

T.C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES



**THE VIEWS OF TURKISH TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN
LANGUAGE ON PRONUNCIATION TEACHING AND AN IN-SERVICE
TRAINING SUGGESTION**

MASTER'S THESIS

Selçuk BAYRAM

Department of English Language and Literature

English Language and Literature Program

July, 2021

**T.C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES**



**THE VIEWS OF TURKISH TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN
LANGUAGE ON PRONUNCIATION TEACHING AND AN IN-SERVICE
TRAINING SUGGESTION**

MASTER'S THESIS

**Selçuk BAYRAM
(Y1812.020028)**

**Department of English Language and Literature
English Language and Literature Program**

Thesis Advisor: Prof. Dr. Veysel KILIÇ

July, 2021

ONAY FORMU

DECLARATION

I hereby declare with respect that the study “The Views of Turkish Teachers of English as a Foreign Language on Pronunciation Teaching and an In-Service Training Suggestion”, which I submitted as a Master’s Thesis, is written without any assistance in violation of scientific ethics and traditions in all the processes from the project phase to the conclusion of the thesis and that the works I have benefited are from those shown in the Bibliography. (.../.../20...)

Selçuk BAYRAM

FOREWORD

I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Prof. Dr. Veysel KILIÇ for his endless support and guidance at every phase of this thesis.

I also owe my gratitude to the academicians who took part in this study and made it possible. In addition, my special thanks are for my colleagues Ferit ACAR, Oğuzhan YANGÖZ and Dr. Yasemin KARAKOÇ for their help.

I also wish to thank my wife Görkem Gümüş BAYRAM for her patience and support in every step of this journey.

July, 2021

Selçuk BAYRAM

TABLE OF CONTENT

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	iii
TABLE OF CONTENT	iv
ABBREVIATIONS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ABSTRACT	viii
ÖZET	ix
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background of the Study.....	2
1.3 Statement of the Problem	4
1.4 Significance of the Study	5
1.5 Research Questions	6
1.6 Conclusion.....	6
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 English Pronunciation Teaching	7
2.2.1 Brief history of english pronunciation teaching.....	7
2.2.2 Approaches and practices in pronunciation teaching.....	12
2.2.3 Teachers’ perceptions about english pronunciation teaching	16
2.3 In-Service Education and Training (INSET)	17
2.3.1 Developing an effective INSET program	20
2.4 Related Research in Turkey	25
2.4.1 Research on pronunciation teaching	25
2.4.2 Research on the views of Turkish teachers on pronunciation teaching	26
2.5 Conclusion.....	28
3. METHODOLOGY	29
3.1 Introduction	29
3.2 Design of the Study	29
3.3 Settings and the Participants	30
3.4 Data Collection Procedure	30
3.5 Data Analysis	32
3.6 Conclusion.....	32
4. DATA ANALYSIS	33
4.1 Introduction	33
4.2 Analysis of Quantitative Data Regarding Research Question 1.....	33
4.2.1 Age	34
4.2.2 Years of experience.....	36
4.2.3 Education	38
4.2.4 Taking phonology classes	39
4.2.5 The amount of time spent abroad.....	41
4.2.6 Pearson correlation analysis PS and SS	42

4.3 Analysis of Qualitative Data regarding Research Questions 1, 2 and 3.....	42
4.3.1 Analysis of interview question 1.....	44
4.3.2 Analysis of interview question 2.....	45
4.3.3 Analysis of interview question 3.....	46
4.4 Conclusion.....	47
5. AN IN-SERVICE TRAINING SUGGESTION ON EPT.....	48
5.1 Introduction.....	48
5.2 Needs Analysis.....	49
5.3 Participants, Time, and Place.....	50
5.4 The Plan of the Program.....	50
5.5 The Content of INSET Suggestion on EPT.....	51
5.6 Conclusion.....	55
6. CONCLUSION.....	56
6.1 Introduction.....	56
6.2 Findings and Discussions.....	56
6.3 Implications of the Study.....	61
6.4 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research.....	62
6.5 Conclusion.....	63
REFERENCES.....	64
APPENDIX.....	69
RESUME.....	79

ABBREVIATIONS

ALM	: Audiolingual Method
CL	: Counselling-Learning
CLL	: Community Language Learning
EFL	: English as a Foreign Language
ELT	: English Language Teaching
EPT	: English Pronunciation Teaching
ESP	: English for Specific Purpose
GTM	: Grammar Translation Method
INSET	: In-service Education and Training
PD	: Professional Development
PS	: Pronunciation Practice Scale
PT	: Professional Training
SS	: Self-Perception Scale
TBLT	: Task-Based Language Teaching
TD	: Teacher Development
TEFLT	: Turkish EFL Teachers
TEFLL	: Turkish EFL Learners
TT	: Teacher Training

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 2.1: Professional Development Models and Formats (taken from Collinson & Ono, 2001:222-223)	19
Table 4.1: Results of Descriptive Statistics Related to PS and SS.....	34
Table 4.2: Results of Descriptive Statistics Related to PS/SS and Age.....	34
Table 4.3: Results of One-way Anova Related to PS/SS and Age	35
Table 4.4: The Homogeneity Test of Variances regarding PS/ SS and Age Groups	36
Table 4.5: Results of Descriptive Statistics Related to PS/SS and Years of Experience	36
Table 4.6: Results of One-way Anova Related to PS/SS and Years of Experience .	37
Table 4.7: The Homogeneity Test of Variances regarding PS/ SS and Years of Experience	38
Table 4.8: Results of Descriptive Statistics Related to PS/SS and Degree of Education.....	38
Table 4.9: Results of One-way Anova Related to PS/SS and Degree of Education .	39
Table 4.10: Results of Descriptive Statistics Related to PS/SS and Taking Phonology Classes	39
Table 4.11: Results of Independent Samples T-Test Related to PS/SS and Taking Phonology Classes.....	40
Table 4.12: Results of Descriptive Statistics Related to PS/SS and Time Spent Abroad	41
Table 4.13: Results of One-way Anova Related to PS/SS and Time Spent Abroad	41
Table 4.14: Results of Pearson Correlation Analysis Test.....	42
Table 4.15: Codes and Themes of the Semi-structured Interviews	43

THE VIEWS OF TURKISH TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE ON PRONUNCIATION TEACHING AND AN IN-SERVICE TRAINING SUGGESTION

ABSTRACT

Compared to the other skills, English pronunciation teaching has been considered unimportant and very little focus has been given to teaching pronunciation. (Kelly, 1969; Celce-Murcia et al. 1996; Brown & Yule, 1983). Several studies have been conducted regarding the errors of TEFL and their views on pronunciation (Aktuğ, 2015; Akyol, 2013; Demirezen, 2010; Demircioğlu, 2013; Ülkersoy, 2007; Yılmaz 2019). However, there is still a lack of in-depth analysis of the views of TELFTs on pronunciation and their perspectives on their own pronunciation. In addition, although being reported as useful in several studies, INSET programs have been considered ineffective due to some problems with their designs and processes (Hoş & Topal, 2013; Çelik et al,2013; Saban,2000).

In this respect, this study aimed to reveal the pronunciation teaching perspectives of Turkish EFL Teachers and their views on their own pronunciation skills. The study also presented an INSET suggestion on English pronunciation teaching targeting the higher education instructors at preparatory programs. The study was designed with a mixed method approach and carried out with 156 participants working at foundation universities in Istanbul. Quantitative data were gathered via a questionnaire to reveal the perspectives of TEFLT on EPT and their self-perspectives on pronunciation. Qualitative data were gathered via semi-structured interviews with instructors selected using convenience sampling to reveal their perspectives on EPT, the EPT practices they use as well as their needs on EPT.

The results revealed that TEFLT's perspectives were positive towards pronunciation. Taking phonology classes and years of experience showed significant differences compared to TEFLT's views on pronunciation teaching practices and their self-perspectives. In addition, the interview results revealed that TEFLT do pay attention to pronunciation teaching in their classes, and they require further training and education on the subject matter. The data gathered via interviews created the basis for an INSET on EPT with the use of integrating different approaches.

Key Words: *Pronunciation, teaching, INSET, self-perceptions, practices,*

TÜRK İNGİLİZCE YABANCI DİL ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN TELAFFUZ ÖĞRETİMİ ÜZERİNE GÖRÜŞLERİ VE BİR HİZMET İÇİ EĞİTİM ÖNERİSİ

ÖZET

Diğer beceriler ile karşılaştırıldığında, İngilizce telaffuz öğretiminin önemsiz olduğu ve telaffuz öğretimine daha az odaklanıldığı düşünülmektedir (Kelly, 1969; Celce-Murcia et al. 1996; Brown & Yule, 1983). Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin telaffuz hataları ve telaffuz üzerine görüşleri hakkında birçok çalışma yapılmıştır (Aktuğ, 2015; Akyol, 2013; Demirezen, 2010; Demircioğlu, 2013; Ülkersoy, 2007; Yılmaz 2019). Ancak, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin telaffuz öğretimi ve kendi telaffuzları üzerinde detaylı incelemeye ihtiyaç vardır. Ayrıca, birçok çalışmada kullanışlı olduğu belirtilmesine rağmen hizmet içi eğitim programlarının tasarımı ve işleyişi ile ilgili problemlerden dolayı yetersiz olduğu düşünülmektedir (Hoş & Topal, 2013; Çelik et al,2013; Saban,2000).

Bu bakımdan, bu çalışma Türk İngilizce öğretmenlerinin telaffuz öğretimi hakkındaki görüşlerini ve kendi telaffuzları üzerine görüşlerini ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamıştır. Ayrıca çalışma yüksek öğretimde hazırlık programlarında görev alan öğretmenleri hedef alan, İngilizce telaffuz öğretimi hizmet içi eğitim önerisi sunmuştur. Çalışmaya İstanbul'da bulunan vakıf üniversitelerinde çalışmakta olan 156 öğretim görevlisi katılmıştır. Çalışma karma yöntem olarak tasarlanmıştır. Anket kullanılarak elde edilen nicel veriler öğretmenlerin telaffuz öğretimi ve kendi telaffuzları ile ilgili görüşlerini ortaya koymak için toplanmıştır. Yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler ile toplanan nicel veriler ise öğretmenlerin telaffuz ile ilgili görüşleri, sınıf içinde uyguladıkları telaffuz öğretim teknikleri ve telaffuz öğretimi ile ilgili ihtiyaçlarını ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamıştır.

Çalışmanın sonuçları, katılımcıların İngilizce telaffuz ve telaffuz öğretiminin önemine inanmakta olduğunu göstermiştir. Öğretim görevlilerinin İngilizce telaffuz öğretimi ve kendi telaffuzları ile ilgili görüşleri ile eğitim geçmişlerinde sesbilim dersi almış olmaları ve iş tecrübeleri anlamlı farklılık göstermiştir. Ayrıca görüşme sonuçları, öğretim görevlilerinin telaffuz öğretimine önem verdiğini ve bu konu ile ilgili eğitime ihtiyaç duyduklarını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Görüşmelerde çıkan veriler, farklı yaklaşımları entegre eden, İngilizce telaffuz eğitimi üzerine geliştirilen hizmet içi eğitime temel oluşturmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Telaffuz, öğretim, hizmet içi eğitim, öz algı, uygulamalar*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

English has been one of the most commonly used languages in many different areas all over the world. As it has become the most influential language for international discourse (Weber, as cited in Christiansen 2015), teaching English language also has become one of the major focuses in higher education institutions in Turkey. Going through different phases with the new approaches, methods and techniques in English Language Teaching (ELT), different skills of the language have gained more focus from time to time. However, pronunciation teaching can be considered as one of the skills that has been long neglected (Kelly, 1969).

There have been many studies related to the pronunciation errors of Turkish English as foreign language learners (TEFL) which were carried out with learners at different levels of English. (Ülkersoy, 2007; Demirezen, 2010; Demircioğlu, 2013; Geylanioglu & Dikilitaş, 2016). These studies mainly focus on the difficulties and errors of TEFL. Compared to the number of studies regarding TEFL, not many studies have been carried out to provide an insight into the pronunciation teaching views of Turkish EFL teachers (TEFLT).

In-service Training (INSET) Programs have gained popularity and focus in recent years. A well-developed INSET program is considered to have contribution to the professional development of teachers. The effectiveness of the program, however, is handled widely with not so many positive results. There are numerous INSET programs for English language teachers provided both by the institutions they work for and third parties. According to the studies carried out by Hoş & Topal (2013) in Turkey, although teachers believe in the necessities and importance of INSET programs, they do not want to attend. In addition, Turkish university level English instructors feel that INSET/ Professional Development (PD) practices do not have a significant effect on their teaching practices. (Çelik et al., 2013).

This study aims to provide an insight into the pronunciation teaching practices of TEFLT at university level preparatory programs. With the data collected in the process of gathering information on the teaching practices of teachers, this study also aspires after providing a well-designed, effective INSET program on pronunciation teaching practices.

1.2 Background of the Study

Pronunciation teaching only began to be studied systematically shortly before the beginning of the twentieth century (Celce-Murcia et al.,1996). The perception of teaching pronunciation has changed drastically since the late 1800s. In the methods applied until the 1900s, pronunciation teaching was almost completely ignored. Until the 1970s, influenced by different teaching methods such as the Direct Method, Audiolingualism and naturalistic approaches, pronunciation teaching could not go any further than imitation and repetition without real-life practices using meaningful contextualization .Although it is an inseparable part of language, pronunciation is sometimes ignored in language teaching and learning in the following decades as well (Elimat & AbuSeileek, 2014). In 1980s, pronunciation was considered an unimportant aspect of language teaching by language teachers (Brown, Yule, 1983). In 1990s, teachers were not sure about the best method of teaching pronunciation. With the emerge of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), pronunciation became relegated to a less important position since the chief concern was regarded as the communication of meaning, as opposed to the form (pronunciation) that carries it (Celce-Murcia, 2016; Richards, Rodgers, 2014; Murphy, Baker, 2015; Çelik, 2008).

Considering the lack of attention and effort paid to pronunciation, it is no surprise that Turkish EFL learners have difficulty in articulating the desired sounds, and even have fossilization in some sounds of the English language (Demirezen, 2009). According to Kelly (2001), lack of interest and knowledge on pronunciation are the two main reasons why English pronunciation is neglected by teachers. Kelly also adds that rather than having a strategically planned teaching practice, in most cases pronunciation teaching is merely a reaction to a particular problem which occurs in classroom environment. In their

European-wide pilot study conducted on pronunciation teaching, Henderson et al. (2012) concludes that “teacher training in relation to the teaching of English pronunciation is woefully inadequate, according to the majority of participants” (p.23). The study also points out that the lack of training does not match the emphasis placed on English pronunciation in Common European Framework of Reference. According to the survey carried out by Foote et al. (2010) in Canada, among 201 participants, “only 20% of the respondents reported taking an entire course focused on teaching pronunciation”.

There are some studies providing information on the perceptions and pronunciation teaching practices of TEFLT. In her study carried out in Turkey on pronunciation teaching practices of non-native English-speaking teachers, Sarıkaya (2013) states that non-native teachers of English should be encouraged to take phonology classes as part of their professional development. In a study carried out by Akyol (2013) with pre-service EFL teachers, through the data collected with interviews and surveys given to two groups of university students (n=82) it is suggested that more attention to pronunciation learning strategies should be paid. The study also concludes that pronunciation learning needs to be more enjoyable and suitable to the demands of a communicative-oriented class. Thus, it can be assumed that EFL teachers need more attention on how students learn pronunciation and what their needs are.

Effective pre-service and in-service educational activities are crucial for well-qualified teachers. (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005) The practicality and effectiveness of INSET or professional training (PT) programs have been the focus of some recent studies in Turkey. Instructors and professionals teaching in both state and foundation institutions have stated that INSET/PT programs are needed and important for the professional development. However, the results of studies conducted in Turkey shows that most of the participants who are in favor of INSET programs also believe that these programs have little or no significant impact on their teaching practices. (Hoş & Topal, 2013; Çelik et al,2013; Saban,2000). Studies carried out by Ministry of National Education (MoNE) also provides information on the issues regarding INSET programs in terms of design and implementation. In a study led by MoNE, it is asserted that

the lack of focus in needs analysis causes the INSET activities fail in meeting the needs of teachers. (Budak & Demirel, 2003).

