Journal of English as an International Language, Vol. 6, Issue 2, 2011

Future English teachers' attitudes towards EIL pronunciation

Abdullah Coskun

Abant Izzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey

English has become the world's international language, used for international communication mostly among non-native speakers of other languages and 80 percent of all the English teachers around the world are nonnative English-speaking (NNES) teachers (Canagarajah, 1999). Therefore, there is a growing need to investigate the EIL (English as an International Language) movement from non-native pre-service or in-service teachers' point of view. This study examined future English teachers' attitudes towards teaching pronunciation within an EIL perspective. Questionnaires and semi-structured interviews with senior students revealed that native-speaker English is regarded as the correct model in English language teaching (ELT). The implications of the findings on the propagation of native speaker norms as the teaching model and the status of ELF and its reflections on ELT in Turkey are discussed.

Keywords: EIL pronunciation, attitudes, teachers of English

Introduction

In recent years, English has gained a special position in the world as an international language used as a means of communication mostly between nonnative speakers outnumbering the native speakers. In today's world, English has become an international language between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common culture and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication (Seidlhofer, 2005). Crystal (1997) estimated the number of English speakers worldwide and claimed that there were 1,200-1,500 million people having reasonable competence of the English language, only 337 million of which were native speakers. Since 1997, the number of non-native English speakers has been increasing rapidly and the native speakers are currently a minority.

The ownership of the English language has also changed with the changing statistics of English speakers. Widdowson (1994), for example, claims that English no longer belongs to native-speakers, but to everyone who speaks it. Similar to Widdowson, Brumfit (2001) touches on the issue of who owns English with a focus on the statistical and sociolinguistic realities in the world:

> And for English, the current competent users of English number up to seven hundred million, living in every continent…of whom less than half are native speakers. Statistically, native speakers are in a minority for language use, and thus in practice for language change, for language maintenance, and for the ideologies and beliefs associated with the language -at least in so far as non-native speakers use the language for a wide range of public and personal needs. (p. 116)

It is obvious that the increasing numbers of non-native learners, the changing ownership of the English language and the growing needs of most learners who are likely to face mostly non-native speakers have made EIL researchers think about the reflections of EIL or ELF (English as a Lingua Franca, often used interchangeably with EIL) in the English classroom and challenge the traditional assumptions that ELT pedagogy should be informed by native speaker models. Alptekin (2002), for example, questions the so-called native speaker norms by claiming that the native speaker model is utopian, unrealistic and constraining in relation to EIL. Similarly, Seidlhofer (2005) criticizes the native speaker language by suggesting that the fine nuances of native speaker language are communicatively redundant or even counter-productive. Jenkins (2000) also argues that speakers do not need a near-native accent; instead, a way of speaking English reflecting the linguistic and cultural identities of non-native speakers of English should be adopted. Jenkins (2005a) also draws attention to the difference between English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and ELF by suggesting that speakers of EFL utilize English mainly to communicate with native-speakers of English generally in native-speaker contexts and their purpose in learning the language is to speak like a native-speaker. On the other hand, speakers of ELF use English primarily to communicate with other non-native speakers from various L1 backgrounds and in non-native speaker settings, there is no point for speakers in trying to speak like a native-speaker.

McKay (2002) points out that the teaching and learning of an international language like English must be different from the teaching and learning of any other second or foreign language. In this study, what McKay calls “different” will be dealt with by discussing the differences brought about by EIL researchers in four interconnected aspects of ELT: teaching culture, curriculum development, teacher education and teaching pronunciation.

The current study arises from Doğançay-Aktuna’s (1998) call for more research among the EFL countries of the expanding circle like Turkey about the variation in the role and status of English. Although a number of studies have been carried out on teachers’ attitudes towards ELF pronunciation and many non-native teachers have found to be strongly opposed to the idea of abandoning native-speaker pronunciation norms in various language learning contexts, there is

a need for such a study in the Turkish EFL setting. The study examined candidate English teachers' attitudes towards EIL pronunciation. After discussing the status of English in Turkey and effects of EIL on culture, curriculum development and teacher education, relevant literature about attitudes towards international English and EIL pronunciation will be reviewed.

EIL and Turkey

About the status of English in Turkey, Doğançay-Aktuna and Kızıltepe (2005) point out that Turkey belongs to the Expanding Circle, where English has no official status but is increasingly used as a language of wider communication with other Europeans and the rest of the world. According to Doğançay-Aktuna (1998), English carries two important functions, the first of which is the instrumental function that in general refers to job opportunities. In an attempt to investigate the attitudes and motivation of Turkish learners towards English, Kızıltepe (2000) found that the most important reason for learning English are instrumental purposes: finding work after graduation after university and using the internet. Moreover, only a moderate interest in the British and the American community and culture was found and having conversations with British and American people was regarded as unimportant by most of the Turkish learners in her study. On the interpersonal level, English is used in Turkey as the language for international business and tourism. Besides, it is the symbol of modernization and elitism to the educated middle classes and those in the upper strata of the socioeconomic ladder. To exemplify the interpersonal function, some of the participants in Kızıltepe's study believe that the knowledge of English will make them a better educated person (see Coşkun, 2010a for further discussion on the place of English in Turkey).

