and the native speakers'. In that sense, they are confident about their own pronunciation when they compare

themselves to their colleagues who are also non native English speaking teachers. Therefore, there may be a misconception of feeling content with their pronunciation because of being in a non-native speaking environment.

Analysis of Research Question 2

In order to answer the second research question, which is " What is the relationship between NNESTs' perceptions and their teaching practices?" an analysis was conducted to see if there is a relationship between the NNESTs' levels of scores on the Pronunciation Practice Scale (PPrS) and the Self Perception Scale (SPS). The relationship between NNESTs' scores on the PPrS and the SPS was tested using the Pearson Correlation Analysis Technique. The results of the test are given in Table 15.

Table 15

Results of the Pearson Correlation Analysis Related to Research Question 2

Test Pair	<i>N</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i> ²	<i>p</i>
PPrS-SPS	140	.113	.013	.117

As seen in Table 15, the results of the Pearson Correlation Analysis showed that there was no significant relationship between English instructors' scores on the PPrS and the SPS, $r(N = 140) = .113$, $p = .117 > .05$, $r^2 = .013$. According to Cohen's (1992) correlation coefficient scale, the ranges of $.10 \leq r < .30$, $.30 \leq r < .50$ and $.50 \leq r < 1.00$ are defined as a small correlation, medium correlation and large correlation, respectively. Thus, it could be said that there is a small and positive relationship between English instructors' scores on the PPrS and the SPS. In addition, a small value of the determination coefficient of $r^2 = .013$ indicated that

NNETs' scores on the PPrS and the SPS explained only 1.3 percent of the variation on each other. Yet, these results are not significant which means it might have occurred by chance.

These results indicated that there is no relationship between English instructors' scores on the PPrS and their scores on the SPS. In other words, an English instructor's self perception of pronunciation skills has no relation with his / her classroom practices.

Conclusion

This study examined the NNETs' self perceptions of their pronunciation skills and their pronunciation teaching practices in their classes. A five-point Likert Scale questionnaire was given to 140 NNETs in four different universities and a number of t-tests and correlations were carried out. This chapter presented the analyses of the questionnaire in detail. The next chapter will discuss the findings, reflect on limitations of the study and provide ideas for further research.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study investigated the non-native English speaking teachers' (NNEST) perceptions of their own pronunciation skills, their styles of teaching pronunciation as NNEST, and the relationship between their pronunciation teaching styles and their self-perceptions. Their perceptions and teaching styles were also examined together with the following five factors; 1) Teaching Experience, 2) Degree of Education, 3) Having a Native English Speaking Teacher, 4) Taking Phonology Classes, and 5) Time Spent in English Speaking Countries. In this respect, the study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the NNESTs' perceptions of teaching pronunciation as a non native English speaker?
 - 1.1. Is there a significant difference between teachers' reported practice of teaching pronunciation and these factors separately: their years of experience, their degree of education, whether or not they had a native English speaking teacher, whether or not they took phonology classes, and the time they spent in English speaking countries?
 - 1.2. Is there a significant difference between teachers' self-perceptions of pronunciation and these factors separately: their years of experience, their degree of education, whether or not they had a native English speaking teacher, whether or not they took phonology classes, and the time they spent in English speaking countries?
2. What is the relationship between NNESTs' perceptions of their own pronunciation and their reported teaching practices?

This chapter will present the findings and discussion, the implications as well as the limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research.

Findings and Discussion

The statements in the questionnaire were classified into two main groups: statements that refer to self-perceptions (SPS) and the statements that refer to pronunciation practices (PPrS) of the participants. These two main groups were analyzed according to the first part of the questionnaire which included background information of the participants, namely, their teaching experience, their degree of education, whether or not they had ever had a native English speaking teacher, whether or not they had ever taken phonology classes and whether or not they had ever been in an English speaking country.

In order to see if there is a relationship between the participants' years of experience and their pronunciation teaching practices, the participants were categorized into four main groups according to the years of teaching experience (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15, 16 and more). When the participants' responses to the PPrS statements were analyzed in relation to their years of experience, the results indicated no statistically significant difference among the groups. The results revealed that both the experienced and novice NNESTs pay attention to teaching pronunciation in their classrooms. The same result was also observed in the analysis of the self-perception scale (SPS). The responses to the SPS statements indicated that both experienced and inexperienced non-native speaking English teachers feel comfortable with their own pronunciation. However, among the groups, there was a statistical difference between the 1-5 years group and 11-15 years group ($p = .022$). The results of these two groups showed that the 1-5 years group is more confident

about being a NNEST and their own pronunciation skills. This result is in line with Rajagopalan's (2005) findings in which experienced NNESTs were more worried about being a non-native teacher than their less experienced colleagues. One probable reason for this finding can be that being experienced means being exposed to more challenges about pronunciation in or outside of the classroom over time when compared to their less experienced colleagues. The challenges awaiting a new teacher may lead to a decrease in the level of self-confidence about one's pronunciation skills.