1.3 Statement of the Problem

The problematic sounds of the English language for Turkish EFL learners and the errors of Turkish EFL learners in pronunciation have been a focus of several studies carried out in Turkey (Aktuğ, 2015; Akyol, 2013; Demirezen, 2010; Demircioğlu, 2013; Ülkersoy, 2007; Yılmaz 2019). However, there are few studies related to the views and perceptions of Turkish EFL teachers on pronunciation teaching practices (Demirezen, & Topal, 2015; Akıncı, 2015; Sarıkaya, 2013). For this reason, the views of TEFLT on pronunciation and pronunciation teaching practices still need to be investigated from various aspects.

The issue of teaching pronunciation and the practices of pronunciation teaching are considered rather new concerns of language teaching compared to the other skills such as grammar and vocabulary (Kelly,1969). The need for a more systematic research on ESL pronunciation and pronunciation teaching methods has been the focus of several studies. (Kelly,1969; Celce-Murcia et al.,1996; Fraser,2000; Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2016). Although there have been several approaches and methods influencing English pronunciation teaching (EPT) practices all over world, it is argued that the teaching practices are largely limited to certain approaches based on behaviorist approach. (Jones In Methodology in Language Teaching, 2002). Despite the fact that there have been innovative ideas and activities provided in terms of pronunciation teaching (Celce-Murcia), whether these practices are used in classes or how effectively they are adapted still remain as questions to be investigated.

Determining the real needs of the teachers is a must in preparing an INSET program. Although a great number of studies have been carried out regarding INSET programs on ELT, they are not specified on pronunciation teaching practices of TEFLT teaching at university level. In addition, studies indicate that in contrast to the perception that INSET programs are believed to be important, they are not considered to have contribution to real life practices by

the majority of the participants. Thus, an INSET program based on the needs of teachers may be more to the point and made use of.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Among all the elements of language, pronunciation has been thought to be the most neglected by many scholars (Celce-Murcia et al., 1996; Kelly, 2001; Demircioğlu,2013). This study presents an insight into whether pronunciation is not paid much attention in teaching by TEFLT at university level in Turkey. In addition, the results of this study may contribute to the literature by providing a better understanding of the perspectives of TEFLT on pronunciation teaching practices.

The results of this study can also provide data to better understand the practices and activities used in pronunciation teaching regardless of the area or the country it is taught in since, in this study, the materials used in teaching are mainly provided by publisher from the UK or the USA. The results may shed light on the issue whether recent techniques and practices are used in pronunciation teaching or rather old methods are still preferred, such as drills and repetitions without contextualization. The results can contribute to the perception of pronunciation teaching practices in a broader sense.

There have been several studies on INSET programs in terms of English language teaching (Hermans, et.al. 2017; Arslan, et. al. 2019; Arıkan & Yılmaz 2019), however, this study focuses on pronunciation teaching specifically. Several studies conclude that not adequate training and education is received by English language teachers on teaching English pronunciation (e.g. Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2016; Henderson et al.,2012; Foote et al., 2010). Thus, providing a well-constructed INSET program on pronunciation teaching based on the current teaching trends, this study is educatory and practical for TEFLT. The study also aims to design a program based on the needs and perspectives of TEFLT at foundation universities, which has not been basis of any studies. The INSET program is also important for the institutions in the sense of providing a well-designed, spot on training program for the specific group based on the real needs on pronunciation teaching practices.

1.5 Research Questions

This study will address the following questions:

1. What are the views of TEFLT towards EPT at preparatory programs at universities?

1.1. Is there a significant difference between TEFLT's practices of EPT and the following factors separately: age, years of experience, education, the amount of time spend abroad, whether they had phonology lessons?

1.2. Is there a significant difference between TEFLT's self-perceptions of EPT and the following factors separately: age, years of experience, education, the amount of time spend abroad, whether they had phonology lessons?

2. What are the pronunciation teaching practices of TEFLT at preparatory schools?

3. How can an INSET program on pronunciation teaching be developed based on the needs of TEFLT at preparatory schools?

1.6 Conclusion

This chapter provided an introduction of the study by presenting the background, significance of the study and research questions which were attempted to be answered.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the review of the literature regarding the study which investigates the views of TEFLT on pronunciation and provides an INSET suggestion based on the related research done in the field of study. First, EPT will be investigated by giving the historical background of pronunciation teaching as well as the approaches and practices to pronunciation teaching so far. In the second section of this chapter INSET programs and their implementations will be reviewed. The last section will investigate the related research on EPT in Turkey and the views of TEFLT on EPT.

2.2 English Pronunciation Teaching

2.2.1 Brief history of english pronunciation teaching

Referred as the “Cindrella” area of the language by Kelly (1969), pronunciation teaching can be considered as a neglected part of English language teaching for a very long time by the language teachers (Brown & Yule, 1983). It can be stated that one reason for this negligence stems from the place of pronunciation teaching in the language teaching approaches in the past centuries. The focus of the Western philologists was more on vocabulary and grammar teaching until the early twentieth century. Thus, pronunciation was not studied systematically until the beginning of the last century. (Celce-Murcia et al., 1996)

In the late 1800s and early 1900s, with the use of direct method language teaching, pronunciation was taught through imitation and intuition in a non-instructional setting. Following this method, the naturalistic methods, such as Total Physical Response and Natural Approach also had a similar approach in pronunciation teaching, which lacked explicit pronunciation teaching. The target was to provide the opportunity to listen without pressure to speak, which would supposedly lead to produce a good pronunciation and speaking

performance although pronunciation was not taught explicitly. (Celce-Murcia et al., 1996)

Linguists such as Henry Sweet, Wilhelm Vidtor, and Paul Passy influenced the Reform Movement in teaching greatly by providing a new perspective in teaching, regarding pronunciation and speaking skills in particular. They formed the International Phonetic Association in 1886 and developed the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), which provided the scientific analysis and description of the sound systems of languages and gave new insights into speech process. (Richards, Rodgers, 2014) Teaching of modern languages was one of the targets of the association. They influenced modern language teaching greatly, especially in terms of speaking skill by advocating the study of spoken language, phonetic training and establishing good pronunciation habits and training of teachers in phonetics.

In the 1950s and 1960s teaching was influenced by the behaviorist psychology. With the development of Audiolingual Method (ALM) in the USA, pronunciation teaching gained importance and was started to be taught explicitly. In Direct Method classes, in addition to setting (recording) a model for the learners and let them repeat, visual phonetics and sound charts were used in the classes, which provided explicit pronunciation teaching. However, pronunciation teaching was based on drilling of sound contrast and word pairs, with little attention to rhythm, intonation, and real-life conversation practices. Articulation of individual sounds with the phonemic description of English were more focused on rather than constructing useful sentences (Fraser, 2000).

In the 1960s, influenced by Chomsky's transformational-generative grammar and Neisser's cognitive psychology the Cognitive Approach brought about a new perspective in language teaching, including pronunciation teaching as well. In this perspective, language learning process is an active mental process and a rule-governed behavior rather than habit formation. Some of the implications of Cognitive Code learning might have led to more analytic-linguistic styles of pronunciation teaching, however, its implications were more often associated with the teaching of grammar (Murphy, Baker, 2015:21). Spending time on grammatical structures and vocabulary would be considered better for the learner as these can be achieved with practice. Achieving nativelike

pronunciation was considered very difficult and for this reason the supporters of cognitive approach deemed pronunciation teaching as an unrealistic objective (Scovel, 1969 as cited in Celce-Murcia et al., 1996).

Until the end of 1960s, approaches, methods and techniques used in teaching either had no focus on pronunciation or they were mainly based on imitation and repetition, without explicit instructions. Grammar-Translation Method (GTM), which emerged in the 16th century in teaching of Latin and Greek, completely ignored pronunciation with the use of mother tongue in teaching the target language and focusing on grammar and vocabulary teaching. The Direct Method and naturalistic approaches, and Audiolingual/Oral Method, as the successors of the former, considered pronunciation as a part of natural acquisition process and claimed that the errors in pronunciation would disappear as the learner gained proficiency in the target language and improve the communication. (Celce-Murcia et al., 1996; Fraser, 2000; Murphy & Baker, 2015).

By the 1970s, ALM and the other methods with the Direct Method and naturalistic approaches in the back wings had started to lose popularity, and some new methods emerged based on the Humanistic Approach, which places teacher as the guide in learning and emphasizes the learners' responsibility for their own learning. The Silent Way and Community Language Learning (CLL)/Counselling-Learning (CL) were the two dominant methods of language learning during 1970s, and new pronunciation teaching practices were developed based on these two methods.

In the Silent Way, pronunciation teaching starts in the very beginning of the learning process along with the structure. The focus is more on showing stress, intonation and how words combine in phrases rather than learning a phonetic alphabet or explicit linguistic information as in ALM. The teacher speaks as little as possible and guide the learner through gestures. Teachers tap out the rhythmic patterns using a pointer and show learners the number of syllabus using their fingers. Using the sound color chart, created by Gattengo, teachers point and show the sound system and patterns and by pointing the lips, teeth or jaw, teachers also model proper positioning of articulators. (Celce-Murcia et al., 1996).

The CLL/CL, developed by Charles A. Curran and his associates, is based on Humanistic Approach, redefining the roles of teacher and the learner. As the name suggests, teachers become “counselors” as they give advice, assistance and support to the learner, who have the role of “client” (Richards, Rodgers, 2014). In this method, pronunciation is taught by recording the utterances of students on tape. After being encouraged, students are asked to say a something they wish to be able to utter in the target language. Teacher provides the utterance, and it is divided into chunks for the students to say easily. Once the student produces the sentence correctly, it is recorded on tape. Next, the students listen to their own utterances form the tape and they ask the teacher/counselor to repeat if they wish to listen to the correct utterance again. In this method, teacher acts as human computer, which can be turned off and on at students’ will. Along with the other skills of the target language, pronunciation learning process is controlled by the student rather than the teacher. Students decide whether they need more practice to correct their pronunciation. Thus, they are able to improve the target pronunciation to the extend they desire.

As the communicative approach and methods gained popularity in the 1980s, the focus in teaching stated to change, including pronunciation teaching. The focus of the communicative approach was communication and using the real-life situations. This had a rather negative impact on pronunciation teaching. The communicative approach favors fluency over accuracy in any part of the communication constructed by the learner. In addition, the drills methods used in behaviorist approach was not adapted and incorporated into the communicative methods, which led to the decrease in focus given to pronunciation teaching in teacher training programs (Fraser, 2000). However, Celce-Mucia states that in the communicative approach, there is a threshold level of pronunciation for the learners and if they fall below the level, the learners will have oral communication problems, which is not desired since the primary focus of the this approach is communication. With this perspective, some new pronunciation teaching techniques and activities have been introduced by scholars such as Celce-Murcia, Brinton and Goodwin, which are

explained in the following section which investigates the approaches and practices in pronunciation teaching.

In the 2000s, with the trigger of critics of the bilingual programs in Canada, the theory of second language acquisition was reconsidered regarding its role of explicit feedback in fine-tuning learners' competence in a second language. "L2 teaching in the 1990s and 2000s reinstated a focus on form that incorporated explicit attention to pronunciation within an overall goal of effective communication" (Pennington, Rogerson-Revel, 2019:123). The focus and orientation of language learning moved to learning a language for a specific purpose or task. In this period Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and English for Specific Purpose (ESP) methodologies were developed. Communicative performance was important in both methods and they focused on form as a communicative aspect. The ability to function in English is not directly linked to accuracy of grammatical use or pronunciation in ESP as well as TBLT. Thus, although pronunciation and form are given explicitly, not much importance was attached to pronunciation teaching in these methods. However, as they take communication for the specific tasks in the center of their methodology, to be understood clearly by the speakers of the target language is important in both. In addition, in the 2000s, with the help of the advances in technology, computer assisted language learning (CALL) and automatic speech recognition (ASR) techniques started to be adapted in EPT using various exercises, visuals and activities.

The above-mentioned approaches and methods have naturally led to some differences in material and book designs regarding pronunciation teaching. In his article Hirschhorn (2017) draws attention to how English coursebooks and language teaching books handled pronunciation over the last decades. With his brief analysis of the content of some books, it can be concluded that books published in the 1970s had little to deal with pronunciation and some early 1980s publications did not even have any pronunciation section. It is clearly seen that pronunciation teaching gained its focus back starting from the 1990s most of the coursebooks and ELT books as well.

Although the focus was brought back by adding related pronunciation sections into the literature, materials and programs, it is argued that not much has

changed since the emerge of behaviorist notions of second language learning. In *Methodology in Language Teaching*, Rodney Jones states that despite the fact that the focus of the new textbooks may reflect more recent ideas and views on pronunciation, teaching techniques and tasks are based on the behaviorist approaches and methods, mainly relying on imitation, drills, reading aloud and comparison of L1 and L2 sound systems.

2.2.2 Approaches and practices in pronunciation teaching

There have been many different perspectives to how to teach pronunciation, influenced greatly by the approaches and methods emerged throughout the history of pronunciation teaching. As presented in the previous section, different methods and approaches in language teaching have led to different practices of pronunciation teaching as well. Although pronunciation teaching has been investigated for a long time, there is consensus on how to teach it.

Approaches to pronunciation teaching also have different focuses. Some approaches focus on how the instruction should be given to the learner, or whether it should be given at all. Based on the changes throughout the history, the field of modern language teaching has developed two general approaches to pronunciation teaching in terms of instructions and tools used in pronunciation teaching: intuitive-imitative approach and analytic-linguistic approach.

The intuitive-imitative approach depends on the learner's ability to listen and imitate the sounds and the rhythms of the target language without any explicit instructions or information. In this approach, good model of correct pronunciation is presupposed to be available to the learner. (Celce-Murcia et al.,1996) This approach to pronunciation teaching was almost the only way of teaching pronunciation until the late nineteen century, which was influenced greatly by Direct Method. The teaching techniques and practices of this approach still exist, and in fact, thanks to the advances in technology, better applicable today. Intuitive-imitative approach advocates the improvement of the pronunciation without the intervention of any explicit information. The pronunciation practices and exercises providing model for the learner to develop an acceptable threshold level of pronunciation with the use of audio files, videos, computer-assisted learning tools and applications are in the scope of this

approach, as long as no explicit information and instruction given. Community Language Learning (CLL) method is a good example for this approach since the teacher acts like a human computer without giving any overt correction or instruction on student's pronunciation but rather repeat the correct pronunciation at student's will (e.g., Hismanoglu & Hismanoglu, 2010; Celce-Murcia et al.,1996; Euler, 2014; Jam & Adibpour, 2014).

The analytic-linguistic approach, on the other hand, “utilizes information and tools such as a phonetic alphabet, articulatory descriptions, charts of the vocal apparatus, contrastive information, and other aids to supplement listening, imitation, and production” (Celce-Murcia et al., 1996: 2). It advocates explicitly informing the learner on the sounds and the rhythms of the target language. This approach was adopted by several language teaching methods starting from the mid-20th century and still used in various pronunciation teaching practices. With the emerge of ALM, giving explicit information and instructions became an important in teaching pronunciation. The teaching methods developed within the scope of humanistic approaches in the 1970s were also influenced by this approach such as the Silent Way, as the use of sound charts for giving instruction was a fundamental component of this method.

In addition to the concern whether to give explicit instruction to the learner in pronunciation teaching, another concern is which components of pronunciation should be the focus of teaching. In this respect, there are two main factors to pronunciation teaching focusing on different features and components of pronunciation, such as individual sound units (segmental features), rhythm, intonation, and stress (suprasegmental/prosodic features). These segmental and suprasegmental features have played an important role in pronunciation teaching

The segmental features are the individual sound units such as vowels and consonants which also correspond to phonemes and allophones (Celce-Murcia et al.,1996). Up until the 1980s, the segmental approach dominated pronunciation teaching (Euler, 2014; Celce-Murcia) within the scope of behaviorist language learning theory. The production of individual sounds of the target language using pattern drills and repetition is the focus of the pronunciation teaching practice in segmental approach. In this “bottom-up” method to teach

pronunciation, the goal for the learner is to be able to utter the sounds modeled by the teacher by mimicking and repeating. The segmental approach plays an important role in distinguishing individual sounds of the target language with widely use of the minimal pairs. The minimal pair drills are the drills that use words that differ by a single sound in the same position. (Celce-Murcia). This technique, based on the concept of the phoneme as a minimally distinctive sound, is used for both listening practice and guided oral production (Bloomfield as cited in Celce-Murcia;1996:4). The use of minimal pairs is considered to have many benefits in pronunciation teaching based on the studies conducted in both behaviorist and modern approaches to pronunciation teaching (e.g.Celce-Murcia,1996; Demirezen, 2003; Ahmad & Gilakjani, 2011; Bekleyen, 2011).