EIL and Culture

As far as teaching culture is concerned, Cortazzi and Jin (1999) list three types of cultural information to be included in course books or materials. The first one is the source culture like Turkish music and names, the second is the target culture materials such as American idols and British politeness, and the third one is the international target culture materials (e.g., typical Japanese wedding, German festivals and Italian food). Each of these cultural information has both its advantages and disadvantages. According to research, the source culture may be beneficial in some ways. Snow, Kamhi-Stein, & Brinton (2006) point out that the source culture enables students to talk about their own culture. Although Alptekin (2002) also admits that the source culture has some benefits in the EFL context, he draws attention to a very important fact that in the EIL context whose culture

becomes the world itself, international culture should be emphasized. Similarly, McKay (2003a) underlines the advantages of using international culture by giving examples of "a text in which bilingual users of English interact with other speakers of English in cross-cultural encounters for a variety of purposes" (p. 39):

1. Such texts could exemplify the manner in which bilingual users of English are effectively using English to communicate for international purposes.
2. They could include examples of lexical, grammatical and phonological variation in the present-day use of English.
3. They could also illustrate cross-cultural pragmatics in which bilingual users of English, while using English, nevertheless draw on their own rules of appropriateness.
4. They could then provide a basis for students to gain a fuller understanding of how English today serves a great variety of international purposes in a broad range of contexts.

Kramsch (1993) has a different approach to teaching EIL culture and her approach seems applicable to EFL contexts like Turkey as most of the English course books are still lacking the international culture and still includes the native-speaker cultural norms such as actors in Hollywood, the history of Coca-Cola and pumpkins in Halloween (Ilter & Güzeller, 2005). Kramsch coined the term establishing a "sphere of interculturality" which promotes the idea that learners consider his/her own culture in relation to another. To illustrate Kramsch's term with a classroom activity, a teacher might have to teach a unit titled "stereotypes" but the examples, pictures and activities are all about the stereotypes attached to the native-speaker culture like England and the USA. The teacher can promote reflective thinking to elicit more stereotypes about different countries including Turkey, the source culture.

.

EIL and Curriculum Development

In addition to teaching culture, the EIL movement offered some new perspectives to curriculum developers in ELT. For instance, Matsuda (2005) proposed an EIL curriculum in which students are exposed to English speakers from different backgrounds. Instructional materials that represent different varieties of World Englishes are integrated so that learners of English become aware of the role and the place of English in different geographical regions. McKay (2003a) also draws attention to EIL curriculum development by underlying three assumptions:

1. EIL curriculum development is recognition of the diverse ways in which bilingual speakers make use of English to fulfill their specific purposes

2. Many bilingual users of English do not need or want to acquire native-like competence.
3. English no longer belongs to any one culture and, hence there is a need to be culturally sensitive to the diversity of contexts in which English is taught and used.

If the ELT curriculum is designed within an EIL perspective in mind, it is unavoidable that the testing system should also change. Considering the assessment dimension of the ELT curriculum, it would be fair to suggest that the existing exams are not appropriate in a world where English is taught as a lingua franca. Taylor (2005) draws attention to the growing number of English varieties and the need for a change in the assessment aspect of the English language. They both support the idea that testers should take the changing status of English into account and prepare their tests accordingly. According to Ahvenainen (2005), there appears to be a contradiction even in the Common European Framework (2001) since it promotes *pluralingualism* that includes the idea that all levels of language competence should be accounted for, but it still emphasizes the so-called achievement of native-speaker competence when drawing up assessment criteria as in the following examples:

"…sustain relationships with *native speakers*" (level B2, p. 35, p. 74)

"Appreciates fully the sociolinguistic and sociocultural implications of language used by *native speakers* and can react accordingly" (level C2, p. 122)

"Can hold his/her own in formal discussion at no disadvantage to *native speakers*" (level C2, p. 78)

EIL and Teacher Education

Another important influence of EIL can be seen in teacher education. Sifakis (2007) addresses the important issue of teacher education considering the need for a change in the worldviews of English teachers through the teacher education programs. In order to meet this need, Sifakis developed a transformative model which includes five phases:

Phase 1: Preparation: Before the start of the actual training session, trainees are asked to respond to some questions concerning their own professional background, studies and interests.

Phase 2: Identifying the primary issues of ELF discourse.

Phase 3: Fostering trainees' informed awareness about ELF discourse.

