

INVESTIGATION OF PSYCHO-SOCIAL FACTORS THAT AFFECT
ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION PREFERENCE OF EFL LEARNERS:
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IN-CLASS INJUNCTIVE NORMS FOR
ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION AND FEAR OF NEGATIVE EVALUATION
IN ELT CLASSROOMS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ZEYNEP ÖLÇÜ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

JUNE 2008

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science/Arts / Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Wolf König

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science/Arts/Doctor of Philosophy.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Alev Yemenici
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Y. Doç Dr. Dilara Demirbulak (Çankaya University, ELL) _____

Y. Doç. Dr. Alev Yemenici (METU, FLE) _____

Y. Doç. Dr. Nurdan Gürbüz (METU, FLE) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Zeynep ÖLÇÜ

Signature :

ABSTRACT

INVESTIGATION OF PSYCHO-SOCIAL FACTORS THAT AFFECT ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION PREFERENCE OF EFL LEARNERS: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IN-CLASS INJUNCTIVE NORMS FOR ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION AND FEAR OF NEGATIVE EVALUATION IN ELT CLASSROOMS

Ölçü, Zeynep

MA., Department of Foreign Language Education

Supervisor : Y. Doç Dr. Alev Yemenici

June 2008, 174 pages

This thesis aims to investigate socio-psychological factors that affect foreign language learners' pronunciation and focuses on the relationship between in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation and Fear of Negative Evaluation (FNE). Injunctive norms are a type of social norms that define the expected behavior from the group members and sanctions for disobedience. They are evaluative in their nature. FNE is one of the three components of foreign language classroom anxiety and experienced when a person is in an evaluative situation. For this study, the quantitative data were collected through a questionnaire developed by the researcher and the qualitative data were gathered from the interviews. Freshman students at the Department of Foreign Language Education at Middle East Technical University participated in the study.

The results indicated that speaking with native like or Turkish-like English pronunciation and having some pronunciation mistakes, which are commonly observed in the classroom, are approved according to in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation. However, if speakers cannot achieve sounding native like when they are trying to emulate native pronunciation, or if they make pronunciation mistakes which are not commonly observed in the classroom or overemphasized by the instructors, these performances are not approved. Speaking with an English pronunciation in the classroom which is not approved according to these norms triggers FNE in the learners. Therefore, learners generally prefer speaking with Turkish-like English pronunciation, which is within the frame of in-class injunctive norms. The results also demonstrated that the pronunciation rules that teachers emphasize become a part of injunctive norms; therefore, teachers have an important role in the determination of these norms.

Keywords: In-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation, Fear of Negative Evaluation, Pronunciation, Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety.

ÖZ

İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENERİN İNGİLİZCE TELAFFUZ TERCİHİNİ ETKİLEYEN SOSYO-PSİKOLOJİK ETKENLERİN ARAŞTIRILMASI: SINIF İÇİNDE İNGİLİZCE TELAFFUZU BELİRLEYEN NORMLAR VE OLUMSUZ DEĞERLENDİRİLME KORKUSU ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ

Ölçü, Zeynep

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Dili Öğretimi

Tez Yöneticisi : Y. Doç. Dr. Alev Yemenici

Haziran 2008, 174 sayfa

Bu tez İngilizce telaffuzu etkileyen sosyo-psikolojik faktörleri incelemeyi hedeflemektedir ve özellikle sınıf içinde İngilizce telaffuzu belirleyen normlar ve Olumsuz Değerlendirilme Korkusu (ODK) arasındaki ilişkiye odaklanmaktadır. Belirleyici (injunctive) normlar grup üyelerinden beklenen davranışı ve bu davranışlara uyulmaması halinde kullanılan yaptırımları tanımlayan bir çeşit sosyal normdur. Bu normlar, doğal olarak değerlendirici bir yapıya sahiptirler. ODK yabancı dil sınıflarında hissedilen kaygının üç ögesinden birisi olup kişi değerlendirilmeye tabi tutulduğunda deneyimlenmektedir. Bu çalışma için nesnel veriler araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilen bir anket aracılığı ile nitel veriler ise mülakat yolu ile toplanmıştır.

Sonuçlar Amerikan veya İngilizlerin İngilizcesine benzer veya Türkçeye benzer bir İngilizce telaffuzu ile konuşmanın ve sınıf içinde yaygın olan telaffuz

hatalarını yapmanın sınıf içinde İngilizce telaffuzu belirleyen normlar tarafından kabul gördüğünü göstermiştir. Fakat konuşmacı İngilizler veya Amerikalılar gibi konuşmayı denerken bunu başaramaz veya sınıfta yaygın olarak gözlemlenmeyen ya da öğretmenler tarafından çok fazla vurgulanan telaffuz hatalarını yaparsa bu konuşma biçimi kabul görmemektedir. Sınıf içi İngilizce telaffuzu belirleyen normlara uymayan bir telaffuz ile konuşmak ODK' yi tetiklemektedir. Bu nedenle, öğrenciler genellikle sınıf içindeki belirleyici normlar çerçevesinde Türkçeye benzer bir İngilizce telaffuz ile konuşmayı tercih etmektedir. Sonuçlar öğretmenler tarafından vurgulanan telaffuz kurallarının belirleyici normların bir parçası olduğunu da göstermiştir, bu nedenle bu normların belirlenmesinde öğretmenlerin rolü önemlidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sınıf içinde İngilizce telaffuzu belirleyen normlar, Olumsuz Değerlendirilme Korkusu, Telaffuz, Yabancı Dil Sınıfı Kaygısı.

To My Parents Seviye and Hüsni ÖLÇÜ
Who Always Done More Than I Deserve

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Alev Yemenici without whose constant support and guidance this study would never have been accomplished. Besides, I am greatly indebted for her enthusiasm, constructive feedback and encouraging conversations we have had during the process. I would also like to thank my committee members Assist. Prof. Dr. Nurdan Özbek and Assist. Prof. Dr. Dilara Demirbulak for their invaluable feedback and helpful suggestions.

I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Hüsnü Enginarlar for his invaluable feedback for the research instruments. Besides, many thanks to Özcan Elçi and Aynur Gürata for their suggestions and feedback.

I would like to express my special gratitude for Deniz Şallı Çopur who is my role model as a teacher and a colleague of mine with her constant support and invaluable suggestions. Besides, many thanks to Hatice Emre Eşberk, Özlem Türe Abacı, Seda Cantimur Örmengül, Seda Coşar, Sedat Akayoğlu, Serkan Ertin and Sibel Korkmazgil for their help and support.

I would like to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sömez and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Joshua Bear for their help to prepare the questionnaire as native speakers of

English. I am also grateful to my students who inspired and helped me to carry out this research.

Last, but not the least, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my family; to my parents Seviye and Hüsni Ölçü, to my sisters Ayşegül Mutlu and Emra Ölçü, to my brothers Ekrem Ölçü and Refik Mutlu and to my niece Semiha Mutlu and nephew Hüsni Eren Ölçü for their unconditional love, constant encouragement, patience and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF TABLES	xv
CHAPTER	1
1.INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background to the study.....	1
1.2 Research Questions	5
1.3. Hypotheses	6
1.4. Purpose and Scope of the Study	7
1.5. Significance of the Study	8
1.6. Overview of Methodology	9
1.6.1. Procedures	9
1.6.2. Participants	11
1.7. Overview of Analytical Procedures	12
1.8. Limitations of the Study	12
1.9. Definition of Terms	13
1.9.1. Anxiety	13

1.9.2. Norms	13
1.9.4. Injunctive Norms	14
1.9.5. Fear of Negative Evaluation.....	15
1.9.6. Pronunciation.....	15
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	18
2.0. Presentation	18
2.1. Social Contexts and English Language Learning.....	19
2.2. Norms	24
2.2.1. Descriptive and Injunctive Norms.....	25
2.3. Anxiety	29
2.3.1. Anxiety and L2 Learning	31
2.3.1.1. Foreign Language Anxiety and L2 Oral Performance.....	37
2.4. Fear of Negative Evaluation.....	41
2.4.1 Fear of Negative Evaluation and L2 Learning	43
METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS.....	46
AND INTERPRETATION	46
3.0. Presentation	46
3.1 Design of the Study	46
3.2 Research Questions	48
3.3 Participants	49
3.4. Setting.....	51
3.5. Data Collection Instruments.....	51
3.5.1. Questionnaire.....	53

3. 5. 2. Interview.....	56
DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	59
4.0 Presentation	59
4.1. Analysis of the Responses Related to the Social Perspective	60
4.1.1. Analyses of questionnaire item: “Features of the commonly used English Pronunciation”	60
4.1.2. Analysis of interview responses: “Features of the commonly used English Pronunciation”	61
4.1.3. Analysis of questionnaire items: for “Reasons for its common use”	63
4.1.4 Analysis of interview responses: “Reasons for its common use”	66
4.1.5. Analysis of questionnaire items: “In-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation”	67
4.1.6 Analysis of interview responses: “In-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation”	72
4.2. Analyses of the Responses Related to the Psychological Perspective	83
4.2.1. Analysis of questionnaire items: “Feelings and beliefs of the speaker”	83
4.2.2 Analysis of interview responses: “Feelings of the speaker”	89
CONCLUSION	98
5.0 Presentation	98
5.1 Summary of the Study	98
5.2. Results	100
5.3. Pedagogical implications.....	113

5.4. Assessment of the study and Suggestions for Further Research	119
REFERENCES	121
APPENDICES	129
APPENDIX A	129
APPENDIX B.....	139
APPENDIX C.....	144
APPENDIX D	145
APPENDIX E.....	146
APPENDIX F.....	149
APPENDIX G	151
APPENDIX H	153
APPENDIX I.....	162
APPENDIX J.....	171

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

Table 2.1: Social contexts and potential learning outcomes	23
Table 4.1: Results for Item-1 in Part B	61
Table 4.2: Interview responses regarding the most commonly used English pronunciation.....	62
Table 4.3: Interview responses regarding features of the most commonly used English pronunciation.....	62
Table 4.4: Interview responses regarding the common preference of Turkish like pronunciation.....	64
Table 4.5: Reasons for the rare practice of native like pronunciation.....	65
Table 4.6: Interview responses regarding the common use of Turkish-like English pronunciation.....	66
Table 4.7: Summary results for Turkish-like English pronunciation.....	69
Table 4.8: Summary results for native like pronunciation	70
Table 4.9: Summary results for pronunciation mistakes	71
Table 4.10: Interview responses regarding the existence of tacit rules that determine English pronunciation.....	73
Table 4.11: Interview responses regarding the features of in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation.....	74
Table 4.12: Interview responses regarding reactions to speakers' violating the norms	80

Table 4.13: Summary of the responses for FNE experienced when speaking English in the classroom.....	85
Table 4.14: Summary of the responses for FNE experienced when speaking with native like pronunciation	86
Table 4.15: Summary of the responses for FNE experienced when speaking with pronunciation mistakes.....	87
Table 4.16: Summary of the responses for FNE experienced when speaking with Turkish-like English pronunciation.....	88
Table 4.17: Personality difference and FNE	89
Table 4.18: Interview responses regarding FNE experienced when speaking with native like pronunciation	91
Table 4.19: Interview responses regarding FNE experienced when speaking Turkish-like English pronunciation	95

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.0. Presentation

This chapter consists of eight consecutive sections. The first one provides background information for the study. This section mainly elaborates on social and psychological factors that affect English pronunciation of learners. In the second section, the research questions and hypotheses are presented. Following this, significance of the study is explained. Then, overview of methodology and overview of analytical procedures are provided. Following this, limitations of the study are mentioned. Finally, basic terms employed in the study are explained.

1.1. Background to the study

Today, it is known that, together with other factors affecting learning, classroom context itself plays an important role on learning. A student is not only an individual learner with their unique personality, aptitude, attitude or knowledge etc., but they¹ are also a member of the classroom which is accepted as a social organization. Bany and Johnson (1964) claim that *a group* includes two or more people who have relationships of interdependence and unity, and classroom can be defined as a small group showing the characteristics of *a group*.

It is acknowledged by Bany and Johnson that a classroom group is “a socio-psychological” structure. Since a classroom is formally organized, it is a

¹ In order to avoid the bias of using gendered pronouns plural pronouns are preferred.

social structure which has its own distinctive action patterns describing how individual students should act. Every group, including classroom groups, adopts or develops distinguishing norms or values that affect the behavior of the members. Like in other small groups, in a classroom group, each student is a part of the norm construction and preservation process and their behaviors might be affected by these norms. While social aspect of a classroom group takes classroom context as a social entity, psychological aspect of a classroom group concerns the expectancies developed among the students as a result of the interrelationships of each individual to one another. In other words, “groups have psychological influences that affect individual behavior” (Bany and Johnson, 1964, p. 37) and classroom groups have the same effects on students.