As far as the participants' degree of education and its relationship to their practice of teaching pronunciation are concerned, the results indicated that regardless of the degree that NNESTs hold (undergraduate or post graduate degrees), they all pay attention to teaching pronunciation in their classes and feel comfortable about teaching pronunciation as non-native teachers of English. The participants did not show any signs of lack of confidence in terms of their own pronunciation skills as well. This may be an indicator that the perceptions of these NNESTs and their pronunciation teaching practice skills do not develop or change during their education periods. In that, these NNESTs already have their own terms about teaching pronunciation and their perceptions do not change in time according to the further education they receive such as a graduate degree. When Bradford and Kenworthy's study (1991) is considered in which the participants stated that the pronunciation and phonology had been almost neglected in their training courses at the graduate level, it can be concluded that most teachers do not get sufficient training in their graduate level; therefore, they build their own ways of teaching pronunciation (as cited in Lambacher, 2001). Moreover, the results also support

Levis's (2005) claim that the importance of pronunciation has been based on the intuition of most teachers who decide what to teach by considering what is learnable in a classroom setting.

The factor of whether the NNESTs had ever had a native English speaking instructor throughout their education at any level revealed an interesting finding. According to the results, the NNESTs who had not had the chance to be taught by a native English speaking instructor displayed more confidence about their own pronunciation skills when compared to the ones who had had native English speaking instructors. These results may be interpreted with the help of Liu's (1999) study which focused on the perception of the participants who worked in a major university in U.S. in terms of whether they see themselves as native or non-native speakers of English. Some of Liu's (1999) participants described themselves as NNESTs, but according to Liu's (1999) description they spoke English like native speakers. Both of these participants had received an MA degree in the U.S. from which it can be concluded that they had at least one NEST throughout their education. In addition, before going to the U.S., both of the participants were first exposed to English in EFL contexts. In short, like the participants of the current study, Liu's (1999) participants had the chance to compare themselves with native English speakers and they did not think they were at the same level with them. Still, the perceptions of the participants in Liu's (1999) study may also be the result of being in a country where English is the first language (L1) rather than simply having had a native English speaking instructor. Despite this significant difference in NNESTs's confidence in pronunciation, the results of the pronunciation practice

scale (PPrS) revealed that having a native English speaking instructor or not does not relate to the participants' teaching practices in their classrooms.

When the participants' responses were analyzed according to whether they had taken phonology classes or not at any level of their English language education, the results indicated that instructors who had taken phonology classes pay more attention to teaching pronunciation than their colleagues who had not had the chance to take phonology classes. In that sense, the results concur with the literature. For instance, Macdonald's study (2002) indicated that some of the participants in his study were reluctant to teach pronunciation not only because they do not like teaching it but also because they had not received any previous training on teaching it. While Macdonald (2002) mainly focused on the pedagogical training on teaching pronunciation, taking phonology classes as part of professional development could have some positive effects on teachers. This way, the NNESTs could have more self confidence about teaching pronunciation and learning how to teach pronunciation. The results of the current study indicated that taking phonology classes can positively affect teachers' willingness to teach pronunciation in their classes. However, the participants' self-perception results did not reveal any difference; in other words, both groups see their own pronunciation skills as being good enough and they are self-confident with respect to their own pronunciation skills as NNESTs.

As for the last factor, which was whether the participants had been in an English speaking country or not, there was no statistically significant difference in their results on the teaching practice scale (PPrS). Both groups' results indicated that they pay attention to teaching pronunciation in their classes. However, their results on the self-perception scale (SPS) showed significant differences. The participants

who stated that they had been in an English speaking country are not as comfortable with their own pronunciation skills when compared to the other group which has not been abroad. This finding concurs with Arva and Medgyes's (2000) study which found that despite having been to English speaking countries, the participants stated that they have problems with competence, especially with pronunciation, vocabulary and colloquial expressions. Even the non-native participants of Kamhi-Stein, Aagard, Ching, Paik, and Sesser's study (2004), most of whom had lived in the US for more than ten years, stated that their pronunciation skills were their weakest feature of their English (as cited in Braine, 2010). This result is also in line with the findings of having a native English speaking instructor factor, as in both cases, the participants who somehow had the chance to communicate with native English speakers and compare themselves to the native speakers of the language are more aware of their deficiencies when compared to the ones who did not have this chance. The participants who had not been to English speaking countries, therefore, may have a higher confidence rate because of the fact that they mostly experience a NNES-NNES communication. However, this higher confidence rate may also be interpreted as their being exposed to a variety of resources rather than only communicating with the native speakers of the language. These results indicate that the participants of this study match with Medgyes' (1992) description of the ideal NNEST, as he states that an ideal NNEST is the one who achieved near-native proficiency in English and the participants of this study revealed that they do not seem pleased with their own pronunciation skills, and they feel that they still need some improvement in terms of pronunciation in order to achieve near-native proficiency.

Concerning the relationship between the self-perceptions of the NNESTs and their classroom practices, the results of this study showed there was no significant relationship between the classroom practices of the participants and their self-perceptions about pronunciation. This finding contradicts with Kelly's (2001) claim that pronunciation is a neglected part of English because most of the teachers are not comfortable with dealing with the sounds and intonation. According to this result, one can infer that however the instructors feel about their own pronunciation skills, their self-perceptions do not have any effect on their pronunciation teaching practices. The result also contradicts with Samimy and Griffler's (1999) results in which most of the participants stated that their difficulties with language affected their classroom practices (as cited in Braine, 2010).