Phase 4: ELF and pedagogy: As the sessions progress, the issues discussed will start to become more and more centralized on trainees' individual teaching situations and influences and choices that have formed their professional identity.

Phase 5: Formulating an ELF action plan: Once trainees are aware of all the major issues involved in ELF discourse and pedagogy and have grasped the implications for their own teaching context, they should be ready to put that knowledge into practice by designing, implementing and evaluating an ELF action plan.

Also, Snow et al. (2006) underline the importance of the following so as to restructure teacher education programs in line with the changing face of English:

1. Exposing teachers (learners) to varieties of English beyond the Inner Circle;
2. Helping to deconstruct the myth of the native speaker;
3. Integrating methodologies that are valued in the local context and reflecting students' actual needs and interests;
4. Fostering language development through increased target language exposure, consciousness-raising activities, and feedback;
5. Encouraging collaboration between local and outside experts; and
6. Instilling in participants the value of on-going reflective practice and lifelong learning endeavors.

Similarly, Sifakis and Sougari (2005) propose that teacher training in Expanding Circle settings should promote awareness of issues related to EIL, persuade teachers to study the varieties of English used and encourage reflection on issues of identity and ownership of English. Jenkins (2005a) also draws attention to the importance of teacher education by claiming that ELF practice starts with teacher education and the more teachers learn about ELF, the more likely they will implement it into their classrooms. Jenkins argues that teacher education could focus more on intercultural communication and less on what native-speakers do. From her point of view, teachers should be educated in such a way that they can enable their students to accomodate their lexico-grammar, pronunciation and pragmatics according to their ELF interlocutors who are non-native English speakers coming from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

EIL and Pronunciation

In the teaching of pronunciation, EIL research seems to agree on the idea that learners do not need to strive for standard pronunciation, nor for the values and behaviors of native speakers of English (Byram, 1997). Instead, intercultural communication should replace the native speaker model and the non-native speaker should replace the so-called native speakers. Alptekin (2002) suggests that teachers in EIL contexts should be successful bilinguals with intercultural insights, not necessarily native speakers. Similarly, Jenkins (2000) suggests that there is no justification for insisting on calling an item as an error if the vast majority of the English speakers in the world produce and understand an error.

Believing that there is not any monolithic variety of English and teaching English must be different from any other languages, Jenkins (2000), the creator of the ELF core, set priorities in teaching pronunciation by observing non-native learners of English from different language backgrounds in classroom conversations to analyze the causes of problems of comprehension in their use of English. Jenkins (2000) provides a set of phonological features which are important for intelligibility in communication between non-native speakers of English. Some of these forms are as follows:

1. All the consonants are important except for “th” sounds as in “thin” and “this”.
2. Consonant clusters are important at the beginning and in the middle of words. For example, the cluster in the word “string” cannot be simplified to “sting” or “tring” and remain intelligible.
3. The contrast between long and short vowels is important. For example, the difference between the vowel sounds in “sit” and “seat”.
4. Nuclear stress is also essential.

These “lingua franca core” aspects requiring pedagogic focus for production in ELF classes. On the other hand, Jenkins states that many other pronunciation items that do not seem to cause intelligibility problems in ELF interactions are regularly but unnecessarily taught in English pronunciation courses. These items can be summarized as follows:

1. Weak forms such as the words “to”, “of” and “from”
2. Word stress
3. Pitch movement
4. Stress timing

The implications of Jenkins' model for pronunciation teaching promote the idea that students should be given choice. When students are learning English so that they can use it in international contexts with other non-native speakers from different first languages, they should be given the choice of acquiring a pronunciation that is more relevant to EIL intelligibility than traditional pronunciation syllabuses offer. Besides, students should be given plenty of exposure in their pronunciation classrooms to other non-native accents of English so that they can understand them easily even if a speaker has not yet managed to acquire the core features. For EIL, this is much more important than having classroom exposure to native speaker accents.

If the core of ELF pronunciation is accepted as a valuable model by teachers of English, this can help teachers prepare their ELF syllabus and materials for listening, speaking and pronunciation courses. Also, teachers would become more careful about the course books they select for their courses. Modiano (1996) stresses that exercises in a course book should include frequent samples from non-native EFL speakers because learners in the expanding circle settings will mostly come across non-native speaker in the real world. Similarly, Widdowson (1998) points out that English course books cannot develop linguistically tolerant attitudes toward non-native localized varieties, or toward the speakers of varieties considered different from the standard ones as they are heavily native-speaker based. He also suggests that instructional materials and activities should have suitable discourse samples pertaining to native and non-native interactions as well as non-native and non-native interactions. Widdowson believes that discourse displaying only native speaker use is mainly irrelevant for many learners in terms of potential use in authentic settings.