As it is mentioned above, a classroom group is a social structure and norms are of great importance in this structure. Norms are broadly defined as “codes of conduct that either prescribe or proscribe behaviors that members of a group can enact” (Rimal & Real, 2003, p. 185). In order to develop a better understanding of norms they are subcategorized as *descriptive* and *injunctive norms*. Descriptive norms, as it can be interpreted from the term itself, represent the typical widespread behavior commonly observed in a group regardless of its appropriateness, whereas injunctive norms have an ethical perspective and describe what people should do. Descriptive norms define the group members’ noncompliance, while injunctive norms provide sanctions for group members’ noncompliance. According to Rimal and Real (2003), “whereas descriptive norms

describe the prevalence of a behavior, injunctive norms refer to the extent to which individuals feel pressured into engaging in a behavior” (p. 186). Unlike descriptive norms, injunctive norms provide information about perceived sanctions of a group according to which a group member can determine their self standards of act to survive in the group. Therefore, group members experience guilt or anxiety when their actions deviate from the injunctive norms of the group (Christensen et al., 2004). Since the current study focuses on the relationship between classroom norms and fear of negative evaluation (henceforth; FNE), which is one of the three subcategories of foreign language classroom anxiety proposed by Horwitz et al. (1986), injunctive norms for English pronunciation in EFL classrooms will be the main concern of the present research.

As mentioned before, it is stated that disobedience to injunctive norms provokes anxiety, which is a psychological state of apprehension. Anxiety can be defined as “the subjective feelings of tension, apprehension, nervousness and worry associated with an arousal of the autonomic nervous system” (cited in Horwitz et al., p. 27). Considering its effects on learners’ performance, Alpert and Haber (1960) state that anxiety can be either facilitating or debilitating. Facilitating anxiety fosters learners’ performance, whereas debilitating anxiety is detrimental to the performance of the learners. The latter attracted SLA researchers’ attention and Horwitz et al. (1986) proposed *foreign language classroom anxiety*, which is a distinctive detrimental anxiety experienced only when a person is learning a new language.

Horwitz et al. (1986) state that learners of a new language experience a different type of anxiety that can be distinguished from other academic anxieties. Foreign language anxiety is defined as “a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process” (Horwitz et al., 1986, p. 31). Horwitz et al. (1986) developed a 33-item Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) to measure the severity of language learners’ anxiety level. In this scale, possible reasons for foreign language anxiety are listed under three major categories; communication apprehension, test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation. The latter is the one which is mainly taken into consideration in this study. This categorization is the basis of other studies that focus on foreign language anxiety. For example, speaking in the target language is acknowledged as the most anxiety evoking activity (Horwitz et al., 1986) and Yang (2005) developed a scale to measure the severity level of cognitive and psychosomatic affects of target language speaking anxiety, Foreign Language Classroom Speaking Anxiety Scale (FLCSAS). In this scale, these three categories, communication apprehension, test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation, are used as a framework to develop the questionnaire items.

Communication apprehension stands for the feeling of shyness characterized by fear of communication with other people and it increases when people are speaking in another language that they are not fully competent (Horwitz et al., 1986). Test anxiety is defined as a type of performance anxiety caused by

fear of failure. Finally, fear of negative evaluation is similar to the test anxiety but it has a wider scope (Horwitz et al., 1986) and language learners are not necessarily in a testing context.

Fear of negative evaluation is described as “apprehension about others’ evaluations, distress over their negative evaluations, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively” (cited in Collins et al., 2004). As mentioned previously, injunctive norms have evaluative value which shows what is acceptable or unacceptable. Injunctive norms provide sanctions for the members of a group, which is not the case for descriptive norms. When students do not follow the norms of the classroom group they are likely to be evaluated as deviant. Bany and Johnson (1964) state that “an individual deviant is one who behaves in a way that is completely outside the range of the behavior that has been established for a particular norm” (p. 144). Deviating from the injunctive norms of the classroom will be an impetus for negative evaluation of the classroom members. As emphasized previously, this deviation will trigger anxiety of the student which is caused by fear of negative evaluation.

1.2 Research Questions

Based on the studies done on injunctive norms, anxiety caused by fear of negative evaluation, and language learning this study aims to answer the following research questions.

1. What are the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation for freshman students in the Department of Foreign Languages Education at METU?
 - 1.1 Which English pronunciation, i.e. native like, nonnative or wrong pronunciation, is the most appreciated one among the students?
 - 1.2 Which English pronunciation, i.e. native like, nonnative or wrong pronunciation, is the least appreciated one among the students?
2. What is the relationship between in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation and fear of negative evaluation.
 - 2.1. Do the students feel anxious about their peers' negative evaluation when they make mistakes while speaking English?
 - 2.2. Do the students feel anxious about their peers' negative evaluation when they attempt to imitate native speakers' performance?
 - 2.3. Do the students feel anxious about their peers' negative evaluation when they adapt their English pronunciation according to their native language?

1.3. Hypotheses

1. The following statements describe the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation.
 - 1.1. Speaking English by imitating the vowels and consonants which do not exist in Turkish is not approved by the students in the classroom.
 - 1.2. Speaking English by imitating intonation and stress patterns used by native speakers is not approved by the students in the classroom.

- 1.3. Speaking English with a strong nonnative pronunciation, e.g. thrilled /r/, /v/ for /w/, is not approved by the students in the classroom.
- 1.4. Speaking English with a flat intonation pattern is approved by the students in the classroom.
- 1.5. Turkish-like English pronunciation is the most commonly preferred type of pronunciation among the students.
- 1.6. Native like English pronunciation is the least commonly preferred type of English pronunciation among the students.
2. Deviations from in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation triggers students' fear of negative evaluation.
 - 2.1. Learners experience fear of negative evaluation when they make pronunciation mistakes while speaking English.
 - 2.2. Learners experience fear of negative evaluation when they attempt to speak with native like pronunciation.
 - 2.3. Learners do not feel fear of negative evaluation when they use Turkish-like English pronunciation.

1.4. Purpose and Scope of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation and foreign language speaking anxiety caused by fear of negative evaluation.

First of all, the study aims to clarify in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation accepted among ELT Department freshman students. This will provide information about the injunctive norms that are used to evaluate the appropriateness of students' English pronunciation. Besides, it will specifically examine whether the students approve using native-like pronunciation in the lessons. This will give information about the students' preference about the English pronunciation used in the classroom. Then, the relationship between the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation and fear of negative evaluation experienced when speaking in the target language will be taken into consideration.

1.5. Significance of the Study

This study presents a socio-psychological perspective which would enhance the scope of the studies conducted to understand foreign language classrooms. First, examining the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation in EFL classrooms, the current study provides a genuine perspective for SLA researchers and language teachers. Understanding the role of injunctive norms in students' pronunciation preference, the researchers and the teachers can develop strategies to overcome the social pressure created by these norms and also they can use the norms for the benefit of the learners. This research is the first study that focuses on the relationship between in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation and peer pressure in language classrooms. Since this study aims to unearth the relationships between English speaking anxiety caused by fear

of negative evaluation and putative injunctive norms for English pronunciation in language classrooms, it would offer broader understanding of the factors that affect the pronunciation performance of ELT learners.

This study further points out that inadequate oral performance of the learners can be a result of the difference between learner and teacher goals. Learners might aim to follow the injunctive norms of the classroom though the norms are not congruent with teachers' aims. Recognizing this conscious action of the learners, the teachers would gain a new understanding of learner mistakes. Approaching the problems in teaching English pronunciation skills from the learners' point of view, the study will answer some of the questions which cannot be answered through focusing on only teachers' point of view.

1.6. Overview of Methodology

1.6.1. Procedures

First, a preliminary study was conducted to investigate the reasons for fear of negative evaluation experienced when speaking English. The researcher conducted an interview with 9 students (6 first year and 3 second year students). The data obtained from these interviews were used to prepare the questionnaire items. Besides, the researcher observed at least one lesson of each section taking the Listening and Pronunciation course and took notes. These anecdotal notes and interview responses gathered from the preliminary study along with the research done on foreign language classroom anxiety and fear of negative evaluation were

used to prepare the questionnaire items and revise interview questions. Then, a 23-item questionnaire was developed to discover the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation accepted among ELT department freshman students and the relationship between these norms and fear of negative evaluation. The questionnaire was evaluated by four judges: a Turkish instructor, a testing professional, a psychologist and a specialist in ELT. The questionnaire contains three parts. The first part is for demographic information, the second part is for eliciting injunctive norms for speaking English and the third part is to investigate the relationship between these norms and fear of negative evaluation. After the piloting of the questionnaire with 25 freshman students, the items were revised according to the feedback obtained from the learners. Then the items were piloted with 31 second year students for the second time. 58 freshman students participated in the main study and they answered the questionnaire. Then, semi-structured interviews were conducted to unearth the injunctive norms for speaking English accepted among ELT department freshman students and the reasons for anxiety caused by fear of negative evaluation when speaking English. 10 students participated in the interviews. 6 of the interviewee were female and 4 of them were male. 3 female and 2 male students from each section, who answered the questionnaire, were chosen for the interviews through quota sampling. In quota sampling, the interviewer determines a quota for particular types of samples which will participate in the interviews. After the quota is filled with that particular types of samples, no more samples with same characteristics are included in the

interview. In this study quota for freshman female students was 6, 3 from each section, and the quota for male students was 4, 2 from each section. Since the percentage of female students is higher than male students in the department, the quota for female participants were higher than the male participants. Only the volunteer students participated in the interviews.

There are three sections of freshman students in the Department of Foreign Language Education and the students are distributed according to the initial letter of their surnames. One of these sections was used for piloting of the questionnaire and the other two sections were used for the administration of the questionnaire and the interviews. The sections in which the numbers of male and female students are relatively more equal are preferred for the main study.

1.6.2. Participants

The participants of this study (N= 58) (50=F, 8=M) are all freshman university students studying at the Department of Foreign Language Education at Middle East Technical University. Although there are some exchange students in the department, the participants of the current study are Turkish students. The students were put into three sections according to the alphabetic order of their surnames. Each section has a different syllabus and they have different classroom activities for their speaking courses. However, they have the same course objectives which were determined by the department. Different instructors teach listening and pronunciation to different sections.

1.7. Overview of Analytical Procedures

The recordings of the interviews were transcribed and evaluated through content analysis. Following the interpretation of the interview data, the results of the open ended questionnaire items were analyzed through content analysis and likert scale items were analyzed by using SPSS 13.0 for Windows.

1.8. Limitations of the Study

Although this study provides valuable information to the field, the findings are limited to the EFL context in Turkey. Besides, the scope of the study covers only the first year students studying at Middle East Technical University, Department of Foreign Language Education. Since this is a case study, sample size is limited to the student population in the department.

The first piloting of the questionnaire was handled with first year students; however, the learners misunderstood some of the items. Then the statements were revised according to the feedback from the students. Therefore, a second piloting was conducted with second year students to verify reliability of the questionnaire.

The testing expert suggested adding sample recordings for each item to make students understand the type of pronunciation defined in each statement. However, hearing only these examples the participants focused on the samples and answered the items accordingly. Finally, the questionnaires were conducted in the lessons to foster reliability; therefore, the questionnaire couldn't be retested in order not to interrupt the flow of the lessons in the department.

1.9. Definition of Terms

1.9.1. Anxiety

Anxiety is a psychological feeling of fear and apprehension experienced by an individual and it is associated with physical symptoms like sweating, increased heart beat and nausea. Anxiety is examined from three different perspectives; trait anxiety, state anxiety and situation specific anxiety. Trait anxiety is considered to be a general personality trait that is relevant across different situations. State anxiety is here and now experience of an anxiety as an emotional state. Finally, the specific form of anxiety which is observed over time in a given situation is called situation specific anxiety (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991).

1.9.2. Norms

Norms are rules for behavioral patterns which are accepted, at least to some degree, by members of a group (cited in Bany & Johnson, 1964). Norms have an evaluative nature. Although they describe the acceptable and unacceptable behavior, norms are not the behaviors themselves; “rather, they represent what people in groups think behavior ought to be or what they expect it to be” (Bany & Johnson, 1964, p. 120).