As the communicative approach in language teaching started to influence language teaching in the 1970s, the practices in pronunciation teaching based on segmental features began to be “rejected on theoretical and practical grounds as being incompatible with teaching language as communication” (Celce-Murcia et al. 1996:10). Rather than teaching the individual sounds of s language, a top-down method, focusing on the stress, rhythm and intonation of sentences as a whole was considered to be more effective in pronunciation teaching. Therefore, *the suprasegmental features* of pronunciation have become the focus in contemporary language teaching theories, mostly due to the communicative value and the discourse function of intonation in English, along with the rhythm and stress. In this respect, the suprasegmentals are considered to be more critical to communicative competence than segmental features (e.g., Celce-Murcia, 1996; Saka, 2015; Kelly, 2000; Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019). The prosodic information facilitates the listener in identifying the structure of the utterance as well as the message conveyed in connected speech. Intonation and stress used incorrectly in an uttered sentence may lead to a misunderstood function of utterance, leading to a miscommunication. (Kelly, 1969; Pennington, 2019). Also compared to buttom-up method (segmental) where the focus is to teach pronunciation features separately, in the the top-down method requires the learner to use more macro-skills and have a broader analysis of the language.

Referring to the above-mentioned dominance of suprasegmental features in communication, several different practices and approaches were developed, taking individual suprasegmental features into consideration. Developed as a countermove to the segmental approach, the intonation-based approach (O’Conner & Arnold, 1973; Brazil, 1975) as the name suggests, focuses on the intonation feature mainly, and even neglecting the teaching of segments completely in its extreme form (Euler, 2014). Developed by Teschner and Whitley, stress-based approach focuses on the role of stress in the language based on its meaning distinguishing function both on the word and sentence level. Chela-Flores (1997) suggests a rhythm-based approach in pronunciation teaching prominently putting the stress-timed rhythm in the center of attention.

The current *integrative approach* in pronunciation teaching is more of a well-combination of different approaches and adaptation of the methods and techniques of both the modern and the traditional ones in classes as an integral component of communication. (e.g., Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019; Celce-Murcia et al., 1996). Pronunciation is practiced in meaningful, communicative task-based activities rather than isolated, segmental drills. Celce-Murcia et al. (1996) state that “today’s pronunciation curriculum seeks to identify the most important aspects of both the segmentals and suprasegmentals and integrate them appropriately in courses that meet the needs of any given group of learners” (p.10). With this perspective on pronunciation teaching, Celce-Murcia et al. provided a wide variety of methods and techniques using both traditional and modern approaches and practices in their seminal work *Teaching Pronunciation: A Reference for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Kelly (2001) also covers a variety of activities with sample lesson plans with an integration of both segmental and suprasegmental features of pronunciation teaching. In their book *A Course in Phonetics*, Ladefoged & Johnson (2011) provide a great source for teachers by a detailed course content in phonetics including current updates in the field. In chapter five of this study, an INSET suggestion regarding pronunciation teaching is provided based on the works of the above-mentioned experts combining the current trends in pronunciation teaching.

2.2.3 Teachers' perceptions about english pronunciation teaching

Even though the role of pronunciation teaching has gained importance considering its significance in forming an effective communication, it is considered to have been neglected in teaching practices. (Brown & Yule, 1983; Kelly, 1969; Celce-Murcia et al., 1996; Demirezen, 2009; Demircioğlu, 2013; Saka, 2015; Fraser, 2000). In many cases, teachers deem other skills more valuable and worthy of teaching compared to pronunciation teaching. This problem stems from not only the reluctance or/and incompetence of the instructors but also the lack of interest and studies conducted regarding the issue in the literature.

Gilbert (2008) states that lack of time in pronunciation classes is one reason why pronunciation teaching is ignored or paid less attention to. The time allocated to pronunciation is not adequate in many universities, either (Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2016). In any circumstance that causes time constraint in English language classes, pronunciation is generally sacrificed for the sake of teaching grammar, reading or vocabulary.

Lack of confidence is another difficulty English language teachers face when it comes to pronunciation teaching. This lack of confidence is a result of poor education on the issue. Fraser (2000) states "many (teachers) have received little training in how to teach pronunciation, and even where they have, many standard methods of pronunciation teaching are less than ideally effective." (p.8) He also mentions that pronunciation is the skill on which the least time spent in language teaching. Henderson et al. (2012) also states that according to the participants of their study, teacher training on pronunciation teaching is inadequate. In their study carried out in several European countries, Foote et al. (2010) found that only 20% of the participants of their study reported to have received training on pronunciation teaching.

In terms of pronunciation instruction, teachers' views and practices are quite close to the perspectives presented above. Some teachers consider pronunciation as a skill that requires individual effort by students, which would save time for other subjects and skills in class (Bekleyen, 2011). The way instruction is given regarding pronunciation teaching is also another issue. Instead of spending time on explicit and detailed explanation, explanations on pronunciation are merely

through error-correction in foreign language classrooms (Tejeda & Santos, 2014). In another study conducted by Geylanioglu & Dikilitaş (2016), the majority (61%) of the participants comments that teachers have no focus on pronunciation in classes. In the same study, the other two major groups show that the practices and instructions regarding pronunciation teaching are mainly repetition-based and by using modeling approach, which requires no explicit instruction but listening to the teacher to learn pronunciation.

2.3 In-Service Education and Training (INSET)

Having qualified teachers is the one of the most vital parts of the teaching process in every level of education. It could be argued that having a pre-professional training, such as a bachelor's degree or a teaching certificate, should be enough for teachers to be expedient and competent for teaching. However, the profession of teaching is also considered “a career for life, and career development is a life-long process” (Roe as cited in Şentuna,2002: 9). In this respect, with its role in professional development (PD) for teachers, INSET has become an essential part of education. INSET is crucial considering its role in introducing advances, changes and innovations to teachers and adapting them to the cutting-edge (Fullan, 1991; Çimer et al., 2010; Bolam, 1982).

Professional development of the teachers serves not only the individuals but also the institutions they work for. In their book Richards and Farrell (2005) points out some of the areas of PD from the perspective of individual development as follows:

- Subject-matter knowledge
- Pedagogical expertise
- Self-awareness
- Understanding of learners
- Understanding of curriculum and materials.
- Career advancement (p.10)

From the institutional perspective, Richards and Farrell (2015) states that the training received by teachers may become inadequate after some time and “their

knowledge and skills sometimes become outdated” (p.10) This may cause a gap between what teacher has and the needs of the institution. In this respect, the developmental activities referred to as staff development turns into an INSET. The goals of an INSET from the institutions point of view are presented in three groups (p.10-11):

- Institutional development: referring to the improvement of the school/institution as a whole,
- Career development: leading to increased job satisfaction,
- Enhanced levels of student learning: important for the reputation of the institution, as well as teachers.

Used frequently in INSET, teacher training (TT) and teacher development (TD) are two aspects that which are both used regarding the development of the teacher in terms of their teaching skills. Although these terms are used interchangeably, they are two different goals within the scope of teacher education. TT is generally referred as the education and training teachers receive before they start their profession. TT is considered a program through which teacher candidates learn how to teach the language (Fullan, 2001; Freeman, 2001; Woodward, 1992). Freeman (2001) states that in TT the content is defined externally, and outcomes are assessed on external behavioral evidence. The assessment is generally measured through demonstration of the content transmitted to the teacher-learner via exams or portfolios. In TD, on the other hand, the content is formed by the experiences and needs of the teacher-learners and “the impacts of TD are self-assessed through reflective practices” (p.76).

Woodward (1991) presents the TT / TD associations and states the differences between TT and TD. According to Woodward, TT is a compulsory, short-term process transmitted via a top-down approach while TD is a voluntary, long-term process and stems from the experiences of teachers, by which a bottom-up process is formed. While TT is associated with getting a job, TD is related to being interested in the job. Considering the views on TT and TD, the content and aim of the INSET programs generally overlaps with most of the elements of TD.

PD can be conducted in different ways for different purposes. In their study Collinson and Ono (2001) summarize PD models based on “Five Models of Staff Development” by Sparks and Loucks- Horsley (1990) and examples of formats drawn from Collinson (1994) and Little (1982). The table presents the professional development models with their definition and example formats of the specific models are listed.

Table 2.1: Professional Development Models and Formats

Models	Definitions	Examples of formats
Individually-guided model	“...a process through which teachers plan for and pursue activities they believe will promote their own learning.”	Professional conversations and discussions Reading Experimenting in classroom Participating in a Teachers’ Centre Attending professional conferences Formal courses/graduate work Curricular innovations New instructional techniques Collegial networks Reflection Journal writing Collegial collaborations
Observation/assessment model	“...provides teachers with objective data and feedback regarding their classroom performance.”	Having student teachers Having visitors in the classroom Reviewing teaching on videotape Peer coaching Peer evaluations Self-observation and analysis Observing other presenters Observing community resource personnel Use of student evaluations (formal/informal) Visiting other classrooms
Involvement in a development/improvement process model	“...engages teachers in developing curriculum, designing programs or...solving general or particular problems	Developing standards/goals Self-initiated or requested ideas Curriculum writing Designing a survey/needs assessment Piloting or field-testing a program Presenting workshops Presenting at conferences Involvement in a program review Writing grant proposals Problem solving groups Grade level team PDS collaborations Site-based management team
Training model	“...involves teachers in acquiring knowledge or skills through appropriate individual or group instructions.”	Workshops Reading recovery training Co-operative learning training

Table 2.1: (con) Professional Development Models and Formats (taken from Collinson & Ono, 2001:222-223)

Models	Definitions	Examples of formats
Inquiry model	“...requires that teachers identify an area of interest, collect data, and make changes...based on an interpretation of those data.”	Informal classroom inquiry Portfolio Case studies or practice Action research Writing for publications Graduate school assignments, thesis Study groups Research for curriculum unit Analysis of practices and effects
Other learning opportunities	(Self-explanatory)	Committee work Sabbaticals Living with another professional Mentoring Working with good leaders Team teaching Being asked for advice Clinical educator Chairing meetings Parent/teacher conferences Professional organization membership Community service or organizations Transfer to new grade or school

2.3.1 Developing an effective INSET program

There are several factors to be taken into consideration to develop an effective INSET program. In various studies, the indicators and principals of INSET have been investigated and discussed in order to develop an effective program from which teachers as well as the institutions could benefit. Although they focus on some different aspects of the issue, there are some common aspects of the necessary components of an INSET such as detailed planning and needs analysis, timing and duration, instructor quality and program content and also end of course evaluation with follow-up support. (Ayas et al. 2007; Arslan et al., 2019; Hayes, 1995; Koç, 2016; Şentuna, 2002).

Hayes (1995) presents basic principles for in-service teacher development programs as a guide to bring about radical alteration in teaching styles. The principals are presented below:

1. Change is a slow process.
2. Normative-re-educative strategies offer the best prospect of securing changes in behavior.
3. All teacher development activities should be classroom centered.

4. Teachers should be involved in the preparation of courses.
5. Trainers should themselves be teachers.
6. Training methodology should be largely task-based and inductive.
7. Training/development sessions should value participants' existing knowledge.
8. Teacher development activities should raise awareness of the teaching learning issues behind the innovation and give opportunities for in-depth analysis.
9. Teacher development sessions should enable teachers to form generalizable conclusions about the topic under review.
10. Sessions should give participants an opportunity to put into practice what they have learnt in a non-threatening environment.
11. Teacher development sessions should offer opportunities for participants to share knowledge and ideas.
12. Every effort should be made to provide follow-up for courses in participants' own schools.

In her study regarding In-service training of English Language Teachers at elementary schools in Turkey, Koç (2016) states that INSET provided by Ministry of Education is not effective and proposes a new INSET model based on the needs of English language teachers. The proposed new model is designed considering the characteristics of an effective, high quality INSET program and distance education as well. The six components of Koç's proposed INSET model is listed below:

1. Needs Analysis
2. Distance learning mode
3. Cost of free online INSET
4. Collaboration between The Council of Higher Education and the Ministry of Education (MEB)
5. Active participation

6. Assessing the impact of INSET

Ayas et al. focus on the five main characteristics of effective INSET courses (in Çimer et al. 2010). Similar to the previously mentioned studies, the first indicator they report is planning of the course based on the accurate needs assessment. Then, time and duration of the course is given as the second indicator. Teaching method, facilities and instructor quality is gathered under the term administration as the third indicator. Parallel with the points provided by Hayes (1995) and Koç (2015), the last two indicators are end of course evaluation and sustained support after the course. In addition, Çimer et al point out that a more interactive presentation rather than presented information through lecturing is demanded by the teachers participated in the study. The presentation of the content requires to involve the active participation of the teachers. In addition, Çimer et al also conclude that collaboration with universities and academicians in the INSET process are important factors for the quality of training.

In their study conducted to design an INSET program for EFL teachers who taught in non-formal education settings, Arslan et al. (2019) designed a comprehensive needs analysis questionnaire including the expectations and needs of the participants. Aimed to find out the participants' ideal INSET program, the findings lead to two main components: Course planning, which includes needs analysis, participants, duration and flow; and Course Content regarding instructional technology, speaking skill for teachers, classroom management and teaching skills. The process and findings of the study can show the significance of a well-planned needs analysis regarding identifying the components and flow of the INSET program.

Arslan et al. (2019) conclude that information regarding the workload, schedules and other constraints should be obtained before designing the INSET program. In addition, INSET programs could be more effective and efficient through incorporating practice rather than theory-based instructions.

In another study led by Altun and Gök (2010), the quality of the INSET was attempted to be determined by means of conjoint analysis. According to the results of this study, some important aspects regarding the effectiveness of INSET programs have been shed light on. One important result of the study is

that INSET should be held in the same province where participants work (Altun & Gök, 2010:1712). It is stated in the study that this result is consistent with the findings of Briers & Edwards' (1998) study. Another point paid attention to was that the person who gives the training should be an expert, a teacher with PhD degree. The participants. Consistent with the other study results state in this chapter, the findings of Altun & Gök's study also shows that lecture type training is not considered useful and adequate. Finally, the participants of the study stated that the topic of the INSET should be decided in accordance with their interest.

Another concern on developing an INSET program is the long-term effectiveness of the program for the instructors/teachers. In his study, Lamb (1995) focuses on the effectiveness of short term INSET courses. Referring to Tomlinson's comment for INSET programs being "disastrous" without follow-up courses, he sets out to find out whether the information and experiences passed on in these courses are conveyed correctly and taken up by the instructors (as cited in Lamb, 1995: 72). He concludes that most of the original "input" is lost or reinterpreted by teachers to fit their own perspectives and concerns. Lamb finds Tomlinson's suggestion of follow-up sessions after an INSET program useful, but not completely enough for an effective INSET. Lamb points out the importance of teachers' beliefs in effectuality of an INSET program as stated below:

"The focus of the short INSET course, where experienced teachers already have well-developed mental constructs of teaching, should be the teachers' beliefs themselves. These need first to be articulated, and then analyzed for potential contradictions with each other, the teaching circumstances, and the beliefs of learners. Only then will teachers be able to accommodate new ideas—to appreciate the theory underlying them, understand their practical realization, and evaluate their usefulness (p.79)."

Along with all the other aspects to be considered while developing and INSET, the importance of follow-up sessions should not be overlooked. It would be wise to keep in mind that the perspectives and beliefs of the participants could also directly affect the efficiency of INSET programs.

INSET programs are crucial for PD of teachers, however, studies conducted in Turkey show that the participants of several INSET programs have rather negative views on the effectiveness of the programs (Koç, 2015; Tuncel & Çobanoğlu, 2018; Hoş & Topal, 2013). Although it has been widely accepted that a well-constructed INSET program is important and fruitful for the teachers, research suggests that participants of PD/INSET programs are generally unwilling to attend the programs (Hoş & Topal, 2013). Another study shows that the majority of the participants stated that INSET has no contribution on their teaching experience (Tuncel & Çobanoğlu, 2018). In the study, it is also concluded that the minority of the participants found the trainer, the environment, and the process of INSET sufficient. Another issue on INSET programs is their being compulsory for the teachers, which creates a rather negative view on INSET programs. Based on the systematic review of literature regarding the views of EFL teachers on INSET by Hoş and Topal (2013), it can also be concluded that time constraints and lack of needs analysis are other factors that can affect teachers' attitudes towards INSET programs adversely. In addition, the majority of the teachers prefer not to participate in seminars and do not find them useful. Participants state that more interactive forms of INSET are more appealing and serviceable than the ones whose structure is based on lecturing or instructing mainly.