EIL and Attitudes

As this study is related to attitudes towards English pronunciation as a lingua franca, a definition of the concept of "attitude" is needed to provide a theoretical background for the study. In general terms, attitude, which changes depending on age, gender, the effect of community and official institutions and mass media, is a hypothetical construct used to explain the direction and persistence of human behavior (Baker, 1992). Two approaches seem to be helpful to evaluate attitudes: the direct method and the indirect method. The direct methods of measuring language attitudes are questionnaires which can include open or closed question items or a combination of both and interviews that can be regarded as the oral equivalents of open-question questionnaires. The indirect method, on the other hand, infers language attitudes from evaluations of speakers of two or more language varieties. In the indirect method method, informants are confronted with a certain number of speakers of different accents and then asked to evaluate those

speakers according to certain given features such as the nationality, job, personality traits and the likeability of the speaker.

Attitudes towards varieties or speakers of English, among other languages, have been a concern of sociolinguists and social psychologists since the late 1950s and early 1960s. Earlier research concentrated on the attitudes held by native speakers. However, with the spread of English worldwide, the focus has shifted to attitudes held by users of English in the Expanding Circle. There is quite a lot of research carried out in the Expanding Circle both by means of direct or indirect method.

McKay (2003b) investigated attitudes of Chilean teachers of English towards EIL and found that the native-speaker pronunciation is perceived by Chileans as correct. When asked the drawbacks about native speakers, the teachers agreed on the idea that they are not familiar with the local context. Knollmayr (2004), whose questionnaire was adapted for the current study, aimed at revealing attitudes of Austrian candidate teachers of English to standard and non-standard English with a special focus on their preferences for native and non-native norms in pronunciation teaching. Attitudes of respondents were found inconsistent and most students reported an awareness of the something like EIL. However, a clear concept of what it actually constitutes does not exist. Thus, Knollmayr suggests that students should be made more familiar with the concept and the discussions in connection with it.

In an interview conducted by Jenkins (2005b), eight non-native teachers of English were asked about whether they like their own accent and how they would feel if their accent was mistaken for that of a native speaker of English. The participants perceived native accents as good, perfect, correct, proficient, competent, fluent, real, and original English while a non-native accent is not good, wrong, incorrect, not real, fake, deficient and strong.

Similarly, Timmis (2002) assessed attitudes of English students in 14 different countries towards native and non-native English. The study revealed that the learners preferred a native-speaker standard. Sifakis and Sougari (2005) investigated attitudes of Greek teachers towards EIL and found similar results. Dalton-Puffer and Kaltenböck (1995) studied how students evaluate particular native or non-native varieties in Austria. A list of twelve (mostly adjectival) attributes like educated, successful, rude were given and subjects were asked to indicate to what degree this attribute applied to the speaker. It was found that they give more credit to the native speaker accent and hold a negative attitude their own non-native accent.

Teufel (1995) investigated attitudes of Anglo-Australian high-school students towards German accented English by means of combining both direct and indirect

data-gathering methods. Presented with speech samples, the informants were required to comment upon their impressions of the speakers' voice by answering the open and closed questions on the questionnaire. Open questions (e.g., What do you think the speaker's native language is?) were used in order to determine how many informants would be able to identify the speaker's cultural and linguistic background. The majority of the informants were not be able to identify the German background of the accented speakers but treated them as non-standard speakers in general.

The study

Participants

The participants are 47 senior students at the English Language Teaching (ELT) department. The reason for selecting candidate English teachers is that they are the people who will need to experience a change of attitude towards EIL and, in turn, should be equipped with the means of changing their students' attitudes in the future as Jenkins (1998) suggests. The participants also have a broad overview of the basic linguistic terminology to respond to the questionnaire.

The number of participants returning the questionnaire was 47 out of 50. Of these, 38 were female while the rest were male. Their ages ranged between 20 and 24. It is important to note that because the total number of respondents is quite small, it would be true to say that the results of this questionnaire can only give an impression of the attitudes of the students in their last year at the ELT department.

Instrument

In this study, a questionnaire and an interview were used to investigate the participants' attitudes towards EIL pronunciation. The adapted questionnaire from Knollmayr (2004) includes items focusing on participants' awareness and acceptance of EIL in general rather than special EIL terminology that is only a recently emerging concept that may not be familiar to the participants.

The questionnaire has two parts: firstly, background information (age, sex, and contact with native or non-native speakers) and secondly, attitudes towards pronunciation and accent-related matters. The items in the second part of the questionnaire are closed items. Items 1 and 2 are intended to elicit the accent preferences of the participants and the reasons for their preferences. Items 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are related to the importance and the perceived goals of pronunciation teaching. Items 8 and 9 are about participants' awareness of the non-standard pronunciation of English. Item 10 deals with the ideal pronunciation teacher from

participants' perspective. Items 11 and 12 are related to participants' exposure to different varieties of English and their tolerance of L1 accent while conversing with native and non-native speakers. Item 13 is intended to reveal what participants understand from the term "International English" and Item 14 is about the preference for the conversation content of a listening or pronunciation course book. Thinking that respondents may not be familiar with the concept of EIL in detail and may not be able to respond EIL questions with special terminology, the items were kept simple to see whether there is any awareness and acceptance of EIL in general.