The results of the study did not reveal far different results than those that already existed in the literature. The overall picture of NNESTs in this study is that teachers' years of experience and their degree of education do not have a negative effect on their self-perceptions and their teaching practices except for two groups out of four which had different results in the teaching experience year analysis where the teachers with 1-5 years of experience had a higher score on self-perception scale when compared to the teachers with 11-15 years of experience. This is an expected result when Rajagapolan's (2005) findings are considered in which experienced NNESTs felt less confident about being a NNEST when compared to their more junior colleagues.

On the other hand, having a native English speaking instructor, taking phonology classes and spending time in English speaking countries can affect NNESTs' perceptions and their teaching practices. In terms of self-perception, having

a native English speaking teacher and spending time in English speaking countries affect the self-perceptions of the NNESTs as the participants who had had a NEST and been in English speaking countries showed a lower self-confidence rate about their own pronunciation skills. This result is in line with Medgyes and Reves's study (1994) in which they suggested that NNESTs who had been in frequent contact with native speakers perceived their own command of English relatively low, and this perception may be the result of the participants' judging their own command of English more severely because of this frequent contact. In terms of classroom practices, the only difference was seen in the analysis of taking phonology classes. The results of the responses provided by the participants who claimed to have taken phonology classes indicated that these NNESTs pay more attention to teaching pronunciation in their classes. This result also adds on and contributes to Wong's (1993) explanation which shows that it is possible to reduce the anxiety of NNESTs about teaching pronunciation if these teachers become educated in teaching pronunciation. Moreover, the results are also in line with Macdonald's study (2002) in which he claims that in order to teach pronunciation confidently, effectively and more often, NNESTs need ongoing development.

Pedagogical Implications of the Study

The results of the current study suggest considerably important implications to the issue of NESTs and NNESTs. Regarding self-perceptions, NNESTs in preparatory schools of universities are not affected by their degree of education and / or their years of experience. The NNESTs felt comfortable in teaching the language in general and teaching pronunciation in particular; therefore, there is no need to favour NESTs for only speaking English as their first languages.

As for the classroom practices aspect of this study, results indicated that taking phonology classes has a positive effect on NNESTs and they pay more attention to teaching pronunciation when compared to their colleagues who did not take such courses. If taking phonology classes has such a positive effect on teaching pronunciation, then NNESTs should be encouraged to take these classes and some courses which only deal with phonology and pronunciation should be added in teacher training programmes. Moreover, in-service training should also be provided specific to the needs of these NNESTs. As Braine (2010) states, low levels of proficiency or fluency are not enough for language teachers as the teachers are not only the users of the language but also its teachers and role models for students. Training and encouraging professional development in terms of language proficiency in general, pronunciation in particular should be the starting point for the NNESTs in Turkey. If knowledge of phonology is considered to be one of the two especially important factors for teaching pronunciation (Baker & Murphy, 2011), then it can be concluded that NNESTs in prep schools of Turkey should be trained well in this area before learning the other important factor, which is the techniques and approaches for teaching pronunciation. Moreover, the institutions which believe that pronunciation teaching should be emphasized more in EFL should consider re-designing their curriculum accordingly. Phonology courses should also be included in BA and MA programs of ELT departments in order to prepare English language teachers who are interested in pronunciation teaching in a professional manner.

As Jenkins (2004) stated, nowadays pronunciation teaching research has been focusing on supersegmental features as well as the segmental features. Jenkins (2004) also indicated that pronunciation is not treated to be an isolated linguistic

phenomenon any more, on the contrary, it is linked to the other aspects of language and language teaching by many researchers. Considering this change, administrators of the intensive language programs may consider designing curriculum which neither excludes pronunciation teaching as a whole nor focuses on segmental levels too much. According to Jenkins (2004), research on English as an International Language (EIL) also suggests that pronunciation is an important factor that prevents breakdowns in communication between speakers, and the intelligibility of a NNS-NNS communication is elevated by pronunciation. In light of this information, institutions and administrators may evaluate how much emphasis they should put on pronunciation and which parts of pronunciation are important for an intelligible communication; therefore, the results of this study may help the institutions and administrators create or re-organise their curriculum in line with their decisions.

Considering the relationship between the self-perceptions of the NNESTs and their classroom practices, the results of the study showed that there was no significant relationship between the self perceptions of the participants and their classroom practices. According to Medgyes (1992), there is more than language competence to define a NEST superior to his / her NNEST colleague. Therefore, having more or less confidence about language competency, pronunciation in this case, should not be related to the NNESTs' teaching practices and they should not be defined as inferior to their NEST colleagues in these terms. The results of this study indicated that factors other than the self perceptions of the NNESTs about their pronunciation skills should be considered as the factors that affect the reported classroom practices of the NNESTs. Furthermore, the comparison of NEST vs. NNEST should be reconsidered as the results showed that NNESTs put as much

effort as they can in their classes regardless of their self-perceptions of pronunciation skills.

Limitations of the Study

The aim of the study was to examine non native English speaking teachers' (NNEST) self-perceptions of being non-native and their own pronunciation skills and the relationship between their perceptions and their teaching practices. The study was conducted in four different universities in Ankara, Turkey. If the time and resources had been available to reach other universities in Turkey, the study could have explained the situation of NNESTs in prep schools of universities in Turkey more clearly.