The results of above-mentioned studies shed light on the important points to be considered when developing and planning an INSET program along with the principals regarding INSET/PD programs. Based on the studies conducted in Turkey, it can be concluded that INSET programs could be more efficient and fruitful if the following points are taken into consideration:

- A comprehensive needs analysis is required for an effective INSET. The content and components of the program should refer to the real needs of the participants so that the INSET can have some contribution to their teaching practices.
- Time constraints, workload and schedules should be taken into consideration in the planning step of the INSET.

- The environment, facilities and tools should be considered thoroughly since participants pay attention and attach importance to them.
- The trainer should be sufficient, competent in the field and effective enough to attract the attention of the participants.
- INSET programs' being compulsory has a rather negative effect on the participants. Thus, if possible, INSET program can be kept optional or designed on demand.
- Seminars are not preferred as much as other forms of INSET/PD. A more interactive means of INSET, such as a workshop, has a greater chance to be more effective.

2.4 Related Research in Turkey

2.4.1 Research on pronunciation teaching

A great number of studies conducted regarding pronunciation teaching taking a different aspect of the issue into consideration. Some of the recent studies focus on the difficulties, problems and common mistakes made in pronunciation while others try to seek answer to the question of how pronunciation can be taught effectively.

There have been numerous studies in regard to the pronunciation problems of TEFLL conducted in Turkey. In her study, Bekleyen (2011) focuses on the mispronounced words and tries to find the causes of these errors. She concludes that generalization, lack of interest in checking pronunciation are some of the reasons of these errors. The findings of her study also indicates that TEFLL are not accustomed to a language in which words may have two different pronunciations. Thus, TEFLT should give extra exercises on the differences between weak and strong pronunciation. In her study on identifying pronunciation learning strategies of TEFLL, Akyol (2013) concludes that more attention and research is needed to make pronunciation learning more fun, autonomous and suited to the demands of communicative-oriented classes. In another article, Ercan (2018) focuses on pronunciation problems of TEFLL in Northern Cyprus and identifies the specific sounds Turkish speaking learners have problem with and suggests that learners should be given sufficient

information and suitable exercise and motivation for correcting these problematic sounds. Demircioğlu (2013) puts forward the issues of diphthongs in his study. As one of the main reasons why TEFLL have problems in the articulation of diphthongs, Demircioğlu points out the lack of pronunciation teaching in Turkish education system. In his MA thesis, Albaşlar (2015) also focuses on the university level TEFLL' pronunciation of the diphthongs and triphthongs in English.

In his study, Hismanoğlu (2009) presents the articulation problem of interdental sounds of English ([ð, θ]) for TEFLL and suggest the use of audio-articulation method as a treatment. Demirezen (2010) investigates the fossilized pronunciation of the schwa phoneme and considers this a serious pronunciation problem for teachers, teacher trainees and students as well. He indicates the reasons of the problem stating that it is important to be rehabilitated.

There are also several studies conducted to seek ways of overcoming pronunciation problems and also enabling a more effective pronunciation teaching. In his study, Çakır (2011) concludes that extensive listening contributes to the development of correct pronunciation for foreign language learners. Geylanoğlu (2016) suggests developing pronunciation through conceptualization in his MA thesis. The findings of the study showed a high progress in learning and achieving a positive level. Ülkersoy (2007) conducted a study on the problematic sounds of the English Language for Turkish learners and analyzed the role of difference in syllable structure of the two languages based on Markedness Differential Hypothesis. He also implemented a course designed specifically to point out these phonological differences. The results of the study imply that the implementation was effective in correcting phonological mistakes to a certain level. In another study, Hismanoğlu (2012) makes use of internet-based video lessons to teach word stress to TEFLL. The results of his study reveal that students exposed to internet-based video lessons were superior to those trained in traditional lessons.

2.4.2 Research on the views of Turkish teachers on pronunciation teaching

Compared to the studies regarding pronunciation teaching and problematic aspects of the English language for Turkish learners, it can be stated that fewer

studies have been conducted in respect to the views of TEFLT on pronunciation teaching.

In her MA thesis, Sarıkaya (2013) investigates non-native English-speaking teachers' self perceptions of their pronunciation and pronunciation teaching practices. Her study sheds light on the classroom practices. The results also suggest that there is no need to favor native English-speaking teachers. She concludes that taking phonology classes and/or training on pronunciation teaching have a positive effect on EPT. Akıncı (2015) compares the perceptions of students and academicians on English pronunciation learning at tertiary level. The students participated in the study state that correct pronunciation is essential to communicate effectively, although some of them find it difficult to correct their pronunciation. The results were parallel with the perceptions of academicians. In another study conducted by Yavuz and Keser (2019), the perceptions of candidate teachers about teaching pronunciation is investigated. The results of the study show that teacher candidates value pronunciation teaching as much as other skills considering it essential to study. The idea of reaching native-like sound production is also favored by the participants. Yağız (2018) focuses on the cognition of TEFLT about English pronunciation and instructions, and the actual classroom practices regarding pronunciation. The study indicates that TEFLT seem to be less motivated to improve themselves in terms of pronunciation teaching. He suggests practical INSET programs should be considered as a solution. The results of the study also show that TEFLT focus on segmental features and their perception and knowledge of suprasegmental features need to be improved. In his article Coşkun (2011) discusses future English teachers' attitudes towards EIL (English as an International Language) pronunciation. Based on the findings of his study, Coşkun states that the participants believe that intelligible English pronunciation should be the goal in terms of pronunciation while most perceive the goal of a pronunciation class is to speak like a native speaker. The participants also favor American or British English as the goal of pronunciation teaching.

2.5 Conclusion

The literature regarding EPT and INSET are provided in this chapter. EPT is investigated with the historical background including different approaches and perceptions about pronunciation teaching. The studies included the strengths and weaknesses of traditional and modern approaches in EPT as well as the general attitude of teachers towards EPT. In addition, research results and studies provided in this chapter also shed light on the effectiveness of INSET programs and the views of teachers on INSET in general. However, an INSET regarding EPT needs to be investigated based on the practices and needs of TEFLT. This study aims to provide a clear insight into the practices and views of TEFLT in pronunciation teaching as well as identifying the needs to prepare an effective INSET program on EPT.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the views of TEFLT on EPT and examine their practices in EPT. In addition, based on the results of the two, this study aimed to provide an INSET suggestion for EPT with the help of in-depth analysis of the literature and recent studies regarding pronunciation teaching. The research questions of this study are as follows:

1. What are the views of TEFLT towards EPT at preparatory programs at universities?

1.1. Is there a significant difference between TEFLT's practices of EPT and the following factors separately: age, years of experience, education, the amount of time spend abroad, whether they had phonology lessons?

1.2. Is there a significant difference between TEFLT's self-perceptions of EPT and the following factors separately: age, years of experience, education, the amount of time spend abroad, whether they had phonology lessons?

2. What are the pronunciation teaching practices of TEFLT at preparatory programs at universities?

3. How can an INSET program on pronunciation teaching be developed based on the needs of TEFLT at preparatory programs?

In this chapter, the methods, research design and data collection procedures for this study are presented along with the detailed information regarding instruments and participants.

3.2 Design of the Study

This study was conducted as mixed methods design. A Concurrent Triangulation Design was used in the study (Creswell, 2009). First, a quantitative Likert scaled questionnaire was used in order to answer the first

research question. Secondly, the narrative data regarding the research questions were collected via interviews. The researcher aimed to increase and ensure the validity of the study by using mixed method since triangulation is considered an effective strategy to ensure validity (Dörnyei, 2011). The qualitative data gathered in the study was utilized to consolidate the data gathered from the quantitative data as well as providing new data regarding the second and the third research questions.

3.3 Settings and the Participants

The study was conducted at different foundation universities in İstanbul. The majority of the participants were the instructors of İstanbul Medipol University English preparatory programs. Other participants who answered the questionnaire were also instructors of English preparatory programs at various foundation universities in İstanbul. All the participants in the study were Turkish EFL teachers who are responsible to teach listening, speaking and pronunciation skills in preparatory programs. Based on the course book materials used, the institutions provide the syllabi regarding pronunciation teaching, and the instructors apply the teaching practices and exercises presented in the materials in classes. A total of 156 Turkish EFL teachers participated in the study and kindly completed the questionnaire. The interviews were held with 10 instructors from the English preparatory programs of different foundation universities in İstanbul: seven from İstanbul Medipol University, 2 from İstanbul Aydın University and one from İstanbul Kent University.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

The backbone of the study was the questionnaire which sought answer to the first and the second question of the study. The questionnaire was adapted from another study held by Nihal Yapıcı Sarıkaya in her Master of Arts Thesis at Bilkent University. Before using the questionnaire, the consent of the developer was taken via e-mail stating the goal of this study. In her study Sarıkaya developed a questionnaire and applied to reveal the pronunciation teaching perceptions of teachers as non-native English speakers. The piloting of the

questionnaire was conducted by Sarıkaya and it was stated to be reliable with .803 Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient. The independent factor items related to non-native perspective were excluded from the questionnaire in this study. After the exclusion of the non-native perspective items, the scale items were analyzed on SPSS for reliability. The result was positive since the Cronbach alpha value was .779 (See APPENDIX 3), which is considered reliable according to Pallant SPSS Survival Manual (2010). The questionnaire also included demographic data questions whose relation to pronunciation teaching were investigated in the first research question.

The questionnaire was held online, and the data was collected through Microsoft Forms platform with multiple choice demographic data questions and Likert Scale statements including 21 items. After getting the consent of the General Coordinator of the İstanbul Medipol University Language School, the questionnaire link was sent to the instructors in İstanbul Medipol University via WhatsApp application and e-mail. The questionnaire link was then sent to the instructors working at different foundation universities in Istanbul by getting their consent for participating in the study individually by the researcher. The questionnaire link was shared with other colleagues of the researcher working for different foundation universities in İstanbul via WhatsApp application.

Based on the literature, an interview was designed with a total of 10 participants, which is commonly considered enough for reaching saturation (Dörnyei, 2011; Morse,1995; Guest et al.,2006). Participants were chosen via convenience sampling. The researcher interviewed TEFLTs working at different foundation universities with different backgrounds. The semi-structured interviews were held in Turkish via Microsoft Teams online meetings and the questions regarding research questions were discussed with the participants. Then the recordings of the discussions were transcribed and typed on Microsoft Word. With the help of Microsoft Excel and MAXQDA software, codes were identified using descriptive coding. Inductive approach was adopted in coding process (Thomas, 2006) After gathering the codes and narrowing them down under categories, themes were identified, and the data was analyzed manually.

3.5 Data Analysis

The questionnaire used in the study included 21 items which can be categorized in two sections: fifteen items were about the pronunciation teaching practices and six items were about the self-perceptions of their pronunciation. The researcher named these categories in the same way with the developer of the questionnaire; as Self-Perception Scale (SS) and Pronunciation Practice Scale (PS) in the data analysis chapter. The items were presented in different sections in the questionnaire. The data gathered from the questionnaire were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The results of the PS and SS were analyzed by comparison to the five factors given in the demographic questions part: Age, Teaching Experience, Degree of Education, Time Spent Abroad and Taking Phonology Classes. Based on the normality tests results showing Kurtosis and Skewness values between +1,5 and -1,5 (See APPENDIX 2), parametric techniques were adopted in data analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell,2013). Independent T-Test and One-way ANOVA tests were conducted to see if there were any significant differences between the given factors and scales. Finally, the correlation between PS and SS was analyzed using Pearson Correlation Analysis Technique on SPSS (Pallant, 2010).

The qualitative data was used to consolidate the results of the quantitative data provided as well as to investigate the views of the instructors on INSET programs to gather information on their views of the INSET in a broad sense. The narrative data gathered by semi-structured interview was manually analyzed by presenting the codes and the themes of the transcribed interview results.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter included information on the design of the study, settings, participants along with the data collection procedures and data analysis. The in-depth analysis of the data gathered in this study will be reported and presented in the following chapter.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

The detailed analysis of the research questions of the study is presented in this chapter. The study investigated views of TEFLT on EPT and their practices in EPT. Based on the data gathered the other goal was to develop an INSET on EPT. A five-point Likert-Scale questionnaire was used to address the first research questions of this study.

1. What are the views of TEFLT towards EPT at preparatory programs at universities?

1.1. Is there a significant difference between TEFLT's practices of EPT and the following factors separately: age, years of experience, education, taking phonology classes and the amount of time spent abroad.

1.2. Is there a significant difference between TEFLT's self-perceptions of EPT and the following factors separately: age, years of experience, education, taking phonology classes and the amount of time spent abroad.

Along with the findings gathered from this data analysis, a semi-structured interview was conducted to support the first research question and seek answer for the second and third research questions given below:

2. What are the pronunciation teaching practices of TEFLT at preparatory programs at universities?

3. How can an INSET program on pronunciation teaching be developed based on the needs of TEFLT at preparatory programs?

4.2 Analysis of Quantitative Data Regarding Research Question 1

Both PS and SS item scales included only confirmative statements with a Likert-scale: 0 (strongly disagree), 1(disagree), 2 (undecided), 3(agree) and 4 (strongly agree). According to the descriptive statistics gathered on SPSS, PS

scale mean value is 2.7 and SS scale mean value is 2.6 as shown in Table 4.1 below. The mean values indicated that the average tendency of the participants towards pronunciation teaching practices and self-perceptions of their pronunciation is rather positive based on the Likert-scale used in this study.

Table 4.1: Results of Descriptive Statistics Related to PS and SS

Descriptive Statistics									
	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Skewness		Kurtosis	
PS	156	1,27	4,00	2,7179	,48370	,030	,194	,969	,386
SS	156	1,17	3,50	2,5940	,53654	-,464	,194	-,437	,386
Valid N (listwise)	156								

The variables regarding the demographic information were analyzed on SPSS to see whether there is a significant relationship between the variables and pronunciation practices and self-perceptions of the participants. The results are given in details below under with the title of each demographic information item.

4.2.1 Age

Another variable compared with PS and SS was age of the participants. One-way ANOVA was conducted to see if there is a significant difference between this variable and PS and SS scales of the study. The results of descriptive statistics and One-way ANOVA are given in Table 4.2 and Table 4.3 below.

Table 4.2: Results of Descriptive Statistics Related to PS/SS and Age

Descriptives					
	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	% to Total Population
PS	21-25	12	3,0556	,61156	7,7
	26-30	44	2,7848	,48881	28,2
	31-35	38	2,7825	,30832	24,4
	36-40	40	2,6733	,40616	25,6
	41-45	10	2,5867	,40588	6,4
	46-50	8	2,5333	,54043	5,1
	51-55	2	1,2667	0,00000	1,3
	56-60	2	1,7333	0,00000	1,3
	Total	156	2,7179	,48370	100,0
SS	21-25	12	2,3889	,69389	7,7
	26-30	44	2,4470	,55774	28,2
	31-35	38	2,8158	,47425	24,4
	36-40	40	2,6583	,42859	25,6
	41-45	10	2,4000	,50430	6,4
	46-50	8	2,8750	,55456	5,1
	51-55	2	1,8333	0,00000	1,3
	56-60	2	2,1667	0,00000	1,3
	Total	156	2,5940	,53654	100,0

As shown in Table 4.2, the majority of the participants the participants are between the age of 26-40 (26-30 =28,2 %, 31-35= 24,4 %, 36-40 = 25,6% of the total population).

Table 4.3: Results of One-way Anova Related to PS/SS and Age

ANOVA		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
PS	Between Groups	8,399	7	1,200	6,372	,000
	Within Groups	27,866	148	,188		
	Total	36,265	155			
SS	Between Groups	6,021	7	,860	3,298	,003
	Within Groups	38,600	148	,261		
	Total	44,621	155			

According to the results gathered from One-way ANOVA, it can be concluded that both teachers' pronunciation teaching practices (PS) and their self-perception of EPT (SS) had significant differences in relation to their age. (PS $p = .000$, SS $p = .003$). As p value $< .05$, there were significant differences between the age variable and PS and SS. (Pallant, 2010). These results indicated that the age factor influenced the pronunciation teaching practices of the participants as well as their self-perceptions of their pronunciation.

Because there was a significant difference between PS and age group, the effect size was also found with Univariate Analysis of Variance on SPSS. The results indicated a small effect size with $F(7,148) = 6.372$ and Cohen's d value $d = .2$ shown in APPENDIX 4 (Pallant, 2010). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was tested using Levene statistics on SPSS. The results of Levene's test indicated that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, $p = .000$. shown in Table 4.4. Since the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, the post-hoc multiple comparisons were conducted using Tamhane's test. The test results indicated that after excluding 51-55 and 55-60 due to the sample size, no significant difference was found between other age groups regarding PS (See APENDIX 4).