The second data collection instrument is a semi-structured interview inspired by Jenkins' (2000) Lingua Franca Core. These interviews served to confirm and broaden the data from the questionnaire surveys. The main purpose of using a semi-structured interview was to add to, revise or expand on previous questions depending on the participants' response so that a more in-depth analysis of participants' attitudes towards EIL pronunciation can be made. Three randomly selected participants who had expressed their willingness to be interviewed were interviewed and each interview was audio taped.

Three general questions were asked during the interview. The first one is related to their ideas about what the goal of pronunciation teaching should be. The second one is about whether some pronunciation errors can be tolerated in the classroom and what these errors are. Before the third question, Jenkins' (2000) Lingua Franca core was explained in detail and they were asked to reflect on this model.

Data collection and analysis

Before the actual administration of the questionnaire, it was piloted with 15 future English teachers in order for the purposes of content and linguistic validity. Two researchers were consulted about whether the items in the questionnaire and the interview were clear and the scales were appropriate. Based on the feedback obtained, several modifications were done. The questionnaire seems to be reliable with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient value of 0.61 that is a reasonable value for Social Sciences.

For the questionnaire data, frequency counts and percentages were computed as shown in tables in the Results section.

The data collected through the interview were coded and analyzed by two researchers to ensure reliability, one of whom was the researcher himself. The interview data were analyzed by applying content analysis. The participants' reflections on the goal of pronunciation teaching, tolerance of pronunciation

errors in the classroom and Jenkins' (2000) Lingua Franca core made up the three categories under which the obtained data are analyzed.

Results

Personal accent preference and reasons behind these preferences

A nearly equal distribution among the adopted accents of participants was revealed and most of them justified their English accent by claiming that they either learned their accent at school or want to identify themselves with the country of the people speaking with this accent (Table 1). While the justification "I think it sounds best" was chosen by 19 people, only 3 think that their accent is a result of their family background (Table 2).

Table 1. Accent adopted while speaking

Accent	Freq (n = 47)	Percent
Standard British English	15	31.9
Standard American English	18	38.3
A type of Turkish-English	14	29.8

Table 2. Reasons for selecting certain English accents

Reasons	Freq (n = 47)	Percent
Identification	26	55.3
It sounds best	19	40.4
Learned it at school	26	55.0
Family background	5	6.4

Importance and the perceived goals of pronunciation teaching

Although nearly all of the participants are aware of the fact that they communicate mostly with non-native speakers of English instead of native-speakers, except for 9 participants, all of them hold the opinion that teaching English at school (Table 3) and especially teaching a "native-like pronunciation" is very important (Table 4). Interestingly, the majority of participants seem to

accept “intelligibility” as well, the desired aim of teaching ELF, as their personal and educational goal in a pronunciation (Tables 5-7).

Table 3. Importance of pronunciation teaching at school

Level of importance	Freq (n = 47)	Percent
Very important	38	80.9
Important	5	10.6
Not very important	4	8.5

Table 4. Importance of participants having native-like pronunciation in English

Level of importance	Freq (n = 47)	Percent
Very important	38	80.9
Important	5	10.6
Not very important	4	8.5

Table 5. Importance of having clear and intelligible pronunciation

Level of importance	Freq (n = 47)	Percent
Very important	37	78.7
Important	6	12.8
Not very important	4	8.5

Table 6. Goal of pronunciation teaching to help students become as native-like as possible

Agreement or Disagreement	Freq (n = 47)	Percent
Agree	41	87.2
Disagree	6	12.8

Table 7. Goal of pronunciation teaching to help students become clear and intelligible

Agreement or Disagreement	Freq (n = 47)	Percent
Agree	46	97.9
Disagree	1	2.1

Native and non-native varieties of English in pronunciation

Although more than half of the participants claim that they have been exposed to different varieties of English in their pronunciation classes (Table 8), most of them seem unwilling to teach or to be taught a non-native variety such as Turkish English (Table 9).

Table 8. Exposure to different varieties of English in pronunciation classes

Agreement or Disagreement	Freq (n = 47)	Percent
Yes	27	57.4
No	20	42.6

Table 9. Preference to teach or be taught a non-native variety of English

Agreement or Disagreement	Freq (n = 47)	Percent
Yes	12	25.5
No	35	74.5

While only 13 of the participants consider that a successful bilingual teacher is the ideal pronunciation teacher, 34 of them think that the native speaker from either England or America is the ideal (Table 10).