If an in-depth interview session had been conducted with at least five participants whose scores on the questionnaire had differed, it could have given more information about the participants' preferences and given the researcher the chance to explain the results in light of these findings. Classroom observations would also have been a good support to the results and would have given the researcher the chance to compare the reported behaviour with their actual behaviour (Arva & Medgyes, 2000). However, time constraints prevented the researcher from doing either.

Suggestions for Further Research

The study was limited to the data gathered through questionnaires since due to time constraints it was not possible to conduct a classroom observation or an in-depth interview session. This study could be enlarged with classroom observations or in-depth interview sessions. It could also include more instructors from different

universities in different cities of Turkey to get a clearer picture of Turkish non-native English speaking instructors' perceptions and practices.

Moreover, the questionnaire could be revised and expanded with more statements and more factors to be analyzed such as age and/or gender of the participants, which part of the pronunciation teaching is more difficult or easier for them to teach. As much of the literature focused on the NEST vs. NNESTs also from the students' perspectives, it is also possible to include students' ideas about their NNESTs in an environment which does not include native English speaking teachers. Seeing the students' perspectives and getting their ideas about their teachers could also provide more information for both the NNESTs and the institutions.

Conclusion

The study attempted to shed light onto NNESTs' self-perceptions and classroom practices of teaching pronunciation in an environment which does not include native English speaking colleagues. The results showed that only interaction with the native English speakers (having a native English speaking teacher and spending time in English speaking countries) affect the self-perception of the NNESTs, which also supports the literature which compare native English speaking teachers to non-native English speaking teachers working in the same institution (Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Ezberci, 2005; Ozturk & Atay, 2010; Tang, 1997) where, the NNESTs feel less confident when they compare themselves to their native English speaking colleagues.

Being a non native speaker is a challenge to all language instructors especially while teaching pronunciation. Additionally, there are so many different factors that affect NNESTs' motivation to teach pronunciation and their level of

confidence in their own pronunciation skills. However, the NNESTs can both benefit from being a NNEST while teaching English as a foreign language and provide the necessary pronunciation training in their classes by either receiving some training particularly in pronunciation teaching or learning how to deal with their self perceptions of pronunciation which hinder their pronunciation teaching.

REFERENCES

- Al-Omrani, A. H. (2008). *Perceptions and attitudes of Saudi ESL and EFL students toward native and nonnative English-speaking teachers*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3303340).
- Altun-Evci, H. (2010). *International English teachers' perceptions of English as an international language* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.thesis.bilkent.edu.tr/0003966.pdf>.
- Baker, A. A., & Murphy, J. (2011). Knowledge base of pronunciation teaching: staking out the territory. *TESL Canada Journal*, 28(2), 29–50.
- Benke, E., & Medgyes, P. (2005). Differences in teaching behaviour between native and non-native speaker teachers: As seen by the learners. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 195-215). New York, NY: Springer.
- Braine, G. (2005). A history of research on non-native speaker English teachers. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers. Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 13–23). New York, NY: Springer.
- Braine, G. (2010). *Nonnative speaker English teachers: Research, pedagogy, and professional growth*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Brutt-Griffler, J., & Samimy, K. K. (1999). Revisiting the Colonial in the Postcolonial: Critical praxis for nonnative-English-speaking teachers in a TESOL Program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 413–431.
- Chiu, H. H. W. (2008). *Practical understandings: Teachers' beliefs and practices in pronunciation teaching* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from

http://dspace.uta.edu/bitstream/handle/10106/1651/Chiu_uta_2502M_10027.pdf.

Choi, S. J. (2007). *The experiences of non-native English speaking teachers and their professional identity constructions in an ESL context* (Doctoral dissertation).

Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3301115).

Clark, E., & Paran, A. (2007). The employability of non-native-speaker teachers of EFL: A UK survey. *System*, 35, 407–430. doi:10.1016/j.system.2007.05.002.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185–209.

Derwing, T., & Munro, M. (2005). Second language accent and pronunciation teaching: A research based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 379–397. doi:10.2307/3588486

Ezberci, E. (2005). *Native English speaking teachers and non-native English speaking teachers in Istanbul: A perception analysis* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.thesis.bilkent.edu.tr/0002851.pdf>.

Hayes, D. (2009). Non-native English-speaking teachers, context and English language teaching. *System*, 37(1), 1–11. doi:10.1016/j.system.2008.06.001.

Hui-Wen, C. (2009). *An Examination of the personal, socio-cultural, language learning and professional experiences that influence Taiwanese English cultural as foreign language teachers' identities* (Doctoral dissertation).

Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3360678).

- Jenkins, J. (2005). Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: The role of teacher attitudes and identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 535–543. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2307/3588493/abstract>.
- Kelly, G. (2000). *How to teach pronunciation*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Kim, E.-Y. (2009). Do non-native speakers make good ESL teachers? *The Journal of Adventist Education*, 40–42.
- Lambacher, S. (2001). A brief guide to resources for developing expertise in the teaching of pronunciation. *Prospect*, 16(1), 63–70.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2002). University students' perceptions of native and non-native speaker teachers of English. *Language Awareness*, 11(2), 132–142. doi:10.1080/09658410208667051.
- Lee, J. (2010). Nonnative English-speaking teachers' experiences and their pedagogy in the ESL classroom. *WATESOL NNEST Caucus Annual Review*, 1, 22–42.
- Levis, J. M. (2005). Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 369–377. doi:10.2307/3588485.
- Ling, C. Y., & Braine, G. (2007). The attitudes of university students towards non-native speakers English teachers in Hong Kong. *RELC Journal*, 38(3), 257–277. doi:10.1177/0033688207085847.
- Liu, J. (1999). Nonnative English speaking professionals in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(1), 85–102. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2307/3588192>.
- Llurda, E. (2005). *Non-native language teachers perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession*. New York, USA: Springer.