The same procedure was applied in relation to SS and Age groups since there was a significant difference. The effect size was calculated with Univariate Analysis of Variance on SPSS. The results indicated a small effect size with $F(7,148) = 3.298$ and $d = .13$ shown in APPENDIX 4 (Pallant, 2010). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was tested using Levene statistics on SPSS. The results of Levene's test indicated that the assumption of homogeneity

of variances was violated, $p = .000$. shown in Table 4.4. Since the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, the post-hoc multiple comparisons were conducted using Tamhane's test (Meyers et al., 2006). The test results indicated that after excluding 51-55 and 55-60 due to the sample size, there were significant differences between age groups 26-30 and 31-35 (See APENDIX 4).

Table 4.4: The Homogeneity Test of Variances regarding PS/ SS and Age Groups

Test of Homogeneity of Variances				
	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
PS	4,549	7	148	,000
SS	4,549	7	148	,003

4.2.2 Years of experience

Another question asked in the study was whether TEFLT teaching experiences have a significant relation to their perceptions of pronunciation teaching practices and self-perceptions of EPT. In order to see if there is a significance between these variables, One-way ANOVA Test was conducted on SPSS. The results of descriptive statistics and One-way ANOVA regarding years of experience are given in Table 4.5 and Table 4.6 below.

Table 4.5: Results of Descriptive Statistics Related to PS/SS and Years of Experience

Descriptives					
	Years of Experience	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
PS	0-2	10	2,6267	,39403	,12460
	3-5	32	2,9375	,51499	,09104
	6-10	46	2,7536	,37261	,05494
	10+	68	2,6039	,51587	,06256
	Total	156	2,7179	,48370	,03873
SS	0-2	10	2,6333	,60246	,19052
	3-5	32	2,3438	,55992	,09898
	6-10	46	2,6014	,54826	,08084
	10+	68	2,7010	,47801	,05797
	Total	156	2,5940	,53654	,04296

Table 4.6: Results of One-way Anova Related to PS/SS and Years of Experience

ANOVA						
Years of Experience		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
PS	Between Groups	2,569	3	,856	3,862	,011
	Within Groups	33,697	152	,222		
	Total	36,265	155			
SS	Between Groups	2,800	3	,933	3,393	,020
	Within Groups	41,821	152	,275		
	Total	44,621	155			

According to the results gathered from One-way ANOVA, it can be concluded that both participants' English pronunciation teaching practices (PS) and their self-perception of EPT (SS) had significant differences in relation to their years of experience. (PS $p = .011$, SS $p = .02$). As p value $< .05$ in both scales, the results indicated a significant difference between the years of experience variable and PS and SS. (Pallant, 2010). These results showed that the experience of the participants affected their pronunciation teaching practices as well as their self-perceptions of EPT.

Because there was a significant difference between PS and participants' years of experience, the effect size was also found with Univariate Analysis of Variance on SPSS. The results indicated a very small effect size with $F(3,152) = 3.862$ and $d = .07$ (See APPENDIX 4). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was tested using Levene statistics on SPSS. The results of Levene's test indicated that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not violated, with $p = .285$ shown in Table 4.7. Since the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not violated as shown in Table 4.7 below, the post-hoc multiple comparisons were conducted using Tukey's test. The test results indicated a significant difference between participant groups with 3-5 years of experience and 10+ years of experience (See APENDIX 4).

The same procedure was applied in relation to SS and years of experience since there was a significant difference. The effect size was calculated with Univariate Analysis of Variance on SPSS. The results indicated a very small effect size with $F(3,152) = 3.393$ and $d = .063$ (See APPENDIX 4). The assumption of homogeneity of variances was tested using Levene statistics on SPSS. The results of Levene's test indicated that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not violated, $p = .161$ as shown in Table 4.7. Since the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not violated, the post-hoc multiple

comparisons were conducted using Tukey’s test (Meyers et al., 2006). The test results indicated a significant difference between participant groups with 3-5 years of experience and 10+ years of experience (See APENDIX 4).

Table 4.7: The Homogeneity Test of Variances regarding PS/ SS and Years of Experience

Test of Homogeneity of Variances				
	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
PS	4,549	3	152	,285
SS	4,549	3	152	,161

4.2.3 Education

Degree of education was another variable compared to PS and SS in the study. In order to see if there is a significance between the variable and, One-way ANOVA Test was conducted on SPSS. The results of descriptive statistics and One-way ANOVA regarding years of experience are given in Table 4.8 and 4.9 below.

Table 4.8: Results of Descriptive Statistics Related to PS/SS and Degree of Education

Descriptives					
Degree of Education		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
PS	BA	54	2,7951	,48106	,06546
	MA	90	2,6978	,46417	,04893
	PHD	12	2,5222	,60358	,17424
	Total	156	2,7179	,48370	,03873
SS	BA	54	2,6049	,53816	,07323
	MA	90	2,5815	,55150	,05813
	PHD	12	2,6389	,44286	,12784
	Total	156	2,5940	,53654	,04296

Most of the participants in the study held Master of Arts degree with N=90 among a total of 156 participants. Participants with bachelor’s degree are the second largest group with N=54 and only 12 of the participants held PhD degree.

Table 4.9: Results of One-way Anova Related to PS/SS and Degree of Education

ANOVA						
Degree of Education		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
PS	Between Groups	.817	2	.409	1.764	.175
	Within Groups	35.448	153	.232		
	Total	36.265	155			
SS	Between Groups	.045	2	.022	.077	.926
	Within Groups	44.576	153	.291		
	Total	44.621	155			

The results of One-way ANOVA Test in Table 4.9 above indicated that there were no significant differences between the mean scores of PS and SS and participants degree of education. (PS $p = .175$ and SS $p = .926$). Because in both PS and SS scales $p > .05$, it was concluded that there were no significant differences between participants' English pronunciation teaching practices and their self-perceptions of EPT (Pallant, 2010). In other words, the participants do pay attention to the importance of pronunciation teaching regardless of their educational backgrounds.

4.2.4 Taking phonology classes

Whether taking phonology classes during their education have any statistically significant difference on participants English pronunciation teaching practices and their self-perception of EPT was another factor of the first research question. In order to see if there were any significance between taking phonology classes and PP and SS scales, the means of PP and SS were compared with the variable regarding taking phonology classes. An Independent Sample T-Test was conducted to check the significance, since the variable had two possible options. (Pallant. 2010). The results of descriptive statistics and T-Test regarding taking phonology classes are given in Table 4.10 and Table 4.11 below.

Table 4.10: Results of Descriptive Statistics Related to PS/SS and Taking Phonology Classes

Group Statistics					
Taking Phonology Classes		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PS	No	48	2,5694	,43226	,06239
	Yes	108	2,7840	,49251	,04739
SS	No	48	2,6389	,46297	,06682
	Yes	108	2,5741	,56707	,05457

The descriptive statistics given in Table 9 indicate that the majority of the participants took phonology classes (Yes N=108). 30.76 % of the participants did not have phonology classes during their education (No N=48).

Table 4.11: Results of Independent Samples T-Test Related to PS/SS and Taking Phonology Classes

Independent Samples Test		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
PS	Equal variances assumed	,506	,478	-2,604	154	,010
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,738	101,971	,007
SS	Equal variances assumed	1,569	,212	,695	154	,488
	Equal variances not assumed			,751	109,239	,454

The Independent Samples T-Test results indicated that PS and the variable taking phonology classes had a significant difference. Based on PS homogeneity of variance in Levene's Test for Equality of Variances $p=.478 > .05$, it was assumed that variances were approximately equal and $p=.010 < .05$, which is considered to show a statistical significance (Pallant, 2010). This statistical result showed that there was a significant difference between taking phonology classes and participants' pronunciation teaching practices. The means score for the participants who took phonology classes ($M= 2.7840$, $SD=.49251$) was higher than those who did not take phonology classes ($M=2.5694$, $SD=.43226$). The difference was in favor of the "Yes" group showing that taking phonology classes influenced PS with a significant difference. With the mean and standard deviation values presented in Table 4.10, the effect size of the significance was calculated and the result was $d=.46$ (Cohen's d value), which showed that the results of the Independent Sample T-Test yielded a medium effect size according to Cohen's criteria (Pallant, 2010, p.232).

The Independent Samples T-Test results showed no significant difference between taking phonology classes and the self-perceptions of participants on EPT. ($SS p=.488 > .05$). Whether the participants took phonology classes or not had no significant difference in their self-perspectives of pronunciation. In other words, the results indicated that taking phonology classes had no effect on their views of their own level of pronunciation as well as confidence in EPT.

4.2.5 The amount of time spent abroad

The amount of time spent abroad was another variable compared in relation to PS and SS in the study. In order to see whether the amount of time spent abroad had any statistically significant difference, One-way ANOVA Test was conducted. The results of descriptive statistics and One-way ANOVA the amount of time spent in the countries whose native language is English are given in Table 4.12 and Table 4.13 below.

Table 4.12: Results of Descriptive Statistics Related to PS/SS and Time Spent Abroad

Descriptives					
The amount of time spent abroad		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
PS	never	66	2,8202	,48230	,05937
	less than a month	26	2,4769	,46788	,09176
	1-5 months	34	2,7765	,48015	,08234
	6-12 months	8	2,8000	,20778	,07346
	more than a year	22	2,5758	,48536	,10348
	Total	156	2,7179	,48370	,03873
SS	never	66	2,5657	,61594	,07582
	less than a month	26	2,6410	,52850	,10365
	1-5 months	34	2,6373	,46867	,08038
	6-12 months	8	2,6250	,46076	,16290
	more than a year	22	2,5455	,43699	,09317
	Total	156	2,5940	,53654	,04296

Table 4.12 shows that more than half of the participants (N=66) had never been abroad in a country whose native language is English. Only 14% of the participants (N=22) spent more than a year in English speaking countries.

Table 4.13: Results of One-way Anova Related to PS/SS and Time Spent Abroad

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
PS	Between Groups	2,816	4	,704	3,178	,154
	Within Groups	33,450	151	,222		
	Total	36,265	155			
SS	Between Groups	,234	4	,058	,199	,939
	Within Groups	44,387	151	,294		
	Total	44,621	155			

The results of One-way ANOVA Test in Table 4.13 above indicated that there were no significant differences between the mean scores of PS and SS and the amount of time spent abroad. (PS $F= 3.178$, $p= .154$ and SS $F=.199$, $p= .939$). Because in both PS and SS scales $p>.05$, it was concluded that there were no significant differences between the amount of time participants spent in countries whose native language is English and their' English pronunciation

teaching practices and their self-perceptions of EPT (Pallant, 2010). This showed that the TEFLT in the study valued pronunciation teaching practices and had a self-awareness of their pronunciation regardless of the time they spent in English speaking countries.

4.2.6 Pearson correlation analysis PS and SS

After analyzing the variables and their relations to PS and SS scale means, a Pearson Correlation Analysis was conducted to see whether there was a correlation between the pronunciation teaching practices and self-perceptions of the participants. The results are given in Table 4.14 below.

Table 4.14: Results of Pearson Correlation Analysis Test

Correlations		PS	SS
PS	Pearson Correlation	1	,161*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,055
	N	156	156
SS	Pearson Correlation	,161*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,055	
	N	156	156

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The results of Pearson Correlation Analysis Test indicate no significant difference between PS and SS scales. Thus, it could be said that participants' self-perception of pronunciation skills has no relation with their classroom pronunciation practices.

4.3 Analysis of Qualitative Data regarding Research Questions 1, 2 and 3

A semi-structured interview was carried out with 10 TEFLTs to seek answers to research questions 2 and 3. The interview also included a question which could serve to consolidate the results gathered in quantitative data gathered from the questionnaire. Three questions were asked in the interviews:

1. What is your perspective of pronunciation teaching?
2. What kinds of pronunciation teaching practices do you use in your classes?
3. Do you think that you need to improve yourself in EPT? If yes, in which ways?

The first question was asked to see whether TEFLT has a positive or negative perspective towards pronunciation teaching. In other words, the researcher tried to understand whether the participants attach importance to pronunciation teaching in their classes. In this sense, the analysis of the responses to question 1 was used to consolidate the quantitative data gathered from the questionnaire. The second question sought answer to the second research question of the study by trying to identify the pronunciation teaching practices used in classes. Finally, the third interview question created basis for the third research question, as it revealed whether there was a need for an INSET on EPT, which is given as a suggestion in the following chapter in this study.

The responses were transcribed and analyzed for codes on MAXQDA 2020. Then, categorized and the themes were revealed as shown in Table 4.15 below.

Table 4.15: Codes and Themes of the Semi-structured Interviews

Themes	Codes	Frequency (<i>f</i>)
Practices used in EPT	Drilling	1
	Place of articulation	2
	Monitoring and immediate correction	2
	Roleplaying	2
	Integrated exercises	3
	No specific exercise	3
	Providing correct input	3
	Extensive listening	3
	Authentic audio / videos	4
	Using IPA for EPT	4
	Minimal pairs	6
	Exercise provided in MC books	7
	Repetition	7
	Problematic sounds	9
Student Level regarding EPT TEFLTs perspectives on EPT	Teacher's role decreases as SS level increases	3
	Low level / A1-A2 students need more EPT	9
	Good accent /pronunciation increases students Motivation	1
	EPT is neglected	1
	Pronunciation is not very important	2
	Avoiding fossilization is important	2
	Native-like pronunciation is not possible/ should not be the goal	3
	Stress and intonation are important	4
	Intelligible pronunciation is enough	5
	Pronunciation teaching is important	6
Needs regarding EPT	How to give feedbacks	1
	Need to learn IPA	3
	Need EPT techniques and methodology	9
	Need to improve EPT practices	11

4.3.1 Analysis of interview question 1

The first interview question sought answer to the views of TEFLTs on EPT. In this respect, the responses gathered were related to the analysis of the quantitative data whether to see if there were any similarities in terms of the perspectives of teachers on EPT. After categorizing the codes and the themes, the responses regarding the views of teachers gathered under the theme named “TEFLTs perspectives on EPT”. The results indicated that EPT is valued and considered important with $f = 6$. More than half of the participants agreed that EPT is important by stating that they think EPT is important. Only two participants reported that EPT is not important for them ($f = 2$). Participant 6 reported “I cannot say that I give importance to pronunciation that much, because I think it seems like a detail compared to the other main skills and rules of language”.

Almost all participants agreed that EPT was important starting from low levels. Most reported that EPT was more important especially in A1-A2 level (based on CEFR) with $f = 9$. In addition, in accordance with this, some participants stated that they thought need for EPT decreased as students’ levels increased, as they become more autonomous. Participant 1 reported: “... especially in B1 and B2 level students our role decreases, we just let them listen again in parts they could not understand or utter the word correctly”. She also stated that A1-A2 level students required more dictation and repetition.

Another highlighted view on EPT was the level of the desired pronunciation. Participants stated that intelligibility should be the bare limit considering EPT ($f = 5$) and native-like pronunciation should not be the objective while teaching pronunciation ($f = 3$). Participant 1 stated the following: “In the past, I valued native-like perfect pronunciation more. However, after attending a study regarding the English language – lingua franca, I changed my mind. English is so global now, so how can we decide the perfect/correct pronunciation? Now I think pronunciation is enough if it is intelligible.”. Participant 3 also stated that he thought fluency and accuracy was more important and as long as it did not break understanding, it was not the first goal in teaching.

Stress and intonation were two aspects of EPT which participants thought important ($f = 4$). Fossilization was also another concern ($f = 2$). Two participants

reported that starting from low levels, they attach importance to correct pronunciation because fossilization is very difficult to overcome. One participant (8) mentioned the effect of good pronunciation on motivation by saying: “I think I need to improve my pronunciation skill and EPT practices both because I personally need, and also I believe it will increase students’ motivation since they want to be able to speak like a native.”

Only one of the participants stated that EPT is neglected, which showed that most of the participants considered EPT is important according to the responses gathered from the interviews.

4.3.2 Analysis of interview question 2

The second interview question aimed to find the in-class EPT practices of the participants. After the analysis, codes were created based on the exercise and teaching practice types reported in the interviews.