Table 10. Preference for ideal pronunciation teacher

Agreement or Disagreement	Freq (n = 47)	Percent
The native speaker from England or America	34	72.3
A successful bilingual teacher	13	27.7

Results on the tolerance of L1 accent in English speaking show that majority of participants accept only a faint accent while talking to both native and non-native speakers (Tables 11 and 12).

Table 11. Acceptability of accent in conversation with native-speaker of English

Acceptability of accent	Freq (n = 47)	Percent
A faint non-native accent	30	63.8
A strong non-native accent	17	36.2

Table 12. Acceptability of accent in conversation with non native-speaker of English

Acceptability of accent	Freq (n = 47)	Percent
A faint non-native accent	29	61.7
A strong non-native accent	18	38.3

Table 13 shows that more than half of the participants describe international English as the “English easily understood by everyone”.

Table 13. Understanding of the term “International English”

Definition of International English	Freq (n = 47)	Percent
English with a particular accent	6	12.8
English easily understood by everyone	31	66.0
English spoken by any native speaker of English	9	19.1
Other	1	2.1

Content of a listening or pronunciation course book

While native and native or non-native and non-native conversations in a listening or pronunciation course books are desired by nearly half of the participants, only 2 participants preferred to have non-native and non-native conversations in their course books (Table 14).

Table 14. Preference for conversation in a listening or pronunciation course book

Preference	Freq (n = 47)	Percent
Native and native	23	48.9
Native and non-native	22	46.8
Non-native and non-native	2	4.3

Perceptions of varieties of English

Data obtained from the interviews seem to overlap with the questionnaire results. As an introduction question, participants are asked what comes to their mind when they hear the word "correct or Standard English", they all responded as either British or American English. The first question and related discussion about the goal of pronunciation teaching is responded similarly by three of the participants. They all agreed on the idea that a native or a native-like pronunciation should be the goal of a pronunciation course. The following direct quotations about their perceived goal of teaching pronunciation were taken from the interviewees' responses:

T1: There is something called the Standard English and it is the American or the British English. Teachers have different preferences but I personally prefer British English.

T2: I always think that the goal is to teach the accent of English practiced in our course books. Most of time, it is American English in Turkey.

T3: I think it should be the American English as America is the dominant power in all sectors.

When asked to justify their perceived goals of pronunciation teaching, T1 said that he had attended a private course when he first started learning English and had a native-speaker teacher from Manchester for a long time. He thought that his preference might be related to his earlier learning experiences. T2 held the idea that the goal is predetermined by course book writers and the people who are

getting involved in the process of course book selection for the English course. In the interview, T2 said:

> Whatever our goal is in teaching pronunciation, we teach through the course book. If the course book is British, we are teaching British English. If it is American, we are teaching American English. Actually, the goal is decided by some others, not us.

T3 seemed to explain his perceived goal considering what he has heard from people about job and scholarship interviews:

> I heard from a manager of a company that in job interviews, people with a good American accent are hired more than others. I mean American English is the key for a good job. I have heard also that if you do not speak American English in interviews for a scholarship to study abroad, you cannot get it.

The second question is pertaining to their opinions about whether some pronunciation errors can or cannot be tolerated in the classroom and if yes which errors they are. All of the participants have different answers to this question:

T1: I believe that some errors that are rarely committed can be tolerated but if the same errors are made by our students again and again, we should not tolerate them.

T2: I think in pronunciation, we should correct errors because immediately students might think that it is the correct pronunciation and these errors are fossilized if we do not correct them.

T3: Teachers should be more tolerant while correcting pronunciation errors. When students become afraid of speaking and making mistakes in pronunciation, it is hard to get them to speak again.

All teachers were asked to elaborate on which common pronunciation errors can or cannot be tolerated. Except for T3, T1 and T2 seemed to have a greater tendency toward the native-speaker model. T1 gave the example of /-th/ sound as in “three” and “r” at the end of words like car as the errors he would correct. The –th sound is not regarded as essential for intelligibility for ELF communication. The second sound is the –r sound. It is known that in RP, this sound is not as strong as in GA. The importance he gives to this sound might be related to his British accent preference.

T2 seemed to favor a stricter approach in correcting pronunciation errors. He makes further comments by comparing speaking and writing errors:

> Speaking is not like writing. In writing you can correct errors anytime but in speaking, errors fly and you cannot catch them later on.

T3 who seemed to be more tolerant than others gave the example of word stress as errors he would tolerate as mentioned in the non-core features of ELF pronunciation:

> Our teachers sometimes exaggerate their English by trying to put the right stress on the right syllabus. They look quite funny while doing that. For example, the stress is on the second syllabus in the word "important" but it is the same word when pronounced in a way that the stress is on the first syllabus.