- Macdonald, S. (2002). Pronunciation: Views and practices of reluctant teachers. *Prospect*, 17(3), 3–18.
- Mahboob, A., & Lipovsky, C. (2007). Examining attitudes towards NESTs and NNESTs: A comparison of a thematic vs an appraisal analysis. In C. Gitsaki (Ed.), *Language and languages: Global and local tensions* (pp. 1–13). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Mahboob, A. (2005). Beyond the native speaker in TESOL. *Culture, context, & communication*. Retrieved from <http://www.moussu.net/nnest/articles/Mahboob.pdf>.
- McBeth, W., Hungerford, H., Marcinkowski, T., Volk, T., & Meyers, R. (2008). *National environmental literacy assessment project: Year 1, national baseline study of middle grades students. Final report*. (Report to the US Environmental Protection Agency, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and North American Association for Environmental Education under grant NA06SEC4690009). Retrieved May 15, 2013 at <http://www.oceanleadership.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/08/environmental-literacy.pdf>.
- Medgyes, P., & Arva, V. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System*, 28, 355–372.
- Medgyes, P. (1983). The schizophrenic teacher. *ELT Journal*, 37(1), 2–6.
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, 46(4), 340–349.

- Medgyes, P. (2001). When the teacher is a non-native speaker. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 429–442) Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Merino, I. G. (1997). Native English-speaking teachers versus non-native English-speaking teachers. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 10, 69–79.
- Meyers, L. S., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. J. (2006). *Applied multivariate research: Design and interpretation*. London: Sage Publications.
- Moussu, L., & Llurda, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching*, 41(3), 315–348.
doi:10.1017/S0261444808005028.
- Murahata, G., & Murahata, Y. (2000). *Perceived aspects of native and non-native English speaking teachers by Japanese learners of English*. Research Reports of Department of International Studies, Faculty of Humanities and Economics, Kochi University, 1, 103-118.
- Nemtchinova, E. (2005). Host teachers' evaluations of nonnative English speaking teacher trainee: A perspective from the classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 235–261.
Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2307/3588310/abstract>.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ozturk, U., & Atay, D. (2010). Challenges of being a non-native English teacher. *Educational Research*, 1(5), 135–139.
- Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows (Version 10 and 11)*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Rajagopalan, K. (2005). Non-native speaker teachers of English and their anxieties: Ingredients for an experiment in action research. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native*

- language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 283–303). New York, NY: Springer.
- Reves, T., & Medgyes, P. (1994). The Non-native English speaking EFL/ ESL teacher's self-image: An international survey. *System*, 22(3), 353–367.
- Sahib, A. (2005). "*The unfluency of my language*": *Non-native English-speaking Teachers' self-image and confidence in second language teacher education programs* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:>
- Scarcella, R. (1994). Second language pronunciation: State of the art in instruction. *System*, 22(2), 221–230. doi:10.1016/0346-251X(94)90058-2.
- Shen, L., & Wu, H. (2007). On NESTs and Non-NESTs. *Chia-Nan Annual Bulletin*, 33, 371–382.
- Shirvani Shahenayatani, S. Z. (1987). *A comparison of native and non-native English-speaking teaching assistants* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8713979).
- Silva, L. P. (2009). *Students' expectations and attitudes towards nonnative-English-speaking teachers in ESL and EFL settings: Teachers' and students' own perceptions* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1478773).
- Suwanarak, K. (2010). Can only native English speaking teachers teach aural and oral skills? *ABAC Journal*, 30(2), 43–63.
- Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. New York: Pearson.

- Tajino, A., & Tajino, Y. (2000). Native and non-native: What can they offer? Lessons from team-teaching in Japan. *ELT Journal*, 54(January), 3–11.
- Tang, C. (1997). The identity of the nonnative ESL teacher on the power and status of nonnative ESL teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 577–580.
- Tang, T. (2007). *Investigating NNS English teachers' self-assessed language proficiency in an EFL context* (master's thesis). Retrieved from http://digitool.library.mcgill.ca/view/action/singleViewer.do?dvs=1371390741642~390&locale=tr_TR&show_metadata=false&VIEWER_URL=/view/action/singleViewer.do?&DELIVERY_RULE_ID=6&adjacency=N&application=DIGITOOL-3&frameId=1&usePid1=true&usePid2=true.
- Weinberg, S., & Abramowitz, S. (2002). *Data analysis for the behavioural sciences using SPSS*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wong, R. (1993). Pronunciation myths and facts. *Forum*, 31(4), 45–46. Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Pronunciation+Myths+and+Facts#0>.

APPENDIX 1: FOCUS GROUPS QUESTIONS

- 1) How important is pronunciation teaching to you?
- 2) What is the amount of time you spend teaching pronunciation in class?
- 3) How do you decide on this amount?
- 4) How do you teach pronunciation?