Teaching and comparing problematic sounds and using repetition for teaching the pronunciation of the new words were the two popular practices among the participant with $f=9$ and $f=7$, respectively. Participant 2,3,4,5 and 6 reported that they focused on the pronunciation of “th” by comparing [θ] and [ð] sounds. Participants stated that they used listening exercises first and then asked students to repeat. In addition, they used some exercises in which students are required to choose correct pronunciation on an exercise while listening. Even Participant 6, who stated that he did not think pronunciation was important, reported that he used comparison of problematic sounds and repetition in his classes: “ ... the first practice I can think of is ‘repeat after me’, which is an deep-rooted in our language teaching and learning culture. When you say repeat after me in class, regardless of their age, they change their mood and start repeating.”

Most participants ($f=7$) reported that they used the exercises provided in the main course books they use. Also, those who said that they did not have any specific exercise for EPT ($f=3$) were included in this group. In addition, half of the participants ($N=5$) reported that they made use of minimal pair exercises and focus on minimal pairs in their classes with $f=6$.

Three participants reported that they used IPA (International Phonetic Alphabet) in their teaching practices ($f=4$). Participant 10 stated that he showed the symbols (alphabet), and which sounds they represented in his classes. Participant 5 reported that she supported the idea that EPT should be practiced together with phonetic alphabet and minimal pairs, especially in the beginning.

Using authentic materials and extensive listening exercises to provide correct input were among other practices used by the participants, however, less than half of the participants used these practices in their classes with $f=4$ and $f=3$ respectively. Participant 10 stated that he wanted to let students hear the correct pronunciation from an online source in addition to his utterances of the words.

In parallel with the use of authentic materials and extensive listening exercises, Participant 3 reported: “I think we can apply a more computer/technology-based strategy for EPT. Because one benefit is that there are numerous authentic materials and exercises online... and this should become a routine in teaching... like a TedX speech every week with integrated skill such as listening, reading then speaking and giving a presentation.” In this respect, three participants including Participant 3 stated that they tried to integrate listening and speaking skills to practice pronunciation with $f=3$. In addition, two participants stated that after introducing the new words, they used roleplaying activities in their classes, which could also be considered as an integrated skill.

The rest of the practices and exercises reported were focusing on the place of articulation ($f=2$), and drilling exercises ($f=1$), to practice new sounds or words they taught in their classes.

4.3.3 Analysis of interview question 3

The final interview question was whether the participants thought they needed to improve themselves in terms of EPT. All participants reported that they needed to improve their EPT practices ($f=11$), which also gave an idea about participants’ self-perceptions regarding EPT.

Lack of education and information on EPT techniques and methodology was mentioned the most in the interviews ($f=9$). Participant 1 stated that she used her own methods, meaning that she taught mostly based on what she had observed. Participant 6 clearly pointed out the need by saying: “I teach the problematic

sounds in classes as I said but it would be better if we learned these in a systematic way with an education or training. It would be better to learn more effective ways...”. Participant 8 also reported: “I have concerns about how much we can realize (regarding EPT), because we reflect the way we learned... the only education I had regarding pronunciation was my teachers’ correcting my pronunciation mistakes”.

It was also clear from the analysis that three of the participants (2,3 and 6) considered themselves open to improvement in terms of IPA. Participant 2 commented on this with the following statement: “What I feel the lack of the most in me as a teacher (meaning EPT) is IPA, learning it and using it in teaching correctly.” Participant 6 also had a similar comment by stating that he sometimes had problem in understanding the phonetic transcriptions of the words and did not feel competent at using it.

Only one of the participants (6) specifically stated that there was a need for learning how to give feedbacks while teaching pronunciation.

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter presented the qualitative and quantitative data analysis with the detailed procedures held. The relevant test results carried out on SPSS and qualitative data analyses were also included with tables.

5. AN IN-SERVICE TRAINING SUGGESTION ON EPT

5.1 Introduction

The studies and research regarding INSET programs investigated in the literature review chapter of this study showed that there is a common ground among teachers from different backgrounds and field in terms of their perspectives on the effectiveness of INSET. Although most participants of these studies believe that INSET/PT programs are necessary, they rather have negative views on the effectiveness of these programs. The negative factors regarding INSET which the participants of the studies state can be summarized as follows:

- Lack of needs analysis
- Time constraints / heavy workloads
- Insufficient / incompetent instructors
- Mandatory instead of on-demand/ optional programs
- Lecture type of INSET instead of more interactive programs.

Considering these factors, the first and most important step of creating an INSET program should be a well-planned needs analysis. Several studies have shown that the participants do not feel satisfied and/or do not see the programs fruitful if they do not feel the need to be trained on the specific topic INSET provides (Koç, 2015; Tuncel & Çobanoğlu, 2018; Hoş & Topal, 2013). It is also indicated that the participants want to decide the topic of the training (Altun & Gök, 2010). Thus, after the needs analysis, it can be suggested that the results of the needs analysis should be shared with the group INSET is designed for. Based on the results, some training topic options can be presented to be decided.

After the needs analysis, the planning stage of the INSET starts. There are some crucial points to be considered in this stage. Study results show that time

limitation can affect INSET programs in a negative way (Hoş & Topal, 2013; Arslan et al. 2019). The location where INSET will be held is also another concern for teachers. The participants favor the INSET programs organized in provinces where they work (Altun & Gök, 2010). The timing of the INSET should not overlap with the workloads of teachers. Teachers schedules, weekly duties and holidays should be taken into consideration while planning an INSET. It would be necessary to keep in mind that INSET program should have further follow up session to maintain long term effectiveness (Lamb, 1995).

Lecture or seminar types of INSET are considered less effective and time consuming. The structure should be based on a more interactive program with different activities and discussions. The use of slides and presentation tools is inevitable; however, they should not be overly used. More time can be spent on the application and practice of what has been presented.

Another important factor in designing the INSET on EPT is that follow up sessions are crucial to check the effectiveness of the program. There should be feedback sessions, which can be held online as well as a part of the follow-ups. The INSET can be re-structured or repeated with some changes after a certain time based on the feedbacks gathered from the participants.

The results of this study regarding the views of TEFLT on EPT served as a model to help create the INSET suggestion given below. The aspects of the INSET design given below can be altered and adapted according to the opportunities institutions/teachers have.

5.2 Needs Analysis

Although this study did not directly aim to carry out a detailed needs analysis for the INSET suggestion, the third research question served well for this purpose. The question asked whether the participants thought they need to improve their pronunciation teaching skills and if so, in which ways they would like to improve. Most of the participants in the study stated that they merely use repetition and monitoring in their studies and feel limited to the practices coursebooks provide. In addition, more than half of the participants concluded that some theoretical information on pronunciation teaching techniques and

practices would be fruitful for them. The EPT suggestion given in 5.2 was shaped taking the interview results into consideration.

5.3 Participants, Time, and Place

It is very crucial to remember that the INSET program should not be compulsory. Only those who want and need the program should attend to have more effective INSET. Sharing the results of the needs analysis with the target group can increase the awareness and may even contribute to the number of participants of the program.

Considering the number of the participants, a large classroom or a conference hall can be suitable for the INSET on EPT. Necessary equipment, tools and devices should be available in the room or hall. The main session of the suggested INSET is divided parts in consecutive weeks. As a suggestion, assuming teachers have fewer lessons on Fridays, the training can take place on this day to avoid stress and workload. A better way to decide on the day and the time would be a quick online survey among those who want to attend the program.

5.4 The Plan of the Program

The layout of the suggested training will be as follows:

- 1- Introduction (10 minutes)
 - a. Greetings with a funny opening video focusing on the importance of pronunciation
 - b. Sharing the survey and needs analysis results
 - c. Giving a brief plan of the main session
- 2- EPT (40-60 minutes)
 - a. Interacting with the participants by asking what they know
 - b. Referring to the current issue by asking how many of the techniques they apply

- c. Giving a summary of current methods & techniques on EPT (20-30 minutes most)
- d. Discussion and feedback on the subject matter/ QA session

15 Minute Break

3- Practice and application (30-40 minutes)

- a. Creating a group work activity among participants to exemplify some practices of newly introduced techniques and methods.
- b. Sharing the ideas with all participants with a brief presentation.
- c. Choosing the most practical and effective activity created.

4- Feedback (10 minutes)

- a. Online survey with some theoretical questions on the subject, and feedback on the INSET session
- b. Planning the follow up session.

5.5 The Content of INSET Suggestion on EPT

As mentioned in the review of the literature, the current and widely accepted trend of EPT is based on the integrative approach, which is a combination of the traditional techniques with modern ones in meaningful contexts. As Celce-Murcia states "...today's pronunciation curriculum seeks to identify the most important aspects of both the segmentals and suprasegmentals and integrate them appropriately in courses that meet the needs of any given group of learners" (1996:10). Pennington also summarizes her EPT approaches with the use of combining different approaches and techniques, which consists of contrastive 5-part scheme (2019). In this study, the INSET suggestion regarding EPT is based on the studies and advice of the above-mentioned professionals.

The INSET suggestion on EPT can be categorized into three main points which, in the following part, will be handled in detail.

Integrating Approaches

- a. Macro to Micro (Top to Bottom or Suprasegmentals to Segmentals):

The combination of macro features and micro features of pronunciation and articulation is a more effective way for teaching EPT (Pennington,2019; Celce-Murcia et al., 1996). From this perspective, using both segmental and suprasegmental features can lead to better results. In her study, Pennington advises the order to be from macro to micro features, as well as from top to bottom and implicit to explicit. In other words, instruction or speech processing that focusses exclusively on sound without regard to meaning (bottom-up) should not be introduced before the meaningful, contextualized speech samples or practices. What is meant by this approach is that students should be exposed to the function and prosodic aspects of pronunciation before they get into details on segmental features in EPT process. It is also stated that a focus on suprasegmentals has a positive effect on segmentals as well (Hardison, 2004 in Pennington, 2019).With the help of the present materials, teachers should focus on the discursive function with the intonation, rhythm of the pronunciation point first. Then the isolated sounds can be practiced and introduced. In addition, how macro prosodic features influence the articulation of individual sounds in contexts should be focused by comparison. Along with the materials provided in coursebook materials, the use of phonetics charts, videos and visuals regarding the forms of articulation and modeling the desired utterance can be used as micro focused teaching of pronunciation.

b. Meaning-Focused to Form-Focused Instructions

As the name suggest, the affects pronunciation point has on the meaning in a context should be handled before the form. In other words, the communicative function of the pronunciation should be introduced before getting into instructional information on the form. The significance of form-focused instruction should not be underrated because of this order. Studies have shown that form-focused instruction in EPT is an effective way to teach segmental aspects of pronunciation as well as intelligibility and prosody. In another study led by Gordon, Darcy and Ewert in 2013 (in Pennington, 2019) explicit instructions on suprasegmentals showed significant improvement in comprehensibility. After focusing on the meaning and function of the pronunciation, form should be given explicitly with the use of various form focused instructions.

c. Implicit to Explicit

Consistent with top to bottom approach, implicit teaching should set a background and reinforcement for explicit pronunciation teaching. Most activities provided in course book materials are designed in a parallel structure. The form-focused listening and pronunciation instruction is given after exposing learners to extensive listening activities. Implicit pronunciation teaching exercises also include speaking activities along with extensive listening. Speaking exercises with the monitoring of the teacher using recasting, in other words reformulating erroneous utterance, can be given as an example. After the unfocused extensive listening/ speaking exercises, the practice can be divided into form-focused practices in which learners can engage in micro-listening practices, chain drills or listen and repeat exercises, which focus on explicit teaching and instructions.

Contextualizing

Teaching pronunciation in context is another important aspect that can empower EPT practices. Pronunciation teaching should take place as speakers produce and listeners comprehend an utterance regarding a meaningful context within which it occurs. Natural speech samples and authentic examples are essential to provide learners with real context samples. Not only the meaningful context but also other sub-features of pronunciation, such as prosody, rhythm, intonation and connected speech can be introduced with the use of natural speech samples.

Using Technology

The use of technology makes EPT much easier and versatile in language teaching environments. There are numerous different language teaching tools, devices, and applications to be used in pronunciation teaching.

Most coursebooks used in preparatory programs in Turkey now have online platforms with various exercises regarding speaking and pronunciation skills. Pronunciation can be focused more by promoting and reinforcing pronunciation practice with the use of these online platform exercises rather than skipping them.

The internet is a great source of pronunciation activities and exercises since it provides a wide range of extensive listening materials with authentic materials

and natural speech samples. There are several structured exercises regarding Tv series, cartoons, movie fragments and so on. There are several websites such as busyteacher.org, on which teachers can find listening and speaking exercises related to a Tv show or a movie. In addition, TED Talks and videos available on YouTube are great sources to provide extensive, authentic materials for listening and pronunciation. Along with the extensive listening materials, form-focused instructions and micro focused listening materials are also available on the internet. Animated forms of articulatory motions, visuals that provide support to pronunciation teaching and listening and repeating exercises are abundant and easy to access not only in classroom/school environments but everywhere thanks to the internet.

As examples of audio materials, introducing pronunciation exercises using songs are also proven to be effective in reinforcing and improving pronunciation (Millington,2011; Supeno,2018). Songs can be used in introducing connected speech, as well as individual sounds with various exercises. They could also provide a motivation in learning environment. Even if not in the class, the positive effects of singing song on pronunciation should be imposed on learners to achieve fluency and to improve pronunciation.

Thanks to the advanced technology, keeping oral dialogue journals (Celce-Murcia et al., 1996:312) are much easier since sound recording is possible via mobile devices. There are some tutors who have taken the next step of these journals by using chat applications to record the voice and questions and expect the learner to record the answer, which creates more practicing opportunity.

Many other pronunciation practices can be added, but the important point is how effectively these activities are used in EPT rather than the quantity and versatility of them. One important aspect discussed in the literature review of this study is that teachers tend to sacrifice pronunciation in the name of saving time for the other skills. It could be suggested that pronunciation practice assignments can take place outside the classroom by promoting and valuing the practices and creating a sense of importance attached to the skill.

5.6 Conclusion

As stated by some participants of this study in the semi-structured interviews, it would be wise to remember that learners should not be forced to have a native-like accent. Studies show that learners perceive having a native like accent desirable (Çakır & Baytar,2014; Fraser,1999; Thompson & Gaddet,2015). However, it should also be considered that one of the new trends of EPT is the intelligibility and communicative effectiveness as goals rather than correctness or accuracy (Pennington & Rogerson-Revell,2019). In addition, Fraser (1999) states “...it is true that learners are very unlikely to attain a native-like accent, but their intelligibility can be greatly improved by effective pronunciation teaching.” (1). Thus, teaching EPT should not be underestimated, neither should having a native-like accent be considered as the ultimate goal. The purpose should be providing learners EPT and help them become intelligible and effective in communication.

It is important to note that the suggestion given for an INSET on EPT above is based on the result of this study, and intended to be kept broad to set a model for the most commonly ignored aspects of developing an INSET. The suggestion can be adapted and specified based on a detailed needs analysis gathered in the institutions INSET can be held for.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction

This study investigated the views of TEFLTs on EPT and their perspectives of their pronunciation. In addition, based on the literature reviewed and semi-structured interview analyses, an INSET suggestion on EPT was given in the study. This chapter will present the findings of the data analyses in comparison with the literature as well as the implications of the study. Limitations and suggestions for further research will also be presented in this chapter.

6.2 Findings and Discussions

In this study both quantitative and qualitative data was gathered to seek answers to the research questions. The quantitative data was gathered via a questionnaire which had 21 items regarding teachers' views on pronunciation teaching practices (PS) and their self-perspectives. The scale items were compared with the variables of age, years of experience, whether TELFT took phonology classes, their degree of education and time spent in countries whose native language is English. The qualitative data was gathered via semi-structured interview to provide a follow-up data for teachers' views on EPT and investigated the EPT practices they use in their classes. The interview also aimed to find out the EPT areas TEFLTs require further training and education on.

The questionnaire used in this study aimed to gather information on the views of TEFLT on EPT practices as well as their self-perceptions regarding pronunciation. SPSS analyses showed that participants in the study had a rather positive attitude concerning the pronunciation teaching practices with $M= 2,7$ on PS scale. In addition to the test results, the analyses of semi-structured interviews also supported this positive tendency towards EPT with 6/10 participants reporting that they thought pronunciation teaching is important.