1.9.3. Descriptive Norms

Descriptive norms are each group member’s beliefs about how common a particular action is among other possible activities. They supply information about

what is unacceptable and what is not, whereas they do not put pressure on the individual because they do not include the sanctions for the members' noncompliance. They only describe the pervasiveness of an exacting behavior.

1.9.4. Injunctive Norms

Unlike descriptive norms, injunctive norms refer to the group sanctions for the members' noncompliance. Therefore, the individuals feel pressure to act according to the accepted behavior. Rimal and Real (2003) state that the pressure experienced due to the injunctive norms "can occur either because of perceived threats (e.g., losing friendships or being unable to cultivate them) or perceived benefits (because of which not engaging in the behavior becomes equivalent to depriving oneself of those benefits)" (p. 187).

Injunctive norms have moral features and depict what people ought to do (Christensen et al., 2004). They are generally "enforced by social rewards and punishments" (Christensen et al., 2004). They provide the frame of reference for the development of the social identity because they are evaluative in nature. Compared to the descriptive norms, injunctive norms have more power on the social identity of the individual.

When people obey injunctive norms, they feel pride or relief, whereas obeying descriptive norms may not trigger pride or relief. Nonconformity of individuals to the injunctive norms triggers feelings of guilt or anxiety, but

deviating from descriptive norms makes the individual feel surprise rather than guilt or anxiety (Christensen et al., 2004).

1.9.5. Fear of Negative Evaluation

Fear of negative evaluation is defined as “apprehension about others’ evaluations, distress over their negative evaluations, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively.” (cited in Shoemaker et al., 2000). Watson and Friend further explain that “fear of loss of social approval would be identical to FNE” (cited in Shoemaker et al., 2000).

1.9.6. Pronunciation

Pronunciation in language learning is described as the articulation and perception of the significant sounds of a particular language to mediate messages in the contexts of language use . An individual reflects their identity via their pronunciation and the way a person speaks indicates their membership in particular groups. Therefore, pronunciation has both psychological and social importance for the speaker. Although achievement in the pronunciation of the second language is important for the language learner there are very limited research studies related to teaching second language pronunciation.

Pronunciation in language teaching comprises two main categories, teaching segmentals and teaching suprasegmentals. Segmentals are the individual

sounds of the target language, namely vowels, consonants and diphthongs. Suprasegmentals stand for the prosody of language. It refers to a “vocal effect that extends over more than one sound segment in an utterance” (Çelik, 2003, p.129). Therefore, the minimal unit that can have suprasegmental features is a syllable. Intonation, stress, rhythm, junction and pitch are the components of suprasegmentals. Stress is the production of a syllable louder, longer and with a greater pitch. Pitch refers to the frequency of vibration of vocal cords. Rhythm is the regular occurrence of stressed syllables. Intonation refers to the use of stress and tones such that it indicates whether an utterance will end, whether the speaker aims to ask a question, express surprise etc.

In the current study nonnative pronunciation of the learners is defined as Turkish-like English pronunciation. Since Turkish is the mother tongue for most of the learners participated in the current study and they learn English in a foreign language context, learners’ pronunciation has the intonation and stress patterns of Turkish. Pronunciation of some English sounds is also very approximate to the similar sounds used in Turkish. Therefore, both segmentals and suprasegmentals used by the learners when speaking English have features of Turkish language and that nonnative pronunciation is defined as Turkish-like English pronunciation in the present study.

In the current study, it is preferred to use pronunciation rather than accent. Accent is the characteristics of speech that distinguishes one way of speaking from the others based on the regional phonological or phonetic differences. Prosodic

and segmental features of speech allow us to differentiate one type of speaking from another and define its accent (Lippi-Green, 1997). Since the present research focuses on the sound production and use of intonation of language learners regardless of the general regional features of that speech, pronunciation is used as a term referring to the speech quality of the learners rather than accent.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.0. Presentation

This chapter presents the background research and theories that prepare the ground for the current study. First, the relationship between the social context of learning and English language learning is explained briefly. Second, studies on the relationship between norms and human behavior are presented, and differences between injunctive and descriptive norms are provided. Third, anxiety is defined as a general psychological state, then second language acquisition studies concerning foreign language anxiety are summarized. Finally, fear of negative evaluation and studies concerning its role in language learning classrooms are presented.

Language learning includes not only the environmental and cognitive factors which affect learning in general but also various social components and personality traits (Dörnyei, 1994). Horwitz (2000) states that “language learning is a complex interpersonal and social endeavor, and to reject the role of affective factors is myopic and ultimately harmful” (p. 258). Therefore, understanding this intricate process warrants interdisciplinary studies that employ findings from different fields. This study combines research findings related to the effects of norms on human behavior, and fear of negative evaluation, which is a kind of

social anxiety, then aims to employ these findings to develop a new understanding of fear of negative evaluation in foreign language classrooms.

2.1. Social Contexts and English Language Learning

English has been the most wide spread medium of international communication. In many countries people use English for different aims. It has been known that English language has different roles in different contexts and English language learning is determined by the context of learning. Edward Arnold (cited in Dörnyei, 1994) states that there are more bilinguals around the world than monolinguals. Since social conditions affect language learning, social aspect of second language learning cannot be ignored. Especially, the immediate spread of English in the world increases the necessity of studies that combine English language teaching and its social relevance.

Kachru's (cited in Erling, 2002) concentric circles of English is one of the well-known models that explains the position of English in the world from a macro-social perspective. According to this model, there are three main circles in which the role and place of English change. The Inner Circle includes the countries in which English is the mother tongue of people such as Great Britain and the United States. These are described as norm-producing countries. In the Outer Circle countries such as India or Malaysia, English is the official language but the speakers create their indigenous varieties like Indian English or Malaysian English. Therefore, the Outer Circle countries are defined as norm-developing

countries. The Expanding Circle is made up of countries in which English is generally taught as a foreign language to settle international communication. The Expanding Circle countries such as Japan and Russia are labeled as norm-dependent contexts in the sense that English norms used by the Inner Circle countries are taken as a model to teach English. Like Japan and Russia, Turkey is an Expanding Circle country in which English is basically learnt for international communication and Inner Circle English is considered to be the main source of English norms. Therefore, native speaker norms, “a standard dialect from the United Kingdom or North America” (Scales et al., 2006), are especially preferred in pronunciation teaching (p. 716). Aktuna and Kızıltepe (2005) claim that the institutionalized entrenchment of English in the educational system increases the role of English in education in Turkey, as observed in many other Expanding Circle countries. Although Turkey is considered an Expanding Circle country, there are some Turkish domains, such as the place of English in higher education, science, technology, business etc., in which English has a role which is observed in Outer Circle countries (Aktuna & Kızıltepe, 2005).

In addition to Kachru’s concentric circles of English model which outlines the role and place of English in the world, the detailed explanation of “the social contexts of L2 learning” by Rod Ellis (1994) provides SLA researchers with in-depth information about the social settings of L2 learning and potential learning outcomes related to these settings. Ellis groups the contexts for L2 learning under two main categories; ie, natural contexts and educational contexts. In natural

contexts, the individual learns the new language through their interactions with other users of this language in different situations, such as through media, at business meetings or conferences, at home or the workplace, or etc. Instead of explicit explanations of the rules and norms of the new language, the learning process relies on learners' observations and their direct participation. In other words, in natural contexts language is learnt informally. Natural contexts consist of three subcategories, namely, majority language settings (monolingual and bilingual), official language settings and international settings. Contrary to natural contexts, in educational contexts language is learnt formally through conscious attention to the rules and the norms of the target language which is considered to be a "subject matter" that is supposed to be mastered by the learners. Educational contexts comprise five subcategories; ie, segregation, mother tongue maintenance, submersion , immersion (majority language, minority language), and language classrooms. Table 2.1 demonstrates these contexts and the potential learning outcomes expected in each of them.

As explained in Table 2.1, in language classrooms the learners progress in L2 writing and reading skills, whereas they cannot show the same advancement in their oral L2 proficiency. This situation has been explained from different dimensions such as difficulty of oral performance, aptitude, attitude or etc. In addition to these explanations, Ellis (1994) proposes that the incorrect pronunciation of the language learners may simply derive from their preferences. Although many studies in SLA reveal that L2 learners aim to achieve the mastery

of a standard dialect of L2, many learners adapt a variety or varieties of the target language according to their preferences (Ellis, 1994). L2 learners' preferences are affected by their attitudes towards the target language and the social context in which they learn the language (Ellis, 1994). Therefore, deviations from the standard English which the learner is exposed to "may not be 'errors', but may simply reflect the dialect which the learner has targeted" (Ellis, 1994, p. 211).

Although Turkey has been considered to be an Expanding Circle country, the role of English is changing in some Turkish contexts, e.g. the place of English in higher education, science, technology, business etc. (Aktuna & Kızıltepe, 2005). English is not an officially spoken language in Turkey; however, in these domains it is becoming the medium of communication. Therefore, Turkey has characteristics of both Outer Circle and Expanding Circle countries. In some contexts, English is used for communication among Turkish people. For example, although many instructors and students are native speakers of Turkish, English is the medium of communication in Middle East Technical University. This situation is similar to the ones observed in Outer Circle countries. Since the role of English is changing in Turkey, foreign language classroom norms are changing, as well. That is, when speaking English language learners may generally prefer Turkish-like English pronunciation instead of trying to imitate native accents. This case cannot be explained by naming all the spoken deviations as errors, but it must be kept in mind that they might be the way of pronunciation which language learners want to use. Therefore, in some EFL classrooms located in the Expanding Circle

Table 2.1: Social contexts and potential learning outcomes

Setting	Examples	Potential learning outcomes
Natural contexts		
Majority language settings		Considerable variation in L2 proficiency: -immigrant interlanguages (stable or unstable) - subtractive bilingualism - additive bilingualism.
Monolingual	L2 English learnt in USA or UK	
Bilingual	L2 English learnt by Francophones in Canada	Subtractive bilingualism likely.
Official language settings	L2 English learnt in Nigeria; Bahasa Indonesian in Indonesia	L2 learnt as additional language; different levels of proficiency: - pidginized varieties - 'babu' - Local standards (e.g. 'New Englishes').
International settings	Use of English for tourism, business, media etc.	Functionally simplified varieties (e.g. Airsteak); Transfer of culture-bound strategies for impression management.
Educational contexts		
Segregation	Special migrant worker programmes in Germany; 'Bantu education programmes' in Namibia.	L2 proficiency may be restricted to development of 'survival skills'; CALP ² likely to be underdeveloped.
Mother tongue maintenance	Finish –medium education for Finish minority in Sweden.	High levels of L2 proficiency in both BICS ³ and CALP.
Submersion	Education in mainstream classrooms for ethnic minority students in UK and USA; withdrawal for L2 instruction.	Low academic performance resulting from many learners' failure to develop CALP; subtractive bilingualism.
Immersion		
Majority language	Bilingual education programmes for English-speaking students in Canada.	Higher level of functional L2 proficiency but grammatical proficiency fails to reach NS levels.
Minority language	Bilingual education programmes for Hispanic -speaking students in the United States.	Higher level of L2 proficiency achieved if programme attends to L1 literacy and provides plenty of comprehensible input.
Language classrooms	Foreign language classes in monolingual countries (e.g. Japan); Second language ESL classes for Francophone students in Canada.	Many learners fail to develop functional oral L2 proficiency; L2 proficiency higher in reading and writing skills.

² Cognitive/academic language proficiency

³ Basic interpersonal communication skills

Source: Ellis, 1994, p. 229

countries, like language classrooms in Turkey, native English norms might not be the norms of the classroom; rather, language learners might have English pronunciation norms that have some features of learners' native language.

Language classrooms are small groups in which classroom norms and rules regulate the behavior of the individual members. Focusing on the motivation in L2 classrooms, Dörnyei (1994) emphasizes the importance of *norm and reward system* in the classroom and its influence on the learners' attitudes and behaviors. Role of norms on the formation of human behaviors have attracted many researchers' attention in the field of sociology (Borsari & Carey, 2001; Christensen et al., 2004; Reno et al., 1993; Lapinski & Rimal, 2005; Real & Rimal, 2003; Real & Rimal, 2005; Schroeder & Prentice, 1998). These studies might shed light on the understanding of L2 classrooms' norms.