APPENDIX 2: INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1) Did you have lessons on pronunciation when you were studying the language?
- 2) Did you take a course in Phonetics/Phonology at university?
- 3) Are you aware of any particular problems with your pronunciation / your students' pronunciation?
- 4) How do you feel about being a non native speaker of the language you teach?
- 5) How do you feel about your own pronunciation as a NNEST?
- 6) What do you do to improve your pronunciation?
- 7) How much attention do you pay to your pronunciation in class?
- 8) What do you do about pronunciation before classes?
- 9) How do you prepare for the activities that focus on pronunciation?
- 10) Do you think you are a good model for pronunciation for your students?

APPENDIX 3: QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: Personal Information

1. Age: _____

2. Number of years in teaching EFL: _____

3. Academic Degree:

a) BA

b) MA

c) PhD.

d) Other.....

4. I had native English speaking teacher(s) when I studied English and/or during my teacher education program.

a) Yes

b) No

5. I took phonetics/phonology classes as part of my teacher education program.

a) Yes

b) No

6. Please fill in the gaps about the total amount of time you spent in the countries whose native language is English.

a).....weeks

b)months

c)years

d) never.

Part II:**1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Undecided, 4: Agree, 5: Strongly agree**

No		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
1	Teaching pronunciation is an essential part of teaching English.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I spend time on improving the pronunciation of specific English sounds that Turkish students have difficulty with.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Pronunciation should be taught as a separate class.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I spend time on teaching how to pronounce individual sounds in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I spend time on teaching stress /rhythm and intonation in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I check the pronunciation of unknown words in a dictionary before going to the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
7	Pronunciation is important for students.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I make sure that my students know about the difference between Turkish and English sound systems.	1	2	3	4	5
9	Knowledge of the phonetic alphabet helps students become independent learners.	1	2	3	4	5
10	The amount of time I spend on pronunciation teaching depends on the level of the students.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I enjoy teaching pronunciation in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5
12	As a NNEST I think it is OK to have an accent.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I need to read more about the phonological characteristics of individual English sounds.	1	2	3	4	5
14	Pronunciation should be taught as part of a class on speaking.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Pronunciation should be taught as part of a class on listening.	1	2	3	4	5
16	Pronunciation should be taught as part of a class on reading.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Pronunciation should be taught as part of a class on writing.	1	2	3	4	5
18	I see myself as a good role model for pronunciation in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5
19	As a NNEST I don't feel confident enough in my knowledge of English.	1	2	3	4	5

20	Being a NNEST is a hindrance in terms of my pronunciation.	1	2	3	4	5
21	Having a native-like pronunciation is important for me as a NNEST.	1	2	3	4	5
22	I need to learn more about stress/rhythm/intonation in English.	1	2	3	4	5
23	My pronunciation would be better if I spent time abroad.	1	2	3	4	5
24	I believe NNESTs can speak English without an accent.	1	2	3	4	5
25	I wouldn't pay attention to my pronunciation in the classroom if my students had a native English speaker teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
26	I would feel proud of myself if someone told me that I have a native-like pronunciation.	1	2	3	4	5
27	I need to work on improving my pronunciation of individual English sounds	1	2	3	4	5
28	I feel confident about my pronunciation as a NNEST.	1	2	3	4	5
29	I am aware of specific difficulties Turkish speakers have with individual English sounds and clusters of sounds.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX 4: SELF PERCEPTION SCALE ITEMS

No		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
1	As a NNEST I think it is OK to have an accent.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I need to read more about the phonological characteristics of individual English sounds.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I see myself as a good role model for pronunciation in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5
4	As a NNEST I don't feel confident enough in my knowledge of English.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Being a NNEST is a hindrance in terms of my pronunciation.	1	2	3	4	5
6	Having a native-like pronunciation is important for me as a NNEST.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I need to learn more about stress/rhythm/intonation in English.	1	2	3	4	5
8	My pronunciation would be better if I spent time abroad.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I believe NNESTs can speak English without an accent.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I wouldn't pay attention to my pronunciation in the classroom if my students had a native English speaker teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I would feel proud of myself if someone told me that I have a native-like pronunciation.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I need to work on improving my pronunciation of individual English sounds	1	2	3	4	5
13	I feel confident about my pronunciation as a NNEST.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I am aware of specific difficulties Turkish speakers have with individual English sounds and clusters of sounds.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX 5: PRONUNCIATION PRACTICE SCALE ITEMS

No		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
1	Teaching pronunciation is an essential part of teaching English.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I spend time on improving the pronunciation of specific English sounds that Turkish students have difficulty with.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Pronunciation should be taught as a separate class.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I spend time on teaching how to pronounce individual sounds in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I spend time on teaching stress /rhythm and intonation in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I check the pronunciation of unknown words in a dictionary before going to the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
7	Pronunciation is important for students.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I make sure that my students know about the difference between Turkish and English sound systems.	1	2	3	4	5
9	Knowledge of the phonetic alphabet helps students become independent learners.	1	2	3	4	5
10	The amount of time I spend on pronunciation teaching depends on the level of the students.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I enjoy teaching pronunciation in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5
12	Pronunciation should be taught as part of a class on speaking.	1	2	3	4	5
13	Pronunciation should be taught as part of a class on listening.	1	2	3	4	5
14	Pronunciation should be taught as part of a class on reading.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Pronunciation should be taught as part of a class on writing.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX 6: NORMALITY TESTS RESULTS