These results revealed that most of the participants in the study did not neglect pronunciation teaching and applied certain EPT practices in their classes in contrast with the previous studies (Demirezen, 2009; Demircioğlu, 2013; Saka, 2015; Fraser, 2000; Kelly, 1969) even though the contrast was not too much. The results of the quantitative data analysis on SS scale also indicated that the participants feel comfortable with their pronunciation and open to improvement. 76.9% of the participants stated that they considered themselves a good role model for pronunciation in their classes, which shows that they have confidence in terms of their own pronunciation. The results also indicated that more than half of the participants are open to improvement and education on pronunciation: 58.4 % agreeing that they needed to read more about phonological characteristics of individual sounds, and 56.4% agreeing that they needed to learn more on stress, rhythm, and intonation in English. In addition, all participants stated that they were aware of the specific difficulties Turkish speakers have with some English sounds.

The results of the quantitative data showed statistically significant difference between teachers EPT practices, perspectives on pronunciation and their years of experience, age and whether they took phonology education., There were also significant differences between SS (self-perspective scale) and their years of experience and age.

The data analyses and test results in Chapter IV revealed a significant difference between the EPT practices and whether they had taken phonology lessons. The results of Independent Samples T-Test indicated a significant difference regarding the PS scale with $p=.01<.05$. The results yielded a medium effect size with $d=.46$. This result shows that taking phonology classes, in other words, learning about pronunciation and EPT in their education had a positive influence on teachers' EPT practices. These results could also be used to support the claim that lack of education is one reason why EPT is neglected. Gilbert (2008) states that lack of time in pronunciation classes is one reason why pronunciation teaching is ignored or paid less attention to. This issue of having little or no focus on pronunciation was also focus of some other studies which supported Gilbert's (Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2016; Henderson et al., 2012; Foote et al., 2010). In this sense, it could be stated that taking phonology classes

and education on pronunciation have a positive effect on teachers' EPT practices. In terms of self-perspectives, however, taking phonology classes showed no statistically significant difference with $p=.488>.05$. This means that taking phonology classes did not influence teachers' views on their own pronunciation and their confidence. However, those with "10+ years" of experience had the lowest mean ($M=2,603$), which could be interpreted as giving less importance to EPT than the group with "3-5 years" of experience. The post hoc test results also showed a significant difference between the same age groups, as well.

TEFLTs' years of experience also showed significant difference between their views of EPT practices and their self-perceptions on pronunciation. (PS $p=.011<.05$, SS $p=.02<.05$). These results showed that the experience of the participants affected their pronunciation teaching practices as well as their self-perceptions of EPT. Considering the descriptive results, participants with "3-5 years" of experience had the highest mean score with $M=2,937$, showing that they concern the most in terms of pronunciation teaching practices. The results indicated a very small effect size with $F(3,152) = 3.862$ and $d=.07$. The post hoc test results indicated a significant difference between participant groups with 3-5 years of experience and 10+ years of experience (See APENDIX 4). As mentioned above, there was also a significant difference between TEFLTs' years of experience and their self-perspectives on pronunciation. The test results indicated a very small effect size of years of experience on SS with $F(3,152) = 3.393$ and $d=.063$. The relation between these age groups were the opposite in terms of their self-perspectives on pronunciation. The group with "10+ years" of experience had a higher mean score with $M=2,7010$ than those with "3-5 years" of experience $M=2,3438$. This shows that the group with 10+ years of experience agreed more on the items stating that they need to learn more about some aspects on pronunciation as well as believing that they presented good models in their classes.

When compared to other variables of the participants degree of education and the amount of time they spent abroad, PS and SS scale means showed no statistically significant difference. Thus, it could be concluded that the degree of their education had no influence on teachers' views on pronunciation teaching

practice and their perspectives on their pronunciation competence. The majority of the participants showed a positive attitude towards pronunciation teaching regardless of their educational background. In this sense, the results of the study were in parallel with those of the study carried out by Sarıkaya (2013). The results indicate that the perceptions of teachers regarding EPT and their own pronunciation do not change in time according to the further education they receive such as a post-graduate degree. The amount of time participants spent in countries whose native language is English also had no significant difference on PS and SS. However, despite these test results, statistics gathered on SS items showed that 61.5% of the participants in this study agreed that their pronunciation would be better if they spent time abroad.

The analyses of semi-structured interviews also revealed some important aspects regarding the EPT practices of TELFT and their needs related to EPT. The first interview question served as a follow up analysis of the perspectives of TEFLTs on EPT. The question asked what their perspectives on EPT were. The results showed that most participants valued pronunciation teaching and gave importance to it. The perceptions of TEFLT on EPT based on these responses showed contrast with previous studies, which stated that EPT had been neglected (Demirezen, 2009; Demircioğlu, 2013; Saka, 2015; Fraser, 2000; Kelly, 1969). The results also consolidated the quantitative data indicating a positive tendency among participant towards EPT practices.

The second interview question aimed to investigate the EPT practices TEFLTs use in their classes. The analyses of the second interview question indicated that focusing on problematic sounds of English for TEFLTs and repetition were the two major EPT practices TEFLTs use in their classes with $f=9$ and $f=7$, respectively. This could be interpreted as focusing on the errors of individual sounds and asking students to repeat in order to correct their pronunciation were the most commonly used practices. In this respect, the results showed similarity with the study reporting that explanations on pronunciation are merely through error-correction in foreign language classrooms (Tejeda & Santos, 2014). The use of repetition was also seen in other studies as the major practice in EPT instructions (Geylanioglu & Dikilitaş, 2016). Most participants reported that they use the exercises provided in the main course books ($f=7$) and three of the

participants in this group stated that they do not use any specific teaching practice apart from the ones provided by the books. This could also mean that they do not have any other EPT strategy than the course books provide. In this respect, the results show similarity with Kelly's statement claiming that rather than having a strategically planned teaching practice, in most cases pronunciation teaching is merely a reaction to a particular problem which occurs in classroom environment (2001).

More than half of the participants considered EPT to be more important with A1-A2 (CEFR) level students with $f=6$, and three participants reported that the role of the teacher decreased as the level of the learners increased. This shows that TEFLTs are more careful about EPT when they teach at beginner or elementary levels.

Half of the participants ($N=5$) stated that they make use of minimal pairs in their classes. Three of the participants reported that they used integrated exercises, including extended listening, speaking and roleplaying activities. The rest of the EPT practices were the use of IPA ($f=3$), focusing on the place of articulation ($f=2$) and drilling ($f=1$). Considering the type of the practices applied in classes, it could be argued that most teachers focus on the segmental features by practicing individual and problematic sounds. The views of the participants on EPT also support this with only four participants mentioning that stress, intonation, and rhythm is important. It can be inferred that suprasegmental features are not practiced and focused on as much as segmental features by TEFLTs in this study.

The third interview question revealed the views and needs of the participants in terms of improving their pronunciation and EPT practices. The question asked whether participants thought they needed to improve themselves on EPT, and if so, what they needed specifically. All participants reported that they needed to improve their EPT practices ($f=11$) and three of them stated that they need to focus on their own pronunciation education, as well. Lack of EPT education was the most common code derived from the interviews regarding the needs with $f=10$. Participants clearly stated that they used their own methods or, as Kelly (2001) stated, they teach as a reaction to a particular pronunciation problem that occurs in class. This indicates that the participants had no planned technique nor

did they use a specific methodology. Three of the participants also reported that learning and improving themselves on IPA could have positive effects on their EPT practices since they would like to make use of IPA more in their classes. In addition, one of the participants stated that how to give feedbacks was also a concern that could be improved with further education. The responses to the third question clearly showed that TEFLT in this study are open to improvements in terms of EPT and they are willing to improve their own pronunciation, as well. This also supports the quantitative data gathered in this study, which show that SS has a positive tendency.

The third question also revealed some of the main themes and focuses of EPT on which TEFLTs need further education and training. In this respect, the study showed that TEFLTs lacked information on EPT strategies, methodologies, and techniques. Thus, it can be concluded that an INSET program on EPT would be very beneficial for TEFLTs. Contrary to the results of several studies conducted in Turkey (Koç, 2015; Tuncel & Çobanoğlu, 2018; Hoş & Topal, 2013), the participants of this study clearly stated that they need some training or further education on the issue. This positive attitude towards INSET supports Richards and Farrel (2015) stating that further training or education can be required in order to avoid getting outdated. In addition, these results provided basis for an INSET by revealing a fundamental factor in the design of INSET: Needs analysis which again is considered one of the most important aspects while designing an INSET (Hayes1995; Koç, 2016; Çimer et al., 2010).

6.3 Implications of the Study

The analysis of data and findings of the study suggest some pedagogical implications. The data analysis showed that TEFLTs attached importance to EPT contrary to several previous study results (Brown & Yule, 1983; Kelly, 1969; Demirezen, 2009; Demircioğlu,2013; Saka, 2015; Fraser, 2000). Another important finding is that TEFLTs are open to improvement on EPT and they felt comfortable about their pronunciation teaching in classes.

Another implication that might emerge from this study is that institutions could provide extra training and education on EPT to TEFLT to improve their pronunciation teaching skills and knowledge, and even their own pronunciation.

All the TEFLTs participated in the interviews agreed that they needed to improve themselves regarding EPT. The results also showed that those who had taken phonology classes had positive perspectives on EPT. Lack of education is one of the reasons why pronunciation is neglected in classes (Gilbert, 2008). Thus, providing INSET programs for the teachers could lead to better EPT practices in classes.

The study also revealed the focuses on TEFLTs regarding their EPT practices. Segmental features were the focus of their EPT practices. The current EPT trend includes a combination of segmental and suprasegmental features, along with the opposite approaches blended together (Celce-Murcia et al., 1996; Pennington, 2019) Thus, curriculum designers and administrators of foreign language programs and English preparatory programs may consider refining the balance between segmental and suprasegmental features. In addition, as stated in the data analysis part, most TEFLTs in this study stated that they merely use the EPT practices provided in the coursebooks. Including some extra practices and materials for EPT may also be considered while designing the curriculum and syllabi

6.4 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

The aim of this study was to investigate the perspectives of TEFLTs on EPT, their EPT practices and how to design an INSET on EPT considering the needs of the TEFLTs. 156 TEFLTs participated in the study. The number of the participants was limited. Including more participants could have explained the results more clearly.

The study took place in some foundation universities in İstanbul. If it had been possible to carry out the study including the English preparatory programs or language schools of all universities in Turkey, more inclusive and clear results could have been yielded.

In addition, although the qualitative data was used to support quantitative, some follow-up interview sessions with different samples from the questionnaire could have been held to shed light on the findings.

The needs analysis on this study was based on the responses of TEFLTs participated in the interviews. However, it could have provided better results if a questionnaire were developed to address more aspects of the needs regarding EPT and to reach more TEFLTs.

Finally, regarding the EPT practices TEFLTs use in classes, classroom observations could have depicted a much clearer picture of which EPT practices they use and how efficiently they handle the practices in real classroom environment.

6.5 Conclusion

The aim of this study was to shed light onto the perspectives of TEFLTs on EPT and their self-perspectives on their pronunciation. The results showed that as opposed to the popular belief, TEFLTs attach importance to pronunciation teaching practices as well as their pronunciation. Having education on EPT showed positive results on TEFLTs EPT practices. The study revealed also that TEFLTs are open to learn more on EPT and improve their pronunciation skills.

This study also attempted to suggest an INSET on EPT based on TEFLTs' needs. Although teachers think that INSETs are important, they do not feel satisfied with INSET programs in general (Koç, 2015; Tuncel & Çobanoğlu, 2018; Hoş & Topal, 2013). Thus, INSET programs should be designed carefully taking the real needs and views of the participants into consideration.

REFERENCES

- Ahmadi, M. R. & Gilakjani, A.P.** (2011). Why is pronunciation so difficult to learn?. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 74-83.
- Aktuğ, B** (2015). *Common pronunciation errors of seventh grade EFL learners: a case from Turkey (Master's Thesis)* Retrieved from: <http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12618738/index.pdf>
- Akinci, E. Ü.** (2015). *Comparison of Students' and Academicians' Perceptions on English Pronunciation Learning at Tertiary Level (Master's Thesis)* Retrieved from: <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Akyol, Tugce.** (2013). A Study on Identifying Pronunciation Learning Strategies of Turkish EFL Learners. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 70. 1456-1462. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.211.
- Altun, A.& Gök, B.** (2010). Determining in-service training programs' characteristics given to teachers by conjoint analysis *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences Volume 2, Issue 2, 2010, 1709-1714* doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.970
- Arikan, A. & Yılmaz, a.** (2019). Pre-Service English Language Teachers' Problematic Sounds. *International e-Journal of Educational Studies*. 4. 1-26. 10.31458/iejes.594715.
- Arslan, S., Mirici, İ, Öz, H .** (2019). In-Service Training Needs of Efl Teachers in Non-Formal Education Settings. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, (42), 223-244 . DOI: 10.21497/sefad.675203
- Ayas, A.P., A. Akdeniz, S. Çepni, A. Baki, A. Çimer, and S. Odabası-Çimer.** 2007. *Hizmet İçi*
- E[gbreve] itimin Etkilili[gbreve] i Temel Araştırması** [Baseline research on inservice training]. (BEP2/04-CQ) Sonuç Raporu, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Projeler Koordinasyon Merkez Başkanlığı Temel Eğitim Projesi.
- Bekleyen, N.** (2011). Pronunciation Problems of the Turkish EFL Learners. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 10 (36) 94-107
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., & Goodwin, J. M.** (1996). *Teaching Pronunciation: A Reference for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chela-Flores, B.** (1997). Rhythmic patterns as basic units in pronunciation teaching. *ONOMAZEIN2*: 111-134.
- Coşkun, A.** (2011). Future English teachers' attitudes towards EIL pronunciation. *Journal of English as an International Language*, Vol. 6, Issue 2, 2011
- Çakır, İ, Baytar, B.** (2014). Foreign language learners' views on the importance of learning the target language pronunciation . *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* , 10 (1) , 99-110 . Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jlls/issue/9938/122951>

- Çelik, M.** (2008) A Description of Turkish-English Phonology for Teaching English in Turkey. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*. 4(1):159-174
- Celik, Servet & Çepni, Sevcan & İlyas Karataş, Handan.** (2013). The Need for Ongoing Professional Development: Perspectives of Turkish University-Level EFL Instructors. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 70. 2013. 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.264.
- Çimer, S. O., Çakır, İ., & Çimer, A.** (2010). Teachers' views on the effectiveness of in-service courses on the new curriculum in Turkey. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(1), 31-41.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J.** (Eds.). (2005). Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Demirel, P, Budak, Y.** (2003). Öğretmenlerin Hizmetiçi Eğitim İhtiyacı. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 33 (33) , 62-81 . Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/kuey/issue/10364/126866>
- Demirezen, M.** (2010). The causes of the schwa phoneme as a fossilized pronunciation problem for Turks. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.237 1567-1571
- Demirezen, M. & Topal, I.** (2015). Fossilized Pronunciation Errors from the Perspectives of Turkish Teachers of English and their Implications. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 199. 793-800. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.613.
- Demircioğlu, M.D.** (2013). The pronunciation problems for Turkish learners in articulating of the diphthongs in English Learning. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 106 doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.344, 2983-2992
- Dörnyei, Z.** (2011). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Erten, Ismail Hakkı & Dikilitaş, Kenan.** (2017). Facilitating In-Service Teacher Training for Professional Development.
- Euler, S. Approaches to pronunciation teaching: History and recent developments In Szpyra, J., Guz,E., Steinbrich, P.& Swiecinski, R.(eds.)** (2014). *Recent developments in applied phonetics*. Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Foote, A. J. et al.** (2010). Survey of the Teaching of Pronunciation in Adult ESL Programs in Canada, 2010. *Test Canada Journal/ Revue Test Du Canada* 29.
- Fraser, H.** (2000) Coordinating improvements in pronunciation teaching for adult learners of English as a second language. Canberra: Department of Education Training and Youth Affairs.
- Fraser, H.** (1999) *ESL Pronunciation Teaching: Could it be more effective?* ALAA Conference, 1999
- Freeman, D.** (2001). Second language teacher education. In R. Carter & D. Nunan, (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 72-79.
- Fullan, M.G.** 1991. *The new meaning of educational change*. New York, NY: TeachersCollege Press.