2.2. Norms

Thibaut and Kelly (cited in Bany & Johnson, 1964) define norms as behavioral rules that are “accepted, at least to some degree, by members of the group” (p.120). Although norms regulate the behaviors of the group members they do not stand for the behaviors themselves; rather they are the ideas of the group members about how a behavior should be or what the individuals expect it to be (Bany & Johnson, 1964). Therefore, one of the significant features of norms is their evaluative quality (Bany & Johnson, 1964). Bany and Johnson claim that norms refer to desired behaviors, preferred ways of thinking and believing. They

are guidelines to the group members to regulate their actions according to the group's expectations. Besides, norms help individuals "perceive and judge what is "right" and what is "wrong"- what is "appropriate", or what is "inappropriate", or what may be approved or disapproved" (Bany and Johnson, 1964, p. 120). Because L2 classrooms are social structures in nature, it has been known that there are norms which regulate the students' actions in the classroom. These norms can be determined by the guidance of the teacher, or it might emerge among the students on its own. Therefore, a norm accepted by the students can be either appreciated or disapproved by the teacher. Bany and Johnson (1964) claim that a behavior may be treated with different attitudes, therefore, a behavior which is approved by the teacher may not be approved by the classroom as a group and vice versa.

2.2.1. Descriptive and Injunctive Norms

In order to clarify the effects of social norms on human behavior, Cialdini et al. (1990) distinguished two subcategories of norms; descriptive norms and injunctive norms. Descriptive norms stand for the commonly observed behavior in a group. They only define the group members' noncompliance or compliance but not define the reward or the punishment that is assigned to that behavior. However, injunctive norms have a moral perspective and define what the group members ought to do. While descriptive norms only define noncompliance, injunctive norms provide sanctions for group members' noncompliance. Rimal and

Real (2003) claim that “whereas descriptive norms describe the prevalence of a behavior, injunctive norms refer to the extent to which individuals feel pressured into engaging in a behavior” (p. 186). Since they are different in their nature, descriptive and injunctive norms have different effects on the group members. There are different studies in sociology that focus on the differences between the effects of descriptive and injunctive norms on individual’s behavioral preferences (Christensen et al., 2004; Reno et al, 1993; Lapinski & Rimal, 2005; Real & Rimal, 2003; Real & Rimal, 2005)

Cialdini et al. (1990) conducted a study to examine the effects of descriptive and injunctive norms on littering behavior of the subjects. The results of the study showed that both descriptive and injunctive norms have influence on behavior. However, descriptive norms affect the action of the subjects only when they are made focal, whereas, injunctive norms influence the behavior even when they are not the focus. Cialdini et al. concluded that social sanctions are the main motivational component of injunctive norms.

A study conducted by Christensen et al. (2004) demonstrated that conforming injunctive norms make people feel positive emotions like pride and relief, whereas violating these norms generate negative emotions like guilt or anxiety. However, following descriptive norms do not necessarily evoke pride or relief, and deviating from descriptive norms might evoke surprise rather than guilt or anxiety (Christensen et al., 2004). Considering the injunctive norms’ effects on the feelings of group members and their behaviors, it might be illuminating for

SLA researchers who are conscious about the low L2 oral proficiency level of EFL learners to examine the injunctive norms for speaking English in L2 classrooms.

Borsari and Carey (2001) made a review of the research related to peer influences on college drinking. They claimed that peer pressure consists of three main components: overt offers of alcohol, modeling and social norms. In the article, they mentioned studies regarding the influence of injunctive and descriptive norms on behavioral preference of students and use of norms for intervention of drinking behavior and education of students. In foreign language education studies, effects of injunctive norms have not been touched upon. Therefore, studies on college drinking and norms would be a source for us to understand descriptive and injunctive norms better. Some of these studies are provided below.

Real and Rimal (2003) studied the normative effects of descriptive and injunctive norms on reducing alcohol consumption among U.S. college students. They conducted a survey with 353 college students. The study reveals that injunctive norms put pressure on people to follow the approved action. However, descriptive norms do not have such kind of a power. The study points out that the normative influence of injunctive norms is considerably higher than descriptive norms, therefore, using injunctive norms to reduce alcohol consumption would be more useful.

Real and Rimal (2005) conducted another study that aims to examine how injunctive norms, outcome expectations, and group identity moderate the influence

of descriptive norms on behavior. According to the results of the study, it is found out that injunctive norms directly affect the behavior but they don't interact with descriptive norms. One of the striking results of the research is students' preference to the injunctive norm of drinking alcohol which is approved in their social circle despite the disapproval of authority figure (eg, parents, university administrators, etc.). The researchers state that the results of the study indicate that the influence of injunctive norms is greater when the approval comes from students' social circles.

Schroeder and Prentice (1998) conducted a research study to discover the behavioral and psychological results of changing students' misperceptions about their peers' attitudes to drinking alcohol. 452 freshman students took part in the study and they answered related questionnaires before and after discussion sessions. The results showed that educating students about the norms related to alcohol consumption influence their drinking habits. As students recognized that their ideas about the common use of alcohol among the students were only their beliefs and it is a result of pluralistic ignorance, the participants' alcohol consumption decreased. During the discussions the students realized that drinking alcohol is not an injunctive norm in the group but it is only their beliefs which make them think that drinking alcohol is within the norms of the group and they should drink heavily to be approved by within that group. After the students were educated through discussions most of them quitted experiencing fear of negative evaluation of other students because they understood that drinking alcohol is not

an injunctive norm among the students but it is their misperception. The results showed that vulnerable students are strongly affected by injunctive norms and fear of negative evaluation moderates the effects of the norms.

It has been emphasized that studies in the field of sociology show that deviation from injunctive norms evokes anxiety. Besides, fear of negative evaluation moderates the effects of injunctive norms. This study aims to understand the relationship between fear of negative evaluation (a constituent of foreign language classroom anxiety) and injunctive norms for speaking English. Therefore, understanding anxiety and its effects on language learning would be useful to understand this relationship.

2.3. Anxiety

Scovel (1978) states that anxiety is a complex psychological construct which has not been totally understood yet. Hilgard et al. (cited in Scovel, 1978) define anxiety as “ a state of apprehension, a vague fear that is only indirectly associated with an object” (p. 18). Anxiety is an emotional state which is operated by the limbic system and it affects human behavior. Three methods have been used to test anxiety;

1. Behavioral tests (observation)
2. Self-reports
3. Physiological tests (Scovel, 1978).

There are three types of anxiety; trait anxiety, state anxiety and situation specific anxiety. Although, in some occasions, it is difficult to label the feeling of anxiety with only one of these categories, this categorization provides a better understanding of anxiety. Trait anxiety is defined as the likelihood of a person to get anxious in any context (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991). It is a characteristic of the individual's personality. People with high trait anxiety, "for example, psychoneurotics, are disposed to perceive the world as more dangerous or threatening than low A-trait (*trait anxiety*) individuals" (Spielberger, 1972, p. 482). State anxiety is the arousal of apprehension as a response to a definite situation at a particular time, which is personally accepted as dangerous or threatening regardless of the presence of a real threat (Spielberger cited in MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991; Spielberger, 1972); e.g. experiencing anxiety before an exam (Spielberger cited in MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991). Here, the exam is not clearly defined; any exam can be the cause of anxiety. Finally, situation specific anxiety is defined as an anxiety experienced in a specific situation or context (Ellis, 1994). In situation specific anxiety the situation is explained in detail and the person assigns their anxiety to a very specific situation or context; for example, public speaking, writing, class participation etc. (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991). Ellis (1994) explains that state anxiety is a combination of situation specific anxiety and trait anxiety; therefore, sometimes it is difficult to distinguish them from each other. MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) claim that preparing instruments within the framework of situation specific anxiety would provide more detailed

and well defined information because the respondents are asked to evaluate their anxiety in a well-defined situation. Language learning anxiety is generally considered to be situation specific anxiety. MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) state that SLA researchers who use situation specific anxiety as the base for their research on foreign language learning anxiety get more plausible and consistent results from their research.

Anxiety may have positive or negative effects on the individuals. According to its effects on people, it can be named as facilitating anxiety or debilitating anxiety (Alpert & Haber, 1960). Facilitating anxiety fosters learners' performance, though debilitating anxiety is detrimental to the performance of learners. Debilitating anxiety has been the foci of many research studies in the field of second language education.

2.3.1. Anxiety and L2 Learning

Negative effects of anxiety on L2 learning has been studied since 1970's (Liu, 2006). However, Horwitz et al. (1986) are the first researchers who stated that foreign language classroom anxiety is unique to the language learning contexts. The anxiety that is experienced when learning a new language is quite different from the anxiety observed when learning math, physics or any other subject matters. Conducting a research on the factors that affect the anxiety level of L2 learner, Horwitz et al. (1986) found out three main anxiety types that are

commonly observed and influential in language classrooms; communication apprehension, test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation.

Communication apprehension is defined as “a type of shyness characterized by fear of or anxiety about communicating with people” (Horwitz et al., 1986; p. 30). Experiencing difficulty in speaking in groups or in public, or in listening are all characterized as manifestations of communication apprehension. Communication apprehension in foreign language classrooms are significant because the speakers have sophisticated ideas to communicate but they have to express themselves in a language in which they are not proficient enough (Horwitz et al., 1986). Besides, they are probably aware that they will experience difficulty in expressing themselves in L2 and understanding when listening to others (Horwitz et al., 1986). Test anxiety is a kind of performance anxiety caused by fear of failure (Horwitz et al., 1986).

The third type of anxiety observed in language classrooms, fear of negative evaluation is described by Watson and Friend (1969) as “apprehension about others’ evaluations, distress over their negative evaluations, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively” (p. 449). Fear of negative evaluation is different from test anxiety in the sense that it is not limited to test-taking situations; rather it may be experienced in any evaluative situation (Horwitz et al., 1986). The students in foreign language classrooms are always in an evaluative context in which the “existence of the teacher, the only fluent speaker in the classroom, and real or imagined evaluation

of their peers make them feel anxious about being negatively evaluated” (Horwitz et al., 1986, p. 30).

Considering the three types of anxiety observed in language classrooms, Horwitz et al. (1986) developed a 33-item scale, Foreign Language Anxiety Scale, to measure the severity level of anxiety experienced in language classrooms. Aida (1994) used the Foreign Language Anxiety Scale to evaluate the anxiety level of learners studying Japanese. According to the results of this study, foreign language anxiety negatively affects L2 performance of the students studying Japanese. Contrary to the reports in Horwitz et al. (1986), test anxiety cannot be defined as a language specific anxiety according to the results of Aida’s study.

MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) developed an anxiety scale which is based on three-stage model of learning: Input, Processing and Output. The authors developed three stage-specific anxiety scales; Input Anxiety Scale, Processing Anxiety Scale and Output Anxiety Scale. In this study, it is pointed out that although many studies focus on the anxiety experienced in the Output stage, the anxiety level of learners in Input and Processing stages must also be taken into consideration. Because language anxiety might have both subtle and pervasive effects on the cognitive processing, not only Output stage anxiety but also Input stage anxiety and Processing stage anxiety must be evaluated by tasks designed for each individual stage. Onwuegbuzie et al. (2000) administered the three anxiety scales developed by MacIntyre and Gardner (1994). Conducting data from 258

participants, it is concluded that the three scales developed by MacIntyre and Gardner must be revised to increase their validity.

Young (1991) summarizes the studies on foreign language anxiety and proposes solutions to decrease language learners' anxiety. In this article, the author suggests six potential sources of language anxiety:

1. Personal and interpersonal anxieties
2. Learner beliefs about language learning
3. Instructor beliefs about language learning
4. Instructor-learner interactions
5. Classroom procedures
6. Language testing

Ohata (2005a) also examines the possible sources of anxiety for Japanese learners of English through in-depth interview. Six sources of anxiety declared by Young were taken as a theoretical background for the study. Five learners took part in the study and the results indicate that learners' anxiety is affected by the cultural norms in Japan. These norms affect learners' performance negatively. At the end of the article, it is suggested that the teachers should be aware of the relationship between culture and anxiety caused by cultural norms because it affects learners' performance.

... those learners who have internalized such culturally-based classroom norms might be afraid of not only losing their face for making mistakes but of being resented by their peers for outperforming others, thus, violating cultural norms. This kind of anxious feeling might be unfamiliar to some

ESL teachers unless they share the same social/cultural with their students.
(Ohata, 2005a; p. 16)

Ohata (2005b) conducted another study to investigate learners' foreign language anxiety from teachers' perspective. The data were gathered through interview with seven experienced ESL/EFL teachers. The results indicated that although there were some differences between teachers' and students' perspectives on the role of anxiety in language classrooms, they mostly overlapped with each other. It is stated in the article that the tacit nature of learner anxiety might prevent teachers from understanding learners' actual psychology. That lack of understanding might increase students' anxiety level.