Teaching Experience Pronunciation Teaching Practice Scale (PPrS) Normality**Test Results**

Before the analysis was conducted, the normality assumption, which is the most basic assumption of the parametric tests, was examined. The results of normality test are given in Table 16

Table 16

Results of the Normality Test for PPrs and Teaching Experience

Independent Variable Level	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	KS	df	p	SW	df	P
1-5 years	0.10	52	.200			
6-10 years	0.15	45	.015	0.90	45	.010
11-15 years	0.19	25	.017	0.89	25	.014
16 or more years	0.14	18	.200	0.91	18	.097

Because the size of the '1-5 group' was greater than 50, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to test whether this group's data were normally distributed or not. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that the group's data were normally distributed at the significance level of .05, $KS(52) = 0.10$, $p = .200 > .05$. The normality of data of the other three groups, which sample size was less than or equal to 50, was examined using the Shapiro-Wilk test. The results of the Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that the '6-10 years' and the '11-15 years' groups' data on the PPrS were not normally distributed, $SW(45) = 0.90$, $p = .010 < .05$ and $SW(25) = 0.89$, $p = .014 < .05$, respectively. However, when sample size per group is at least

20, the normality assumption can be ignored (Pallant, 2001, p. 219; Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2007, p. 78, 382). The '16-or-more-years' group' data on the PPrS were normally distributed, $SW(18) = 0.91, p = .097 > .05$.

Teaching Experience Self Perception Scale (SPS) Normality Test Results

Before the second analysis was conducted, the normality assumption was examined. The results of normality test are given in Table 17.

Table 17

Results of the Normality Test for SPS and Teaching Experience

Independent Variable Level	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	KS	df	p	SW	df	P
1-5 years	0.11	52	.186			
6-10 years	0.16	45	.009	0.95	45	.096
11-15 years	0.20	25	.009	0.92	25	.077
16 or more years	0.14	18	.200	0.96	18	.544

Because the size of the '1-5 group' was greater than 50, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to test whether this group's data were normally distributed or not. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that the group's data were normally distributed at the significance level of .05, $KS(52) = 0.11, p = .186 > .05$. The normality of data of the other three groups, sample size of which was less than or equal to 50, was examined using the Shapiro-Wilk test. The results of the Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that all three groups' data on the SPS were normally distributed,

SW (45) = 0.95, $p = .096 > .05$, SW (25) = 0.92, $p = .077 > .05$ and SW (18) = 0.96, $p = .544 > .05$, respectively.

Degree of Education PPrS Normality Test Results

Before the analysis was conducted, the normality assumption was examined.

The results of normality test are given in Table 18.

Table 18

Results of the Normality Test for PPrS and Degree of Education

Independent Variable Level	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	KS	df	p	SW	df	P
Undergraduate Instructors	0.13	89	.001			
Post-Graduate Instructors	0.18	51	.000			

Because the sizes of both the instructors who have an undergraduate degree and a post-graduate degree groups were greater than 50, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to test whether this group's data were normally distributed or not. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that both the group's data were not normally distributed at the significance level of .05, KS (89) = 0.13, $p = .001 < .05$, and KS (51) = 0.18, $p = .000 < .05$. However, when sample size per group is at least 20, the normality assumption can be ignored (Pallant, 2001, p. 219; Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2007, p. 78, 382).

Degree of Education SPS Normality Test Results

Before the analysis was conducted, the normality assumption was examined.

The results of normality test are given in Table 19.

Table 19

Results of the Normality Test for SPS and Degree of Education

Independent Variable Level	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	KS	df	p	SW	df	p
Undergraduated Instructors	0.08	89	.200			
Graduated Instructors	0.15	51	.006			

Because the sizes of both the instructors who hold an undergraduate degree and post-graduate degree groups were greater than 50, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to test whether this group's data were normally distributed or not. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that the undergraduate group's data were normally distributed at the significance level of .05, $KS(89) = 0.08$, $p = .200 > .05$, but not the post-graduate group's data, $KS(51) = 0.15$, $p = .006 < .05$. However, when sample size per group is at least 20, the normality assumption can be ignored (Pallant, 2001, p. 219; Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2007, p. 78, 382).

Having a Native English Speaking Teacher PPrS Normality Test Results

Before the analysis was conducted, the normality assumption was examined. The results of normality test are given in Table 20.

Table 20

Results of the Normality Test for PPrS and Having a Native English Speaking Teacher

Independent Variable Level	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	KS	df	p	SW	df	P
NEST	0.11	105	.002			
Non-NEST (NNEST)	0.14	35	.065	0.92	35	.029

Because the size of the NEST group was greater than 50, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to test whether this group's data were normally distributed or not. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that the group's data were not normally distributed at the significance level of .05, $KS(105) = 0.11$, $p = .002 < .05$. The normality of data of the NNEST group, which sample size was less than 50, was examined using the Shapiro-Wilk test. The results of the Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that the data of this group were also not normally distributed, $SW(35) = 0.92$, $p = .029 < .05$. However, when sample size per group is at least 20, the normality assumption can be ignored (Pallant, 2001, p. 219; Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2007, p. 78, 382).