- Gilakjani A. P. & Sabouri N. B.** (2016) Why is English Pronunciation Ignored by EFL Teachers in Their Classes? *International Journal of English Linguistics* 6, 195-208 doi:10.5539/ijel.v6n6p195
- Gilbert, J. B.** (2008). Teaching Pronunciation Using the Prosody Pyramid. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Guest, G., Bunce, A. and Johnson, L.** (2006) How Many Interviews Are Enough? An Experiment with Data Saturation and Variability. *Field Methods*, 18, 59-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279903>
- Hayes, D.** (1995) In-service Teacher Development: Some Basic Principles. *ELT Journal-July 1995* doi: 10.1093/elt/49.3.252
- Henderson, A. & Frost, D. et al.**(2012). The English Pronunciation Teaching in Europe Survey: Selected Results. *Research in Language*. 10.1. doi: 10.2478/v10015-011-0047-4
- Hermans, Frans & Sloep, Peter & Kreijns, Karel.** (2017). Teacher professional development in the contexts of teaching English pronunciation. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*. 14. 10.1186/s41239-017-0059-9.
- Hismanoglu, M., & Hismanoglu, S.** (2010). Language teachers' preferences of pronunciation teaching techniques: Traditional or modern. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 983-989.
- Hos, Rabia & Topal, Hatice.** (2013). The Current Status of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Teachers' Professional Development in Turkey: A Systematic Review of Literature. *Anthropologist*. 16. 293-305. 10.1080/09720073.2013.11891357.
- Kafes, Hüseyin.** (2018). A Study on Pronunciation Anxiety of Pre-service ELT teachers. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi Ekim 2018 22(Özel Sayı): 1813-1827* 22. 1813-1827.
- Kelly, L. G.** (1969) *25 centuries of language teaching: An inquiry into the science, art, and development of language teaching methodology, 500 B.C.-1969*, Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Kelly, G.** (2001) *How to Teach Pronunciation*. Longman
- Koç, E. M.** (2016). A general investigation of the in-service training of English language teachers at elementary schools in Turkey. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 8(3), 455-466.
- Lamb, M.** (1995). The Consequences of INSET. *ELT Journal Volume 49* 11 January 1995 Oxford University Press 1995
- Meyers, L. S., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. J.** (2006). *Applied multivariate research: Design and interpretation*. London: Sage Publications.
- Millington, T.N.** (2011). Using Songs Effectively to Teach English to Young Learners. *Language Education in Asia*, Volume 2, Issue 1, 2011 (pp.134-140). Retrieved from http://www.leia.org/LEiA/LEiA%20VOLUMES/Download/LEiA_V2_I1_2011/LEiA_V2I1A11_Millington.pdf
- Murphy, J. M. & Baker, A. A.** (2015). History of ESL pronunciation teaching. In M. Reed & J. M. Levis (Eds.), *The Handbook of English Pronunciation* (pp. 36-65). United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell
- O'Connor, J. D., and G. Arnold** (21 973) *Intonation of colloquial English*. London: Longman.
- Pallant, J.** (2010). *SPSS Survival Manual 4th Edition*. Open University Press

- Pennington, M. C. & Rogerson-Revel, P.** (2019) *English Pronunciation and Research Contemporary Perspective*. Macmillan
- Richards, J. C. (Ed.) & Renandya, W. A. (Ed.)** (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Farrells, T. C.** (2005). *Professional Development for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S.** (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (3rd ed.) Cambridge University Press.
- Sarıkaya, N. Y.** (2013). *Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers' Self Perceptions Of Their Pronunciation And Pronunciation Teaching Practices (Master's Thesis)*. Retrieved from: <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Steve Hirschhorn** (2017). *The Recent History of Pronunciation Teaching In English Language Teaching*. Retrieved from: <https://www.eflmagazine.com/the-recent-history-of-pronunciation-teaching-in-english-language-teaching-adapted-from-a-2004-lecture/>
- Şentuna, E.** (2002). *The Interests of EFL Instructors in Turkey Regarding INSET Content (MA Dissertation)* Retrieved from: <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Supeno, B.** (2018). Using songs to improve students' pronunciation. *Proceeding of the 65th TEFLIN International Conference, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia 12-14 July 2018, Vol. 65. No. 1*. Retrieved from <https://ojs.unm.ac.id/teflin65/article/viewFile/6292/3631#:~:text=A%20teacher%20can%20focus%20learners,the%20words%20according%20to%20sounds.>
- Tejeda, C. A. & Santos, N. B.** (2014). Pronunciation Instruction and Students' Practice to Develop Their Confidence in EFL Oral Skills. *Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Facultad de Ciencias Humanas, Departamento de Lenguas Extranjeras* 16. (151-170)
- Thomas, D.** (2006) A General Inductive Approach for Analyzing Qualitative Evaluation Data. *American Journal of Evaluation, Vol. 27 No. 2, June 2006* (237-246)
- Thompson, T & Gaddes, M.** (2005). The importance of teaching pronunciation to adult learners. *Aian EFL Journal*. Retrieved from https://asian-efl-journal.com/pta_Feb_04_TTMG.pdf.
- Tuncel, Z. A. & Çobanoğlu, F.** (2018). In-Service Teacher Training: Problems of Teachers as Learners. *International Journal of Instruction, October-2018*. doi: 10.12973/iji.2018.11411a
- Ülkersoy, N.** (2007). *Markedness Differential Hypothesis and the Phonological Errors of Turkish EFL Learners (Doctoral Dissertation)* Retrieved from: <http://library.cu.edu.tr/tezler/6352.pdf>
- Wallace, M. J.** (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yağız, O.** (2018). EFL Language Teachers' Cognitions and Observed Classroom Practices about L2 Pronunciation: The Context of Turkey. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language) 2018, 12(2), 187-204*

- Yavuz, F. & Keser, K.** (2019). Perceptions of candidate teachers about teaching pronunciation in English language teaching classes. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*. 11(3), 110-117. <https://doi.org/10.18844/ijlt.v11i3.4298>
- Yılmaz, S.** (2019). *Learners' Perceptions of Their English Pronunciation Anxiety at Tertiary Level (MA Dissertation)* Retrieved from: <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>

APPENDIX

APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE AND INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Part I: Demographic Information

1. Gender:
2. Age
3. Education
4. The total amount of time you spent in the countries whose native language is English
5. Number of years in teaching EFL
6. I took phonetics/phonology classes as part of my teacher education program. (yes/no)

Part II: PS and SS Items

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

No	PRONUNCIATION PRACTICE SCALE ITEMS	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
1	Teaching pronunciation is an essential part of teaching English.	0	1	2	3	4
2	I spend time on improving the pronunciation of specific English sounds that Turkish students have difficulty with.	0	1	2	3	4
3	Pronunciation should be taught as a separate class.	0	1	2	3	4
4	I spend time on teaching how to pronounce individual sounds in my classes.	0	1	2	3	4
5	I spend time on teaching stress /rhythm and intonation in my classes.	0	1	2	3	4

6	I check the pronunciation of unknown words in a dictionary before going to the classroom.	0	1	2	3	4
7	Pronunciation is important for students.	0	1	2	3	4
8	I make sure that my students know about the difference between Turkish and English sound systems.	0	1	2	3	4
9	Knowledge of the phonetic alphabet helps students become independent learners.	0	1	2	3	4
10	The amount of time I spend on pronunciation teaching depends on the level of the students.	0	1	2	3	4
11	I enjoy teaching pronunciation in my classes.	0	1	2	3	4
12	Pronunciation should be taught as part of a class on speaking.	0	1	2	3	4
13	Pronunciation should be taught as part of a class on listening.	0	1	2	3	4
14	Pronunciation should be taught as part of a class on reading.	0	1	2	3	4
15	Pronunciation should be taught as part of a class on writing.	0	1	2	3	4
No	SELF PERCEPTION ITEMS					
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
1	I need to read more about the phonological characteristics of individual English sounds.	0	1	2	3	4
2	I see myself as a good role model for pronunciation in my classes.	0	1	2	3	4
3	I need to learn more about stress/rhythm/intonation in English.	0	1	2	3	4
4	My pronunciation would be better if I spent time abroad.	0	1	2	3	4
5	I need to work on improving my pronunciation of individual English sounds	0	1	2	3	4
6	I am aware of specific difficulties Turkish speakers have with individual English sounds and clusters of sounds.	0	1	2	3	4

Interview Questions:

1. What is your perspective of pronunciation teaching?
2. What kinds of pronunciation teaching practices do you use in your classes?
3. Do you think that you need to improve yourself in EPT? If yes, in which ways?

APPENDIX 2: NORMALITY TEST RESULTS

The number of groups in the study were greater than 50. Thus, Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was used to understand whether the distribution is normal. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that both the group's data were not normally distributed at the significance level of .05 with $p=.001$ for PS and $p=.000$ for SS scales. However, the normality assumption can be tolerated when sample size per group is larger than 20 and skewness, kurtosis values are between +1.5 and -1.5 (Tabachnick & Fidell,2013; Pallant, 2010). The data was supported with the semi structured interviews as well. In case of a non-normal distribution, one suggestion given by Pallant (2010) is that still parametric techniques can be used in hope “that this does not invalidate the findings...most of the approaches are fairly ‘robust’; that is, they will tolerate minor violations of assumptions.” (p.111)

Table PS and SS Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normality Test Results

Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnova			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
PS	0,116	156	0	0,967	156	0,001
SS	0,182	156	0	0,952	156	0

Table PS and SS Normality Test Descriptives: Skewness and Kurtosis Values

PS and SS Descriptives				
			Statistic	Std. Error
			PS	Skewness
	Kurtosis		.969	.386
SS	Skewness		-.464	.194
	Kurtosis		-.437	.386

Table Demographic Information Items Normality Test Descriptives: Skewness and Kurtosis Values

Descriptives		Statistic	Std. Error
Age	Skewness	.807	.194
	Kurtosis	.810	.386
Education	Skewness	.163	.194
	Kurtosis	-.527	.386
Time spent abroad	Skewness	.723	.194
	Kurtosis	-.761	.386
Experience	Skewness	-.672	.194
	Kurtosis	-.645	.386
Taking phonology classes	Skewness	-.841	.194
	Kurtosis	-1.309	.386

APPENDIX 3: Item Reliability Statistics

Table Questionnaire Items Reliability Statistics. Cronbach Alpha Value

Questionnaire Items Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.771	.779	21

APPENDIX 4: Age Group and Years of Experience Post-Hoc and Univariate Analysis Of Variance Test Results

Table PS and Age Group Tamhane's Test Results

Multiple Comparisons					
Dependent Variable: PS					
	(I) age	(J) age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Tamhane	21-25	26-30	.27071	.19131	.996
		31-35	.27310	.18349	.993
		36-40	.38222	.18786	.830
		41-45	.46889	.21827	.722
		46-50	.52222	.26014	.831
	26-30	21-25	-.27071	.19131	.996
		31-35	.00239	.08906	1.000
		36-40	.11152	.09775	1.000
		41-45	.19818	.14800	.998
		46-50	.25152	.20479	1.000
	31-35	21-25	-.27310	.18349	.993
		26-30	-.00239	.08906	1.000
		36-40	.10912	.08140	.997
		41-45	.19579	.13775	.996
		46-50	.24912	.19751	1.000
	36-40	21-25	-.38222	.18786	.830
		26-30	-.11152	.09775	1.000
		31-35	-.10912	.08140	.997
		41-45	.08667	.14352	1.000
		46-50	.14000	.20157	1.000
	41-45	21-25	-.46889	.21827	.722
		26-30	-.19818	.14800	.998
		31-35	-.19579	.13775	.996
		36-40	-.08667	.14352	1.000
		46-50	.05333	.23018	1.000

	50				
46-50	21-25	-.52222		.26014	.831
	26-30	-.25152		.20479	1.000
	31-35	-.24912		.19751	1.000
	36-40	-.14000		.20157	1.000
	41-45	-.05333		.23018	1.000

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table PS and Age Group Univariate Analysis of Variance Test Results

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Dependent Variable: PS						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	8.399 ^a	7	1.200	6.372	.000	.232
Intercept	272.711	1	272.711	1448.376	.000	.907
Age	8.399	7	1.200	6.372	.000	.232
Error	27.866	148	.188			
Total	1188.676	156				
Corrected Total	36.265	155				

a. R Squared = .232 (Adjusted R Squared = .195)

Table SS and Age Group Tamhane's Test Results

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: SS						
	(I) age	(J) age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	
Tamhane	21-25	26-30	-.05808	.21724	1.000	
		31-35	-.42690	.21457	.852	
		36-40	-.26944	.21146	.999	
		41-45	-.01111	.25604	1.000	
		46-50	-.48611	.28030	.949	
		26-30	21-25	.05808	.21724	1.000
			31-35	-.36882*	.11397	.048
	36-40		-.21136	.10799	.788	
	41-45		.04697	.18028	1.000	

	46-50	-.42803	.21334	.881
31-35	21-25	.42690	.21457	.852
	26-30	.36882*	.11397	.048
	36-40	.15746	.10252	.979
	41-45	.41579	.17706	.628
	46-50	-.05921	.21062	1.000
36-40	21-25	.26944	.21146	.999
	26-30	.21136	.10799	.788
	31-35	-.15746	.10252	.979
	41-45	.25833	.17328	.993
	46-50	-.21667	.20745	1.000
41-45	21-25	.01111	.25604	1.000
	26-30	-.04697	.18028	1.000
	31-35	-.41579	.17706	.628
	36-40	-.25833	.17328	.993
	46-50	-.47500	.25273	.905
46-50	21-25	.48611	.28030	.949
	26-30	.42803	.21334	.881
	31-35	.05921	.21062	1.000
	36-40	.21667	.20745	1.000
	41-45	.47500	.25273	.905

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table SS and Age Group Univariate Analysis of Variance Test Results

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	6.021 ^a	7	.860	3.298	.003	.135
Intercept	277.473	1	277.473	1063.891	.000	.878
Age	6.021	7	.860	3.298	.003	.135
Error	38.600	148	.261			
Total	1094.333	156				

Corrected Total	44.621	155
-----------------	--------	-----

a. R Squared = .232 (Adjusted R Squared = .195)

Table PS and Years of Experience Tukey's Test Results

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:	PS		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
	(I) exp	(J)exp			
Tukey HSD	0-2	3-5	-.31083	.17058	.267
		6-10	-.12696	.16428	.867
		10+	.02275	.15946	.999
	3-5	0-2	.31083	.17058	.267
		6-10	.18388	.10838	.329
		10+	.33358*	.10094	.006
	6-10	0-2	.12696	.16428	.867
		3-5	-.18388	.10838	.329
		10+	.14970	.08989	.346
	10+	0-2	-.02275	.15946	.999
		3-5	-.33358*	.10094	.006
		6-10	-.14970	.08989	.346

Table PS and Years of Experience Univariate Analysis of Variance Test Results

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	2.569 ^a	3	.856	3.862	.011	.071
Intercept	711.314	1	711.314	3208.605	.000	.955
experience	2.569	3	.856	3.862	.011	.071
Error	33.697	152	.222			
Total	1188.676	156				
Corrected Total	36.265	155				

a. R Squared = .071 (Adjusted R Squared = .052)

Table SS and Years of Experience Tukey's Test Results

Multiple Comparisons					
Dependent Variable:	SS		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
	(I) exp	(J)exp			
Tukey HSD	0-2	3-5	.28958	.19003	.426
		6-10	.03188	.18302	.998
		10+	-.06765	.17765	.981
	3-5	0-2	-.28958	.19003	.426
		6-10	-.25770	.12074	.147
		10+	-.35723*	.11245	.010
	6-10	0-2	-.03188	.18302	.998
		3-5	.25770	.12074	.147
		10+	-.09953	.10014	.753
	10+	0-2	.06765	.17765	.981
		3-5	.35723*	.11245	.010
		6-10	.09953	.10014	.753

Table SS and Years of Experience Univariate Analysis of Variance Test Results

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Dependent Variable:	PS					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	2.800 ^a	3	.933	3.393	.020	.063
Intercept	630.122	1	630.122	2290.214	.000	.938
experience	2.800	3	.933	3.393	.020	.063
Error	41.821	152	.275			
Total	1094.333	156				
Corrected Total	44.621	155				

a. R Squared = .071 (Adjusted R Squared = .052)

RESUME

Ad-Soyad : Selçuk BAYRAM

ÖĞRENİM DURUMU:

Lisans : Trakya Üniversitesi,Eğitim Fakültesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği

Yükseklisans : İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı

MESLEKİ DENEYİM:

Marmara Büyük Dersane, İngilizce Öğretmenliği, 2009-2010

İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi, Öğretim Görevlisi , 2011-2015

İstanbul Medipol Üniversitesi, Öğretim Görevlisi, 2015-

TEZDEN TÜRETİLEN YAYINLAR, SUNUMLAR VE PATENTLER

Bayram, S. (2021). An Exploration of the Views of Turkish EFL Instructors on Pronunciation Teaching. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 21(1), 275–280.

Retrieved from

<https://techniumscience.com/index.php/socialsciences/article/view/3596>