A study conducted by Gregersen and Horwitz (2002) demonstrates that there is a link between foreign language anxiety and perfectionism. It is concluded that students with high anxiety and high perfectionism have common characteristics. Foreign language anxiety and perfectionism make language learning unpleasant for these students and influence their performance negatively. Therefore, it is suggested that the students should be supported with techniques to overcome their perfectionism and foreign language anxiety. When speaking the target language remembering the value of remaining calm, visualizing oneself relaxing, focusing on continuing conversation rather than mistakes are those techniques that are mentioned in the article.

Perfectionists believe that they will achieve the goal only when the outcome is perfect. Therefore, building friendly and supportive classroom

environments and explaining that mistakes are a natural part of learning; teachers can prevent the arousal of anxiety and the negative effects of perfectionism. Besides, teachers can show students how to set realistic goals and explain them the counterproductive effects of perfectionism (Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002).

It is a well-known occasion that foreign language anxiety affects L2 performance of the learners. Matsuda and Gobel (2004) administered a comprehensive study which examines the relationships between general foreign language classroom anxiety, foreign language reading anxiety, gender, extended overseas experience, and classroom performance. Freshman, junior and sophomore students taking English courses in a Japanese university participated in the study. Foreign Language Anxiety Scale (Horwitz et al., 1986) and Foreign Language Reading Anxiety Scale (Saito et al., 1999) are used to measure the anxiety level of the students. The research pointed out that students with overseas experience have lower foreign language anxiety. Gender does not affect general foreign language anxiety and foreign language reading anxiety of junior and sophomore students. However, gender plays an important role in the foreign language anxiety levels of freshman students. That is, female students are more anxious than the male students in the classroom.

Gardner et al. (1997) examines the relationships among individual difference variables simultaneously and questions their effects on learning a new language. 102 university students taking introductory French course took part in the study. The participants completed a questionnaire including items for

attitudes, motivation, achievement, self-rating scales for French proficiency, anxiety, learning strategies, aptitude, and field dependence/independence. Their final grades for the course were used to evaluate their achievement. The results show that *language anxiety, self-confidence and can do evidence* have higher correlation with achievement compared to the correlation between achievement and aptitude, motivation and attitude.

Batumlu and Erden (2007) report that low achievers experience higher foreign language anxiety than high achievers. However, gender is not a significant factor that determines the level of anxiety. Liu (2006) conducted a research in China and the study revealed similar results. It is demonstrated by the author that students with high proficiency level experience less foreign language anxiety when speaking English. However, Samimy and Saito (1996) administered a study with learners of Japanese and this study pointed out that as Japanese learners' proficiency level increases their anxiety level increases, as well. Samimy and Saito stated that foreign language anxiety of the students may change according to the characteristics of the target language.

2.3.1.1. Foreign Language Anxiety and L2 Oral Performance:

As stated by Philips (1991) oral communication is emphasized in today's language classrooms. However, practicing speaking increases learners' anxiety and decreases the enjoyment experienced when learning. Many studies have focused on anxiety with respect to oral performance in the language classrooms,

suggesting that listening and speaking are the most anxiety provoking activities for language learners (Horwitz et al., 1986; MacIntyre Gardner 1994; Meijas et al., 1991; Steinberg & Horwitz, 1986; Price, 1991). Hilleson (cited in Matsuda & Gobel, 2004) conducted a diary study and interpretation of learners' expressions revealed that not only listening and speaking but also writing and reading activities increase the anxiety level of the learners. Saito et al. (1999) administered FLCAS and Foreign Language Classroom Reading Anxiety Scale (FLCARS), a scale developed to measure the anxiety level of learners specific to reading activities. According to this study they claimed that there is a relationship between foreign language anxiety and foreign language reading anxiety of the participants; i.e. learners of French, Japanese and Russian. Although foreign language reading anxiety has parallel features of general foreign language anxiety, it is pointed out that foreign language reading anxiety has some significant features. Like foreign language reading anxiety, foreign language writing anxiety is also a specific type of anxiety which is also related to general foreign language anxiety. Cheng et al. (1999) buttressed the significant features of foreign language writing anxiety through a study that they conducted in Taiwan with learners of English. They administered FLCAS and a translated version of Writing Apprehension Test which was developed by Daly and Miller (cited in Cheng et al., 1999). The results showed that foreign language writing anxiety is related but distinguishable from general foreign language anxiety. The results indicate that low self-confidence is an important constituent of language learning anxiety.

Krashen, Terrel and Hadley state that speaking is the most anxiety provoking language skill (as cited in Young, 1992). Krashen claims that language learners speak the target language before they are ready and proficient enough to do that. Therefore, they feel very anxious when speaking the target language. Pronunciation is the main source of speaking anxiety for Hadley. He claims that learners have to use the correct language structures; meanwhile they have to pay attention to the correct pronunciation of their utterances.

Lindy Woodrow (2006) mentions that speaking to a native speaker is more anxiety provoking than speaking to a nonnative speaker. She examines English speaking anxiety both inside and outside the classroom context and concludes that learners experience less anxiety in the classroom. Besides, students having a Confucian background experience more anxiety when speaking English. In the study, students from Europe and Vietnam experienced less anxiety compared to the participants from China, Korea and Japan. That is, in academic contexts nationality and culture affect learners' anxiety level when they are speaking in the lessons.

Lefkowitz and Hedgcock (2002) carried out a study to explore psychosocial factors that prevent students from approximating native like pronunciation. They studied with 282 adult language learners in the foreign language context. The quantitative data were supported with interviews and observations. It is emphasized that learners' concerns about their classmates' approval might contribute to their intended or unintended mispronunciation. The results indicate

that the learners appreciate native like pronunciation and they want to achieve that prescribed pronunciation. Nevertheless, they do not put their ideal into practice because they are anxious about their social status and solidarity. Furthermore, the learners are not knowledgeable enough to assess the differences between their pronunciation and the target one. Therefore, they cannot evaluate their pronunciation accurately.

Comparing the effects of culture and linguistic proficiency on East Asian students' oral participation in U.S university classrooms, Lee (2007) claims that linguistic factors are more influential on students' oral participation in the lessons than their cultural background. Lee also points out that these students feel anxious when they are speaking English because they are afraid of making mistakes and being negatively evaluated by their peers. Young (1990) states that learners feel anxious because they don't want to be negatively evaluated by their peers when speaking English. Young (1990) emphasizes the effects of the evaluative classroom context on students' foreign language anxiety and points out that "speaking in the foreign language is not exclusively the source of students' anxiety, but that speaking in front of the class is" (p. 539). Therefore, speaking activities must be designed in such a way that they do not increase the anxiety level of the students (Young, 1990).

2.4. Fear of Negative Evaluation

Fear of negative evaluation (FNE) is a kind of social anxiety which is called “evaluation anxiety” by Beck and Emery (cited in Leary & Kowalsky, 1995). FNE is labeled as the core feature of social anxiety (Weeks et al., 2007). Watson and Friend (1969) define fear of negative evaluation as “apprehension about others’ evaluations, distress over their negative evaluations, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively” (p. 449).

When people experience fear of negative evaluation this does not necessarily mean that they evaluate themselves negatively. Fear of negative evaluation can be identical to fear of loss of social approval (Watson & Friend, 1969). People with high FNE feel nervous in evaluative situations and they seek for the social approval. Moreover, “the threat of negative evaluation might increase the chances of eliciting compliant behavior if the individual is in a state of anxiety and appraises that he can reduce anxiety through compliance” Watson & Friend, 1969, p. 456). A person experiencing FNE would seek for nonevaluative social contexts (Watson & Friend, 1969). It is pointed out by Watson and Friend (1969):

If fear of negative evaluation is an avoidance motive, then a person high in FNE might try to gain social approval simply as a way of avoiding disapproval. Individuals high on FNE might be expected to be most affected by the possibility of disapproval. (p. 454)

However, lack of FNE does not mean that the subject wants positive evaluation of the people; rather they are not concerned about others' evaluations. FNE may operate in any social context which has an evaluative nature; therefore, FNE is different from test anxiety which is specific to testing conditions (Watson & Friend, 1969).

In order to measure FNE, Watson and Friend (1969) constructed a 30-item scale called Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale. The scale items suggesting two options, true and false, and the participants chose whether a statement is true for themselves or not.

Leary (1983) developed a shortened version of that scale which consists of 12 items; this scale is called Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale (BFNE). Some further studies verified that BFNE is as comprehensive as FNE (Collins et al., 2005; Duke et al., 2006). Duke et al. (2006) state that BFNE has high internal consistency; $\alpha = .94$ for positive scored factors and $\alpha = .73$ for negative scored factors, and $\alpha = .80$ for the full BFNE scale. Collins et al. (2005) claim that BFNE has excellent inter-item reliability ($\alpha = .97$) and its 2-week test-retest reliability is $r = .94$. These studies indicate that validity and reliability of BFNE is very high. Since the result obtained from BFNE are parallel with FNE results, using BFNE to measure the level of fear of negative evaluation is both useful and practical.

2.4.1 Fear of Negative Evaluation and L2 Learning

Fear of negative evaluation is an important factor that affects speaking performance of L2 learners. Horwitz et al. (1986) claim that the students' performance are constantly evaluated by the only fluent speaker, teacher. Besides, "students may also be acutely sensitive to the evaluations- real or imagined- of their peers" (p. 30). Therefore, students' fear of negative evaluation is obviously evoked in foreign language classrooms (Horwitz et al., 1986). In some other studies, it is stated that making oral mistakes make students experience fear of negative evaluation of other students. For example, Young (1990) pointed out that most Spanish learners stated that they would be willing to speak in the lesson if they were not afraid of making mistakes. Fear of making pronunciation mistakes and speaking in front of their peers were specified as situations that evoke anxiety in language classrooms by Price (1991). Kitano (2001) carried out a research study to investigate the effects of two potential causes of foreign language anxiety, fear of negative evaluation and self-perceived speaking ability, on college students' oral performance in Japanese classrooms. The results of the study demonstrated that if learners consider themselves as being less competent in Japanese, they feel more fear of negative evaluation. Especially male students feel more fear of negative anxiety when they think that they are not as competent as their peers. The study showed that fear of negative evaluation increases general anxiety level of the students. However, there is not an interaction between fear of negative evaluation and self-perceived speaking ability. Although errors are a part of language learning

they may be the source of anxiety for some language learners who are aware that making positive social impressions is difficult when speaking a new language (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989). As mentioned before, Lee (2007) points out that the learners do not want to speak in foreign language lessons because they do not want to be negatively evaluated by their peers for their mistakes.

Research indicates that fear of negative evaluation is one of the main sources of general foreign language classroom anxiety. Fear of being negatively evaluated by their peers may make students avoid doing activities that are necessary to improve their second language proficiency (Matsuda & Gobel, 2001). For example, learners with higher fear of negative evaluation may avoid from speaking in the lessons. In addition, fear of negative evaluation increases general foreign language anxiety level of the learners (Kitano, 2001). Avoidance from social disapproval is the key element of fear of negative evaluation. Watson and Friend (1969) claim that “a person high in FNE might try to gain social approval simply as a way of avoiding disapproval” (p. 454).

Studies concerning fear of negative evaluation in language learning emphasize that language learners feel fear of being negatively evaluated when they are speaking L2 because of their oral mistakes (Horwitz et al., 1986; Kitano, 2001; Lee, 2007; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989; Young, 1990). However, Watson and Friend (1969) define fear of negative evaluation as “apprehension about others’ evaluations, distress over their negative evaluations, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively” (p.

449). The reason for L2 speakers' fear of negative evaluation require further research because making mistakes might be only one of the reasons that evokes the disapproval of other students. What if there are some injunctive norms accepted by the students that define how the members of the language classroom should speak the target language? Then deviating from these norms would be the main source of fear of negative evaluation. Hence, focusing on only the assumption that language learners are conscious about their mistakes when speaking English may limit our perspective to only one of the factors that affects fear of negative evaluation in language classrooms. Therefore, pointing out the injunctive norms that define the sanctions of the language classrooms for speaking English would provide further information about the reasons for the fear of negative evaluation experienced by language learners.

Thus, in this research, related studies in the literature are employed to prepare the ground for the present research, design the research materials and to interpret the results. Based on the information obtained from research studies on injunctive norms, foreign language classroom anxiety and FNE a preliminary study was conducted and qualitative and quantitative data gathering instruments are developed. Then, the interpretation of the results are fostered by these studies.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS

AND INTERPRETATION

3.0. Presentation

This chapter provides information about the methodology of the research. First, an overall explanation of the design of the study is presented. Then, information about the participants is provided and the characteristics of the setting are explained briefly. Finally, information about the instruments used in the study, data collection and analysis procedures are provided.