Having a Native English Speaking Teacher SPS Normality Test Results

Before the analysis was conducted, the normality assumption was examined.

The results of normality test are given in Table 21.

Table 21

Results of the Normality Test for SPS and Having a Native English Speaking Teacher

Independent Variable Level	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	KS	df	p	SW	df	P
NEST	0.12	105	.001			
Non-NEST (NNEST)	0.11	35	.200	1.00	35	.705

Because the size of the NEST group was greater than 50, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to test whether this group's data were normally distributed or not. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that the group's data were not normally distributed at the significance level of .05, $KS(105) = 0.12$, $p = .001 < .05$. The normality of data of the NNEST group, which sample size was less than 50, was examined using the Shapiro-Wilk test. The results of the Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that the data of this group were normally distributed, $SW(35) = 1.00$, $p = .705 > .05$. However, when sample size per group is at least 20, the normality assumption can be ignored (Pallant, 2001, p. 219; Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2007, p. 78, 382).

Taking Phonology Classes PPrS Normality Test Results

Before the analysis was conducted, the normality assumption was examined.

The results of normality test are given in Table 22.

Table 22

Results of the Normality Test for PPrS and Taking Phonology Classes

Independent Variable Level	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	KS	df	p	SW	df	P
Phonology	0.11	104	.002			
Non-Phonology	0.16	36	.016	1.00	36	.252

Because the size of the phonology group was greater than 50, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to test whether this group's data were normally distributed or not. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that the group's data were not normally distributed at the significance level of .05, $KS(104) = 0.11$, $p = .002 < .05$. The normality of data of the non-phonology group, sample size of which was less than 50, was examined using the Shapiro-Wilk test. The results of the Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that the data of this group were normally distributed, $SW(36) = 1.00$, $p = .252 > .05$. However, when sample size per group is at least 20, the normality assumption can be ignored (Pallant, 2001, p. 219; Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2007, p. 78, 382).

Taking Phonology Classes SPS Normality Test Results

Before the analysis was conducted, the normality assumption was examined.

The results of normality test are given in Table 23.

Table 23

Results of the Normality Test for SPS and Taking Phonology Classes

Independent Variable Level	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	KS	df	p	SW	df	p
Phonology	0.11	104	.006			
Non- Phonology	0.17	36	.014	1.00	36	.374

Because the size of the phonology group was greater than 50, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to test whether this group's data were normally distributed or not. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that the group's data were not normally distributed at the significance level of .05, $KS(104) = 0.11, p = .006 < .05$. The normality of data of the non-phonology group, sample size of which was less than 50, was examined using the Shapiro-Wilk test. The results of the Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that the data of this group were normally distributed, $SW(36) = 1.00, p = .374 > .05$. However, when sample size per group is at least 20, the normality assumption can be ignored (Pallant, 2001, p. 219; Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2007, p. 78, 382).

Time spent in English speaking countries PPrS Normality Test Results

Before going on with the analysis, the normality assumption was examined.

The results of normality test are given in Table 24.

Table 24

Results of the Normality Test for PPrS and Time Spent in English Speaking Countries

Independent Variable Level	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	KS	df	p	SW	df	p
Abroad	0.13	58	.018			
Non-Abroad	0.08	82	.200			

Because the size of both the Abroad and the Non-Abroad groups was greater than 50, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to test whether their data were normally distributed or not. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that the Abroad group's data were not normally distributed at the significance level of .05, $KS(58) = 0.13$, $p = .018 < .05$. However, the Non-Abroad group's data were normally distributed, $SW(82) = 0.08$, $p = .200 > .05$. Nonetheless, when sample size per group is at least 20, the normality assumption can be ignored (Pallant, 2001, p. 219; Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2007, p. 78, 382).

Time spent in English speaking countries SPS Normality Test Results

Before the analysis was conducted, the normality assumption was examined.

The results of normality test are given in Table 25.

Table 25

Results of the Normality Test for SPS and Time Spent in English Speaking Countries

Independent Variable Level	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	KS	df	p	SW	df	p
Abroad	0.14	58	.007			
Non-Abroad	0.12	82	.009			

Because the size of both the Abroad and the Non-Abroad groups was greater than 50, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to test whether their data were normally distributed or not. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that both the Abroad group's and the Non-Abroad group's data were not normally distributed at the significance level of .05, $KS(58) = 0.14, p = .007 < .05$ and $KS(82) = 0.12, p = .009 < .05$. However, when sample size per group is at least 20, the normality assumption can be ignored (Pallant, 2001, p. 219; Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2007, p. 78, 382).

Research Question 2 Normality Test Results

Before analysis was conducted, the normality assumption was examined for the second research question. The results of normality test are given in Table 26.

Table 26

Results of the Normality Test for PPrS and SPS

Scale	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	KS	df	p	SW	df	p
PPrS	0.09	140	.010			
SPS	0.10	140	.002			

Because the size of the sample was greater than 50, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to test whether the sample's data on the PPrS and the SPS were normally distributed or not. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that both the data on PPrS and the data on the SPS were not normally distributed at the significance level of .05, $KS(140) = 0.09, p = .010 < .05$ and $KS(140) = 0.10, p = .002 < .05$. However, when sample size per group is at least 20, the normality assumption can be ignored (Pallant, 2001, p. 219; Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2007, p. 78, 382).