The participants' general attitudes towards Jenkins' (2000) Lingua Franca Core are also revealed to be negative:

T1: I do not really how she could suggest that these pronunciation features should be taught because they are important for intelligibility and some others could be neglected as they do not break communication. I guess she did not collect any data from Turkish speakers of English. So her models cannot be true for all EFL contexts.

T2: Limiting pronunciation within certain features is a good idea for us as we spend less time and energy in teaching all the problematic pronunciation aspects but for students, it might be problem. As a prospective teacher of English, for example, I want to learn all about pronunciation.

T3: I agree that students should be exposed to other non-native accents of English. But is there a limitation for that? I mean which different varieties does she talk about? I know there are "World Englishes" now but which of these should be taught?

Discussion

This study was conducted to determine the attitudes of candidate English teachers towards ELF pronunciation. The questionnaire results showed that participants are aware of the fact that they speak English mostly with non-native speakers. In other words, they accept the lingua franca status of English. They also believe that clear and intelligible English should be the goal of a pronunciation class and most of them describe "International English" as the "English easily understood by everyone" (intelligible English). However, most of them perceive that the goal of a pronunciation class is to speak like a native speaker, and this implies that intelligible English is associated with the native speaker. Although they claim that they have been exposed to different varieties of English, they do not seem to be very tolerant of a non-native accent while speaking both with native and non-native speakers by allowing only a faint non-native accent. Moreover, the idea of teaching a non-native variety is disagreed by most of the participants and the ideal

pronunciation teacher is perceived as a native speaker. As for the content of a pronunciation course book, they also would like to see conversations between a native and another native speaker or a native and a non-native speaker of English, not between a non-native and another non-native speaker even though they hold the idea that they use English mostly with other non-native speakers in real life situations. These contradictions show that respondents did not regard matters dealt with in the questionnaire as interconnected, but rather replied to them independently from each other, thus producing answers that showed inconsistent attitudes. Clearly what was shown was that respondents had spent little thought on the status of English and its implications in the course of their studies.

The data collected through the interviews also yielded similar results. All three participants seem to favor the so-called American or British English as the goal of pronunciation teaching. Their earlier language learning experiences, the course books used in the classroom and what is heard from people about the desired accent in job and scholarship interviews influence their thoughts on the goal of pronunciation teaching. As for tolerance of pronunciation errors, one of the teacher candidates favors a zero tolerance approach as he believes in the fossilization of pronunciation errors when not corrected immediately. Another participant was found to be tolerant of rarely committed errors while the other teacher seems to favor a more flexible approach by suggesting that students should not be discouraged from speaking the language because of correction of each and every pronunciation error. Despite holding a flexible approach, the same person considers "word stress" as a feature of pronunciation to be corrected contrary to Jenkins' (2000) listing this feature in her non-core list. Another non-core pronunciation feature that is the sound of /th/ is also regarded as a sound to be corrected by the other participant. In reaction to Jenkins' ELF pronunciation model, all the teachers have expressed their negative criticisms. One teacher questions her model in the Turkish EFL setting by asking whether Jenkins had collected any spoken English corpus in Turkey, for example, to develop such a list that she claims to be the core of ELF pronunciation. Another teacher expressed the idea that as a candidate teacher of English, he should know all the pronunciation features, not only the ones suggested by Jenkins. One final criticism brought up was related to the limit in non-native accents that students should be exposed to.

Conclusion

Although this study is too small to provide significant data on attitudes towards ELF pronunciation as far as the number of participants is concerned, the findings are assumed to be typical attitudes common among many learners and teachers of

English in EFL contexts. This study also sheds some light on the future of ELT in Turkey as the participants are future teachers of English, which means that they will pass on their preferred pronunciation model and the attitudes towards ELF pronunciation when they start teaching the following year. It would be fair to assume that native speaker norms will remain as the teaching model and there is a growing need for awareness about the current status of ELF and its reflections on ELT in Turkey. Given the instrumental motivation of Turkish learners of English to learn English for utility purposes (e.g., getting a better job) and to communicate mostly with non-native speakers, ELT should be put on a different track so that students are exposed to different varieties and cultures of the English speaking people in order to help them be linguistically ready for intercultural communication. In an attempt to illustrate how the changing track might have an influence on the ELT classroom, Coşkun (2010a, 2010b, 2010c) attempts to illustrate lesson plans, activities and other instructional resources through which students are presented and familiarized with different varieties of English as well as cultural norms of the English speaking world so that they can be linguistically ready to be able to communicate not only with native speakers but also with non-native speakers of English.

As Kirkpatrick (2004) underlines, with the changing face of English in the world, some important points to consider in the ELT pedagogy appear:

1. variation is natural, normal, and continuous, and ELT professionals should develop tolerance and understanding of it;
2. prejudice against varieties is likely but has no rational basis;
3. one variety is not superior to another;
4. specific teaching contexts and specific needs of learners should determine the variety taught; and
5. non-native teachers are ideal in many ELT contexts.