3.1 Design of the Study

Considering the research design types provided by Gass and Mackey (2005), the current study can be labeled as a correlational (associational) research. In correlational research, correlations between or among two or more factors are defined, and the predictions are based on the relationships between these factors. This study is designed to investigate the injunctive norms for speaking English in EFL classrooms, and aims to understand the relationship between these norms and the fear of negative evaluation. In order to achieve this aim, the quantitative data gathered through the questionnaires are supported with the qualitative data obtained from the interviews with students.

After conducting an unstructured interview with nine volunteering students (6 freshman students and 3 second year students) and observing one hour of the “Listening and Pronunciation” lessons of all the sections, the researcher determined the potential key points about the injunctive norms for English pronunciation and how students feel when they deviate from these norms. Besides, the researcher figured out the main features of the types of pronunciations used in the classroom. Three main types of pronunciations were found out after that procedure, namely, native like English pronunciation, Turkish-like English pronunciation and speaking with pronunciation mistakes. Then, a comprehensive questionnaire was designed to unearth the English speaking injunctive norms and their relations with fear of negative evaluation based on these interviews and the related research studies. The questionnaire results were supported with a semi-structured interview consisting of 10 main questions (see Appendix F for the interview questions). The data obtained from likert scale items were evaluated through SPSS 13.0 (Statistical Package of Social Sciences) and the results of the open ended questionnaire items and the interview responses are evaluated via content analysis.

The freshman students are divided into three sections according to the alphabetic order of their surnames. Each section has a different instructor and each one follows a different syllabus with different schedules. The two sections in which the numbers of male and female students are more homogenous were chosen for the main study. Students in the third section (N= 25) participated in the

first piloting of the questionnaire. After the first piloting the questionnaire was revised and a second piloting was conducted with 31 second year students. The questionnaire was administered and the interviews were conducted in the seventh week of the spring semester, in the middle of the second semester.

3.2 Research Questions

The current study aims to answer the following research questions.

1. What are the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation for freshman students in the Department of Foreign Languages Education at METU?

1.3 Which English pronunciation, i.e. native like, nonnative or wrong pronunciation, is the most appreciated one among the students?

1.4 Which English pronunciation, i.e. native like, nonnative or wrong pronunciation, is the least appreciated one among the students?

2. What is the relationship between in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation and fear of negative evaluation?

2.1 Do the students feel anxious about their peers' negative evaluation when they make mistakes while speaking English?

2.2 Do the students feel anxious about their peers' negative evaluation when they attempt to imitate native speakers' performance?

2.3 Do the students feel anxious about their peers' negative evaluation when they adapt their English pronunciation according to their native language?

3.3 Participants

The data were gathered from 58 (50=F, 8=M) freshman students at Middle East Technical University Department of Foreign Language Education in the spring semester. METU is an English medium university and students should be proficient in English to accomplish their academic aims. Being proficient in English is important for students at METU, Department of Foreign Language Education mainly for two reasons. First, these students will be teachers of English in four years. Second, they should use English effectively to achieve their academic aims. Hence, freshman students at the Department of Foreign Language Education take courses, which are offered as ‘must’ courses, to improve their English language skills. In the department, students become English teachers in four years span and they are supposed to be good at four skills of English language. Therefore, speaking English with a good pronunciation is important for these learners. Besides, since they are in an EFL setting, classroom is the main context in which they can practice their English pronunciation skills.

In order to improve EFL freshman students’ English pronunciation skills and oral communication abilities, the students take the “Listening and Pronunciation” course in the first semester and they take the “Oral Communication Skills” course in the second semester. The “Listening and Pronunciation” course aims to develop students’ listening and pronunciation skills while encouraging confidence in communicating through English. This course focuses on fundamentals of listening skills (e. g. note- taking, predicting, guessing meaning

from the context etc.) and phonetics (i.e., segmentals , supra-segmentals, phonetic alphabet). In addition, the students are provided with communication-oriented classroom activities by which they can improve their oral communication skills. The “Oral Communication Skills” aims to develop students’ oral communication competence. Students practice suprasegmentals of English and they improve their strategic competence to continue communication in informal and formal contexts. This course includes communicative activities like discussions, and oral presentations. Reading and listening activities are also integrated into the communicative activities.

All the participants are from Turkey and Turkish is their mother tongue. The proportion of male participants is smaller than the female samples and that reflects the general distribution in the department. The students ranged in age from 17 to 19 and they were all Turkish students. 10 (F= 6, M= 4) volunteer students answered the questionnaire and took part in the interviews.

The freshman students were put into three sections based on the alphabetic order of their surnames. Participants in one of the sections (N= 25) took part in the first piloting of the questionnaire and in the interview. Since other two sections had more homogenous distribution of male and female students, they were included in the main study. However, the numbers of male and female students were relatively less homogenous in this section. Therefore, this section was especially assigned for the piloting. After piloting the items with that group it is recognized that some items should be changed. Then, the questionnaire was

revised and piloted with 31 second year students from the same department to check its reliability.

3.4. Setting

The research was carried out in Middle East Technical University, at the Department of Foreign Language Education, at METU. English is the medium of communication in the Department of Foreign Language Education. The students have to pass an English proficiency exam prepared by the university, or get an equivalent grade from TOEFL before they start their education in the department. The ones who cannot pass the exam take English courses offered from the Department of Basic English to get prepared for the proficiency exam.

3.5. Data Collection Instruments

The data was collected through both qualitative and quantitative data gathering instruments. Before designing the instruments for the study the researcher conducted a preliminary study to build a framework for the questionnaire and the interview questions. The researcher had interviews with 9 students; 3 second year and 6 first year students. Having an interview with these students, the researcher aimed to confirm her assumptions about injunctive norms for English pronunciation and its relationship with FNE, and to explore further points related to this issue which she hadn't thought before. The second year students were included in the preliminary study. They had more experience in the

department then the freshman students and they still remembered their first year in the department. Therefore, they could evaluate their states better and talked about their current and previous anxieties freely. The preliminary study was conducted in Turkish. Although the researcher asked some basic questions to guide the interview, it was an unstructured interview which progressed according to the answers of the students. The students' answers showed that they were conscious about their friends' ideas about their pronunciation when speaking English. They claimed that imitating the native pronunciation was accepted among the students as showing off and artificial. Besides, they stated that making pronunciation mistakes that irritate others and hinder communication was not approved by the students in their classroom. The researcher read a sentence in three different ways. First, with native like pronunciation; second, with Turkish-like English pronunciation and finally with a very bad pronunciation which was full of pronunciation mistakes. Then, she wanted the interviewees to point out the one which was most approved among the students. The students responded that the second pronunciation, Turkish-like English pronunciation, was the most favored type of pronunciation among the students. They also mentioned that they paid attention to use the type of pronunciation which was most favored among the students and they observed their friends' performances to match their pronunciation to this one when speaking English in the classroom. Furthermore, the interviewees emphasized that if they did not match their pronunciation with the favored one their friends might not approve their pronunciation or mock their way

of speaking; therefore, they felt safer when they used Turkish-like English pronunciation in the classroom.

In addition, the researcher observed at least one lesson of each section taking the Listening and Pronunciation course in the fall semester. These observations were used to verify the statements of the preliminary interview results and to develop the questionnaire items and interview questions.

Considering the data gathered from the preliminary study two different instruments were developed to gather data to explore the research questions. First, a questionnaire was designed. Then, after the administration of the questionnaire some interview questions were developed to support the data gathered from the questionnaire. Then, a semi-structured interview was conducted in the light of these questions.

3.5.1. Questionnaire

The questionnaire developed for this study consists of both open-ended and closed items. Open-ended items are the ones which do not offer options; rather, the participants write the answer as they wish. Therefore, open-ended items provide unpredictable and more insightful answers (Gass & Mackay, 2005). Although closed items provide the options for the participants and limit the scope of the answers; they are easy to quantify and analyze, and they provide uniformity of measurement which guarantees greater reliability (Gass & Mackay, 2005). Before piloting the items were evaluated by four specialists; a Turkish instructor, a

testing specialist, a psychologist and a specialist in ELT. According to their feedback the questionnaire was revised and redesigned. Considering the feedback, a sample recording reflecting the type of pronunciation described in the statement was added for each item and some items were reworded (see Appendix A, Appendix D).

The questionnaire consists of 25 items and four main parts. The first part (part A) is for demographic information and it is adapted from Gass and Mackey (2005). In the second part (part B), the first question is a multiple choice question which requires the participants to choose the expression that describes the English pronunciation which is most commonly preferred by the students. The second question is an open ended question which aims to investigate the reasons for the preference of that pronunciation, and the last one is also an open ended question which asks the reasons for which other pronunciations are not preferred. In the third and fourth parts of the questionnaire a five point likert scale is used (from 1 totally disagree to 5 totally agree). The third part (part C) includes 10 items developed to unearth the commonly approved English pronunciation among the students. The last part (part D) consists of 12 items, which aims to discover the relationship between FNE and in-class injunctive norms for pronunciation.

In the initial version of the questionnaire all the items were written on the questionnaire and given to students. The learners were required to listen to the recordings from an mp3 player and answer the items. However, after the first piloting of the questionnaire it was recognized that the learners did not listen to the

recordings but they just read the following items to answer the questionnaire as soon as possible. Therefore, the items for part C and part D are presented as a power point presentation reflected through a projector. This application allowed the researcher to be sure that the participants listened to the related recordings. Besides, the learners participated in the first piloting stated that they answered the questions according to teachers' perspective and ignored students' perspective though students' perspective is the ultimate concern of the current study. The students pointed out that in each statement it must be overtly stated that the main concern is students' perspective. The participants suggested to change some examples to make them more understandable. According to the feedback the questionnaire was revised and 5 students (3 took part in the first piloting and 2 of them had never seen the questionnaire before) gave feedback to the researcher for the final version of the questionnaire. That feedback session was handled in the researchers' office and the students and the researcher discussed each item until they reached a consensus for the final version of the items. Then, the questionnaire was piloted with second year students for the second time. At the very beginning of the application the researcher orally emphasized that they should focus on students' ideas and feelings and not be concerned about teachers' ideas. 31 second year students from the Department of Foreign Language Education took part in the second piloting. According to the findings of the reliability analysis, overall reliability coefficients for 22 items were calculated as "Alpha=.728" (see Appendix C). This shows that the reliability of the questionnaire is acceptable

since the reliability should be at least “.70” to be considered as reliable (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003).

58 first year students answered the questionnaire during course time. Answering the questionnaire took 20-25 minutes. The results of the likert scale items were evaluated through statistical analysis and the responses for open ended questions were assessed by content analysis.

Gass and Mackey (2005) claim that it is preferable to prepare the items in the mother tongue of the participants. Therefore, the questionnaire items are in Turkish (see, Appendix A). However, the questionnaire was translated into English by the translator (see, Appendix D).

3. 5. 2. Interview

Gass and Mackey (2005) state that researchers can investigate phenomena which cannot be directly observed by using interviews. Supporting the quantitative results obtained from the questionnaire with an interview will enhance the vista of the interpretations of the results. Therefore, an interview protocol with 10 questions was designed (see, Appendix E). The questions were developed during the preliminary study and revised and reevaluated during these interview sessions. The interviews were conducted in Turkish, the native tongue of the participants in order to allow participants to express themselves better. The questions were translated into English by the researcher (see, Appendix F).

The interviewees were chosen according to quota sampling. In quota sampling the researcher determines a quota for each category of samples. In the current study it is decided to have 6 (3 from each section) female samples and 4 (2 from each sections) male samples. The percentage of female students is higher than male students in the department; therefore, the samples of the questionnaire are also female dominant. Hence, the number of female respondents was determined to be higher than the male participants so as to a parallelism between the sampling of the questionnaire and the interviews will be achieved. Before the application of the questionnaires it was announced to the students that volunteering students were needed for the interview. Then, the quota was filled with the first applicants volunteered to participate in the interviews.

A semi-structured interview was conducted with six participants. 10 questions to elicit answers for the research questions were used in the semi-structured interview, but still the researcher had the freedom to digress to get more information (Gass & Mackey, 2005). Each interview session took maximum 45 minutes. Interview questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 are to elicit in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation, and questions 5, 9 and 10 are to investigate feelings of the speakers so as to fear of negative evaluation.