For further studies in the field of EIL, it can be suggested that more research about the effects of EIL on ELT with special focus on curriculum, teacher education, materials development, teaching basic skills and culture, course book evaluation and classroom pedagogy will pave the way for a drastic change in our traditional understanding of ELT in the global world.

References

Ahvenainen, T. (2005). *Problem solving mechanisms in information exchange: Dialogues with English as a Lingua Franca*. Unpublished Licentiate thesis, University of Jyväskylä.

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence'. *ELT Journal*, 56(1), 57-64.

Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Brumfit, C. J. (2001). *Individual Freedom in Language Teaching: Helping Learners to Develop a Dialect of their Own*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. (2001). Council of Europe. Retrieved October 30, 2011, from http://www.coe.int/T/DG4/Portfolio/documents/0521803136txt.pdf

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1999). Cultural mirrors: Materials and methods in the EFL classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 196-219) . Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coşkun, A. (2010a). Whose English should we teach? Reflections from Turkey. *English for Specific Purposes World - Online Journal for Teachers*, *9*(1), Article 27.

Coşkun, A. (2010b). *From EFL to ELF in Turkey: Why, whats and hows*. Paper presented in the 1st International Istek Schools ELT Conference, Yeditepe University, Istanbul, Turkey.

Coşkun, A. (2010c). EIL in an actual lesson. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 5, 74-80.

Doğancay-Aktuna, S. (1998). The spread of English in Turkey and its current sociolinguistic profile. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 19(1), 23-39.

Doğancay-Aktuna, S., & Kızıltepe. Z. (2005). English in Turkey. *World Englishes*, 24(2), 253-. 265.

Dalton-Puffer, C., & Kaltenböck, G. (1995). Language attitudes of L2 learners to native and nonnative varieties of English, *Vienna English Working Papers*, 4.2.

Jenkins, J. (1998). Which pronunciation norms and models for English as an International Language? *ELT Journal*, 52(2),119-26.

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The Phonology of English as an International Language*. Oxford: OUP.

Jenkins, J. (2005a). ELF at the gate: the position of English as a Lingua Franca. *Humanising Language Teaching*, 7(2). Retrieved on May 4, 2007 from http://www.hltmag.co.uk/mar05/idea.htm

Jenkins, J. (2005b). Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: The role of Teacher attitudes and identity. *TESOL Quarterly,* 39(3), 535-543.

Ilter, G. B., & Güzeller, C. O. (2005). Cultural problems of Turkish students while learning English as a Foreign Language. *TOMER Journal of Language,* 127, 54-59.

Kızıltepe, Z. (2000). Attitudes and motivation of Turkish EFL Students towards second language learning. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics,* Vol. 130, 141-168.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2004). English as an ASEAN lingua franca: Implications for research and language teaching. *Asian Englishes,* 6, 82-91.

Knollmayr, B. (2004). *Attitudes towards EIL: a focus on pronunciation*. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Vienna.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matsuda, A. (2003). Incorporating World Englishes in teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 729-729.

McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McKay, S. (2003a). EIL curriculum development. *RELC Journal,* 34(1), 31-47.

McKay, S. (2003b). Teaching English as an International Language: The Chilean context'. *ELT Journal,* 57(2), 139-148.

Modiano, M. (1996). The Americanization of Euro-English. *World Englishes,* 15(2), 207-215.

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal,* 59(4), 339-341.

Sifakis, N. (2007). The education of teachers of English as a lingua franca: a transformative perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 17(3), 355-375.

Sifakis, N. C., & Sougari, A. (2005). Pronunciation issues and EIL pedagogy in the periphery: A survey of Greek state school teachers' beliefs. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 467–488.

Snow, M. A., Kamhi-Stein, L. D., & Brinton, D. M. (2006). Teacher training for English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 26, 261-281.

Taylor, L. (2006). The changing landscape of English: implications for language assessment. *ELT Journal,* 60(1), 51-60.

Teufel, G. (1995). Language attitudes of Anglo-Australian high-school students towards Germanaccented English. *Vienna English Working Papers,* 4(2), 131-145.

Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and international English: A classroom view. *ELT Journal,* 56(3), 240-249.

Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly* 28(2), 377-89.

Widdowson, H. G. (1998). Context, community and authentic language. *TESOL Quarterly,* 32(4), 705-716.

Note on Contributor

Abdullah Coşkun (PhD) works as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Translation and Interpretation at Abant Izzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey. He holds a BA and MA in English Language Teaching from the same university where he works. He has a Ph,D from the Department of Foreign Language Education at Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. He also gained a CELTA certificate and has worked as the coordinator of Life Long Learning projects. His research interests include English as an International Language, ELT program evaluation, ESP curriculum development and metacognitive strategy training. Email contact: coskun_a@ibu.edu.tr or abdullahenglish@gmail.com