The interviews were recorded through digital sound recorders and conducted in the office of the researcher. In order to decrease the anxiety of the interviewees and get more accurate answers no other person was allowed to be in the room during the interviews. The interviewee asked the questions one by one

and followed with new questions according to the answers of the interviewee. The aim was to make the students think more on the topic and gather more information about the issue. The recordings were listened by once and the important points were transcribed after the second listening. The results were categorized and evaluated by using content analysis.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.0 Presentation

Analyses of the data conducted through the questionnaire, and the interview questions are presented in this chapter. The quantitative data were analyzed through Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS for Windows13.0), and the qualitative data were analyzed using content analysis.

The data gathered from the likert scale items and the multiple-choice item were analyzed through descriptive statistics in the SPSS. After the analyses of each item, the total frequency and percentage rates of the responses were presented in the form of tables and figures. The data gathered through open ended questions and interviews were analyzed through content analysis. The results are presented under two main categories which prepare the ground for the research, i.e. *Social Perspective* and *Psychological Perspective*. According to the aims of the research questions, the subtitles for each main category were determined.

The first research question is related to a social issue that influences English pronunciation; it focuses on in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation. Therefore, the subtitles for the first category were decided as features of the commonly used pronunciation, reasons for its common use and in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation. The second research question is related to a psychological concern and it aims to find an answer for the

relationship between in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation and FNE. Therefore, the second category has only one subtitle; i.e. feelings of the speaker. Analysis of each questionnaire item is given under the relevant subtitles. Following this, related responses gathered through the interview sessions are presented under each subtitle.

4.1. Analysis of the Responses Related to the Social Perspective

4.1.1. Analyses of questionnaire item: “Features of the commonly used English Pronunciation”

The first item⁴ (Which of the following statements describe the most commonly used English pronunciation in your classroom?) in the questionnaire is a multiple choice question which investigates the most commonly used English pronunciation in the classroom. Three different ways of pronunciation (i.e. Turkish-like English pronunciation, native like pronunciation and speaking with pronunciation errors) are described in three choices and the participants are required to choose the one which depicts the most frequently used English pronunciation in their classrooms.

⁴ All of the questionnaire items are presented in the appendix.

Table 4.1: Results for Item-1in Part B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Turkish-like English pronunciation	49	84,5	87,5	87,5
	Native like	3	5,2	5,4	92,9
	With error	4	6,9	7,1	100,0
	Total	56	96,6	100,0	
Missing	0	2	3,4		
Total		58	100,0		

As Table 4.1 shows, Turkish like pronunciation of English is the most commonly used pronunciation in the classrooms with a value of 87.5 %. Speaking English with pronunciation errors is the second mostly preferred way of pronunciation with the value of 7.1%. Finally, native like pronunciation is the least commonly preferred way of English pronunciation (5.4%).

4.1.2. Analysis of interview responses: “Features of the commonly used English Pronunciation”

Responses gathered from the interviews confirm that the most commonly employed English pronunciation in the classrooms is Turkish-like English pronunciation (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Interview responses regarding the most commonly used English pronunciation

	f	%
Turkish-like English pronunciation is the most commonly used way of pronunciation in the classroom.	10	100 %

In the interviews, the interviewees are required to describe the most commonly preferred English pronunciation in detail. The results are demonstrated in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Interview responses regarding features of the most commonly used English pronunciation

	f	%
The most commonly preferred English pronunciation in the classroom...		
	10	100%
does not sound native like	10	100%
has Turkish intonation patterns	10	100%
includes sounds are neither Turkish nor English		

The results in Table 4.3 provide detailed information about the features of the commonly preferred English pronunciation. Responses gathered from the interviewees strongly confirm the results gathered through the first item in the

questionnaire. According to Table 4.3, the most commonly preferred English pronunciation does not sound native like (f=10), and it has Turkish intonation patterns (f=10). Focusing on the pronunciation of sounds it can be concluded that sounds are neither absolutely Turkish nor pure English sounds, they are somewhere in between. (f=10). In the excerpts provided below, participants commented on their pronunciation:

Only the words are English. We use Turkish stress patterns. I mean neither English nor Turkish; it is a mixture of both. (Interviewee 1)

Our pronunciation is like an adaptation of Turkish into English. I mean, for example intonation that we use in Turkish has a flat structure, English people use a more fluctuating intonation. The one that we use is not like the one used by the natives much. Sounds that we use, I mean, of course they gradually become more approximate (to the native pronunciation), but still they are different from the ones that natives use. (Interviewee 2)

I mean, the sounds are not articulated from its correct place. Then, these sounds become more Turkish like. However, they are not exactly Turkish sounds, but they cannot be articulated from the accurate place (to be heard like a native sound). (Interviewee 3)

4.1.3. Analysis of questionnaire items: for “Reasons for its common use”

Item 2 (What can be the reasons for the common use of that pronunciation compared to other two ways pronunciation described in the other options?) and item 3 (What can be the reasons for the common use of that pronunciation compared to other two ways pronunciation described in the other options?) in Part

B investigates the reasons for the common preference of the English pronunciation described in item 1. Both item 2 and item 3 are open ended questions, and the results are evaluated through content analysis. According to the results of the content analysis 6 main points are determined for the second question (Table 4.4). As it is revealed in Table 4.4 the *effects of L1* is the most frequently mentioned reason for that preference (f=24). *Being in EFL context* appears to be the second reason for the preference (f=13). *Lack of practice and knowledge* is the third reason (f=11). *Lack of speaking courses at high school* (f=10) is the next reason mentioned by the participants. The fifth reason is *group effect* (f=5) which means everybody speaks in a similar way and this makes people prefer speaking in that way. The last reason is *focusing on conveying the message and being understood by others* (f=4).

Table 4.4: Interview responses regarding the common preference of Turkish like pronunciation

	f
Effects of L1(Turkish)	24
Being in EFL context	13
Lack of practice and knowledge	11
Lack of speaking courses at high school	10
Group effect	5
Focusing on conveying the message and being understood	4

Although the third question in part B requires participants to explain the reason why the other two types of pronunciation defined in other two options are not used as common as the one which is chosen in the first question, the content analysis of the answers showed that the participants tended to explain why students do not prefer native pronunciation and didn't make much comment on option c (speaking with pronunciation mistakes). Only three participants mentioned that the students do not speak with pronunciation mistakes because they will be English teachers after three years. Four points are determined after the evaluation of the answers (see Table 4.5). The results indicate that the most frequently mentioned reason is *fear of being picked up by others* (f=16). The second reason is *lack of practice and knowledge in speaking* (f=13). The third point is *focusing on conveying the message and being understood and ignoring pronunciation* (f=6). The last reason is *difficulty of speaking with native like pronunciation* (f=4).

Table 4.5: Reasons for the rare practice of native like pronunciation

	f
Fear of being picked up by others	16
Lack of practice and knowledge	13
Focusing on conveying the message and being understood	6
Difficulty of speaking with native pronunciation	4

4.1.4 Analysis of interview responses: “Reasons for its common use”

Table 4.6: Interview responses regarding the common use of Turkish-like English pronunciation

	f	%
Lack of speaking courses at high school	7	70%
Lack of practice and knowledge	6	60%
Lack of a speaking test in the University Entrance Exam	5	50%
Easier to speak	2	20%

The responses obtained from the interviews are parallel with the results of the open ended questionnaire items. According to Table 4.6., Turkish-like English pronunciation is commonly used among the students because they do not have sufficient practice and knowledge (f=60). Besides, they haven't had speaking courses at high school (f=7). Moreover, the participants mentioned the negative backwash effect of the University Entrance Exams on their speaking skills (f=5). Finally, speaking Turkish-like English pronunciation is easier for them (f=2). An explanation provided by one of the respondents is like a summary of the reasons for the common use of Turkish-like English pronunciation.

We are freshman students now. At high school, at 2nd and 3rd grade we focused on the University Entrance Exam. Therefore, only our test taking

skills developed and we cannot claim that we had sufficient listening and speaking courses at high school... (Interviewee 4)

4.1.5. Analysis of questionnaire items: “In-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation”

After the preliminary study three main ways of pronunciation were discovered to be observed in the classrooms; Turkish-like English pronunciation, native like pronunciation and mispronunciation. Items in Part C aim to examine which one of these three pronunciation types are approved according to the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation.

Item 2 (When one of my classmates uses similar Turkish consonants instead of some English consonants that we are not used to pronouncing, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.), item 4 (When one of my classmates uses similar Turkish vowels instead of some English vowels that we are not used to pronouncing, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange), item 8 (When one of my classmates utters English words with Turkish word stress other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.) and item-10 (When one of my classmates speaks English with a Turkish like intonation other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.) are to understand if using Turkish-like English pronunciation is approved among the students. Item-1 (When one of my classmates emulates consonant pronunciation of British or American people, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.), item 3 (When one of my classmates emulates vowel pronunciation of

British or American people, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.) , item 7 (When one of my classmates emulates word stress of British or American people, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.) and item 9 (When one of my classmates emulates intonation of British or American people other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.) are to evaluate whether native like pronunciation is approved in the classroom. Finally, item 5 (When one of my classmates utters a single sound in the place of a diphthong, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.) and item 6 (When one of my classmates pronounces a consonant which are scribed but not uttered, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.) are to evaluate if pronunciation mistakes are approved by the students. Summary results for Turkish like pronunciation are presented in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Summary results for Turkish-like English pronunciation

	1	2	3	4	5	N
C2. When one of my classmates uses similar Turkish consonants instead of some English consonants that we are not used to pronouncing, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.	N=3 5.2%	N=41 70.7%	N=9 15.5%	N=4 6.9%	N=1 1.7%	58
C4. When one of my classmates uses similar Turkish vowels instead of some English vowels that we are not used to pronouncing, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.	N=6 10.3%	N=39 67.2%	N=6 10.3%	N=6 10.3%	N=1 1.7%	58
C8. When one of my classmates utters English words with Turkish word stress other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.	N=7 12.1%	N=32 55.2%	N=4 6.9%	N=13 22.4%	N=2 3.4%	58
C10. When one of my classmates speaks English with a Turkish like intonation other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.	N=7 12.1%	N=34 58.6%	N=7 12.1%	N=10 17.2%	N=0	58

Note. Column values: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, 5=

Strongly Agree, N= Population

According to the results, most of the respondents disagree (55.2 %) or strongly disagree (12.1%) with item 2. For item 4, again most of the participant disagree (67.2 %) or strongly disagree (10.3 %). A similar distribution is observed in item 8 (D= 55. 2%, SD=12.1%) and item 10 (D= 58.6 %, SD=12.1%). It could be interpreted from the results that Turkish-like English pronunciation is approved among the students. In other words, according to the in-class injunctive norms for

English pronunciation speaking English with Turkish sounds and intonation patterns is an approved behavior.

Table 4.8 demonstrates the summary of the results for native like pronunciation.

Table 4.8: Summary results for native like pronunciation

	1	2	3	4	5	N
C1. When one of my classmates emulates consonant pronunciation of British or American people, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.	N=5 8.6%	N=30 51.7%	N=7 12.1%	N=16 27.6%	N=0	58
C3. When one of my classmates emulates vowel pronunciation of British or American people, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.	N=1 1.7%	N=26 44.8%	N=10 17.2%	N=20 34.5%	N=1 1.7%	58
C7. When one of my classmates emulates word stress of British or American people, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.	N=10 17.2%	N=27 55.2%	N=14 6.9%	N=4 22.4%	N=3 3.4%	58
C9. When one of my classmates emulates intonation of British or American people other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.	N=6 10.3%	N=35 58.6%	N=5 8.6%	N=12 20.7%	N=1 1.7%	58

Note. Column values: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree, N= Population

According to the responses native like pronunciation is an approved behavior in the classroom. For item 1 most of the participants disagree (51.7%) or

strongly disagree (8.6 %) and they state that native like pronunciation of the consonants is an approved way of speaking. They also refused the statement in item 3 (D=44.8%, SD=1.7%) and this shows that native like pronunciation of the vowels are approved in the classroom. Statements in item 7 (D=55.2%, SD=17.2%) and item 9 (D= 58.6 %, SD= 10.3%) are also rejected and it is revealed that emulation of native stress and intonation is an approved way of speaking in the classroom.

In the table below, summary of the results for pronunciation mistakes are provided. According to the responses, most of the participants refuse the statement in item 5 (D= 75.9, SD=10.3%); however, most of them agree with the statement in item 6 (A=51.7%, SA= 36,2%).

Table 4.9: Summary results for pronunciation mistakes

	1	2	3	4	5	N
C5. When one of my classmates utters a single sound in the place of a diphthong, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.	N=6 10.3%	N=44 75.9%	N=2 3.4%	N=6 10.3%	N=0	58
C6. When one of my classmates pronounces a consonant which are scribed but not uttered, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.	N=0	N=6 10.3%	N=1 1.7%	N=30 51.7%	N=21 36.2%	58

Note. Column values: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree, N= Population

It could be concluded that a mistake like using a single sound in the place of a diphthong is approved while uttering a sound which is not pronounced at all is not approved in the classroom.

According to Table 4.9 some pronunciation mistakes are approved while some others are not. An illuminating answer for this difference is obtained from the interviews and given in the following part which stands for the interview results. The responses gathered through the questionnaire indicate that both Turkish-like English pronunciation and native like pronunciation are approved according to the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation.

4.1.6 Analysis of interview responses: “In-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation”

Although the data obtained from the questionnaire provides a framework for the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation, detailed information is gathered through the responses of the interview. Table 4.10 shows that most of the interviewees accept that there are tacit rules that regulate English pronunciation in the classroom (f=8).

Table 4.10: Interview responses regarding the existence of tacit rules that determine English pronunciation

	f	%
We have implicit norms that determine English pronunciation preferred among the students.	8	80%

According to the responses gathered from the interviews these norms provide a frame of reference for English pronunciation which should be used in the classroom. Students claim that they put pressure on each other and affect each other.

We all influence each other. We think that nobody in the classroom speaks like that and if I utter it, others might laugh at me. (Interviewee 5)

An interviewee claims that the type of English pronunciation that a student hears from his/her classmates determines the norms that s/he follows when speaking.

S/he (the student) uses the pronunciation that s/he has heard from his/her friends frequently. Not the instructors, but the friends, because our instructors do not regard us as strange because of our pronunciation but our friends do. (Interviewee 8)

Theory suggests that, I mean, we should speak with American or British English; however, under the pressure of their friends people feel that they should sound Turkish like. (Interviewee 7)

The features of English pronunciation suggested by these norms are presented in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Interview responses regarding the features of in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation

	f	%
According to these norms...		
one should speak English with Turkish intonation	8	80%
one should pronounce English sounds which are well-known by everybody	7	70%
one should follow the pronunciation rules emphasized by the instructors	7	70%
one should speak English like the others	7	70%
one should not emulate native like pronunciation if s/he cannot sound native like	3	30%

Most of the participants claim that using Turkish like intonation is approved in the classroom (f=8). From the questionnaire items it was concluded that enunciation of native like pronunciation is approved in the classroom. However, the results of the interviews show that it is approved only when the speaker really sounds native like (f=3); otherwise, if a speaker attempts to speak native like but cannot achieve it, that attempt is not appreciated by other students. Behaving like the other members of the classroom and using similar pronunciation is highly approved among students (f=7). Besides, a speaker should be able to pronounce some sounds that are well known by every body (f=7) and follow some pronunciation rules emphasized by the instructors (f=7).The students state that they have developed a

way of English pronunciation for years and they have got accustomed to hearing and speaking with that pronunciation. Some rules which are overemphasized by the instructors are taken into consideration but they generally ignore the others and use their own way of speaking.

Our pronunciation reflects the type of pronunciation that we all learnt before, I mean, we cannot change our pronunciation after a period of time or it is difficult to change. We can say that the things that we have learnt before are approved. Or, if there are some certain pronunciation rules that are underlined by the instructors, these rules are taken into consideration. (Interviewee 2)

The pronunciation rules which are not taught and remaining at the background are not used, when we try to pronounce it, it is not so appreciated by our friends. (Interviewee 3)

I mean they sound (native like pronunciation) strange to us. Because in high prior schools our teachers were not speaking like that (with native like pronunciation). Actually, there is a pronunciation style that we have been used to; I mean it (native like speaking) is regarded strange. Therefore, it looks like we have faced something new here (at METU). I mean it is new for us. Therefore, for me it is normal that they find that strange. (Interviewee 7)

We should speak with the pronunciation that we learnt at high school, yes they do not find that so strange. I mean, if we do not make a noticeable mistake it is not found strange. However, if it (pronunciation rule) was discussed in the classroom (and if someone has pronounced it wrong) (Interviewee 7)

Indeed, we do not speak much in the lessons... When we speak we try to follow very prominent rules. Since these rules are known by everyone

obeying them does not create much difference. I mean, there are more detailed rules, for example they are not followed. (Interviewee 3)

The students state that speaking courses are not sufficient to help them improve their pronunciation. They claim that speaking is the subject of these courses and they follow the rules to get good marks but do not use these pronunciation rules in other courses. They claim that if most of the instructors give the impression that it is the ultimate norms for English pronunciation, they could overcome the barriers built by in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation.

The rules that we have learnt in speaking courses are used only in speaking courses. Speaking courses are a kind of lesson, and as I mentioned before the main aim of a students is to be successful in the lesson, I mean, because it affects the grades, because everybody is in that manner. Everybody is in that mood in the speaking lessons. (Interviewee 8)

Suppose that to emphasize native like pronunciation our instructor says that we are supposed to use that pronunciation, and this pronunciation is the correct one. Therefore, everybody learns it and begins to use it, then attempting to use the native like pronunciation won't be a problem. However, today not everybody can learn the rules; everybody do not do not know native like pronunciation and others who know the rules cannot use it in order not to cause others' reaction. (Interviewee 3)

The respondents say that in the classroom if your pronunciation is not different from the others it is approved, and if it has a difference it is not so appreciated. Therefore, speaking like other students is a part of in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation. Even emulation of native like pronunciation is regarded as being against this norm.

Here, everybody does not speak correctly, even if you are speaking correctly, since you do not comply with the group you are in, I mean, regarded as strange.... (Interviewee 3)

One of the respondents claims that she follows the mainstream not to be regarded as different.

I choose the commonly used one, because I am worried about the reactions. (Interviewee 5)

Although following the mainstream is important according to the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation, if a person is already a native like speaker of English people appreciate it. However, if the person does not sound totally native like but still s/he tries to emulate native pronunciation and improve him/ herself, this attempt is not approved by the norms.

People think that one should sound native like, if s/he can't achieve it s/he should speak like us. (Interviewee 9)

If a person can pronounce these sounds (native sounds) correctly that pronunciation is appreciated. We appreciate that person claiming that s/he can speak very well. However, if, I mean, she messes it up when s/he is trying to speak (native like), we say that aa s/he is trying to do something but s/he cannot achieve it. But, if s/he can use native like pronunciation correctly we really like it. (Interviewee 3)

It (native like English pronunciation) sounds different. If it could absolutely resemble the native pronunciation, nobody would criticize. However, the students might think that the speaker is trying to do something different from

others because it does not resemble British accent or American accent, also it does not sound like Turkish... A different accent comes out. (Interviewee 2)

Responses gathered from the interviews draw the lines for the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation. According to this framework commonly approved pronunciation can be defined as speaking with Turkish intonation by giving importance to the correct pronunciation of some English sounds that are overemphasized by the instructors and well known by other students. Besides, these norms approve native like pronunciation only when the speaker really sounds native like; otherwise, trying native like pronunciation is not approved. In addition, speaking like other students is one part of the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation.

Data from the interviews confirm the data gathered by the questionnaire. Both results show that Turkish-like English pronunciation is the base for the norms and approved in the classroom. In the questionnaire it is revealed that some rules like reading a diphthong like a single sound is approved while reading a written letter which is not uttered in actual use is not approved. Interview results also show that common mistakes (like mispronunciation of diphthongs) are not accepted as mistakes in the classroom; however, making mistakes in the rules which are well-known and overemphasized (like production of some English consonants) is not approved.

The responses obtained from the questionnaire show that native like pronunciation is approved in the classrooms and the same results are confirmed by

the interviewees' answers. Therefore, speaking English with native like pronunciation is within the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation. However, interview data presented that native like speaking is approved only when the speaker really sounds like a native speaker of English. Nevertheless, if the speaker is not a proficient speaker of English and attempts to emulate the native pronunciation in the classroom it is not approved according to the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation.

Since violation of injunctive norms is not approved by the group members, the respondents are asked to describe potential reactions of the students to a person who is out of the frame of in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation. After the content analysis of the results it can be concluded that the students show certain reactions to a person who violates norms by making mistakes or emulating native like pronunciation. Here it should be pointed out that pronunciation mistakes comprise the mispronunciation of commonly known sounds and intonation rules emphasized by the instructors. In other words, the benchmark for the determination of the mistakes is not native pronunciation but in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation. According to the content analysis of interview responses it is concluded if the speaker is out of the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation, other students show a kind of reaction for that behavior and Table 4.12 demonstrates potential reactions towards violation of the norms.

Table 4.12: Interview responses regarding reactions to speakers' violating the norms

	f	%
Reactions to the emulation of native like pronunciation due to	4	40%
Thinking that the speaker is boasting	4	40%
Regarding that as affectation	2	20%
Sneering		
Talking in whispers		
Reactions to pronunciation mistakes		
Regarding mistakes strange	6	60%

Many of the students claimed that when a student attempts to speak native like English others think that s/he is boasting (f=4) or regard that as affectation (f=4).

Curving our lips, speaking like them (native speakers), like affectation, I guess, maybe, their idea is that. They might want us to speak directly as we are. With the Turkish accent. I mean like Turgut Özal. (Interviewee 4)

He is boasting, he is trying to adapt his pronunciation to the native speaker pronunciation. I mean, he is trying to show himself as if he is better than us. Such ideas might appear in students' minds. (Interviewee 8)

It might seem as if the speaker is making special effort to look like native speakers, they might question the reason why the speaker doesn't speak like them rather than s/he pays special effort to sound native like. They might think that she is exaggerating. It (the speaker's attempts to pronounce English sounds) might not be appreciated.(Interviewee 10)

A respondent mentioned one of his classroom experiences related to an exchange student. He said that other students find the speaker's enunciation of native like pronunciation strange and laughed at her. The instructor of the Literature course claims that the Russian student is not native like but her pronunciation sounds different from the other students since her mother tongue is different from the others. Here it must be pointed out that although the Russian student is not a native like speaker of English, since her pronunciation is different from the other students, who are all Turkish speakers of English, the interviewee defines her pronunciation as a good native like accent.

There is a blonde student from Russia. We are in the same section only for Literature courses. When she speaks, I mean when she starts to talk about something with a good native like accent our friends sneer at her closing their mouths with their hands. Unfortunately, I am one of those sneering students too. I mean, we find her pronunciation a little bit strange. That is quite normal because, I mean, nearly all of us speak English with Turkish accent. I do not want to regard it strange but I don't feel like. I mean, I find it strange like my friends. (Interviewee 1)

He also added that the reaction will be the same for one of his Turkish classmates, too.

Even if that student is Turkish, we would give the same reaction. I mean, since 90 people out of 100 people speak in the same way and only 10 people attempt to speak native like, all 90 people find that pronunciation strange. I mean, students sitting at the back rows sneer at the speaker etc. (Interviewee 1)

The same interviewee explained that they have certain reactions towards a person who attempts to speak native like English.

They talk in whispers, sneer at the speaker, they talk about the speakers' pronunciation after the lesson. Although they don't say anything directly to the speaker, the speaker might notice their sarcastic attitudes. (Interviewee 1)

Everybody looks at each other and we say "what is she saying, what is she saying?" I mean, actually we know that they are doing the correct thing but since nobody does that (attempt to speak native like), according to us, it looks like s/he is boasting. (Interviewee 5)

Making mistakes which are not common among the students is found strange by the students. The interviewees stated that being a student at such a prestigious university, making such serious pronunciation mistakes cannot be tolerated.

Now that we are grown up and we are freshman students at METU, if that (a simple word) is pronounced incorrectly, it is quite normal that the speaker will be despised I mean others will get angry with her. (Interviewee 3)

A pronunciation mistake is found strange. Even though we might not have a perfect pronunciation, we did not come here (METU) as unknowledgeable students...The students had maximum 5 mistakes in the exam (University Entrance Exam) and they have a certain capacity of learning. (Interviewee 8)

4.2. Analyses of the Responses Related to the Psychological Perspective

4.2.1. Analysis of questionnaire items: “Feelings and beliefs of the speaker”

The questions in Part D are to evaluate the relationship between in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation and fear of negative evaluation. Here, the participants point out whether the occasions described in the statements make them feel FNE or not. Each statement depicts a way of pronunciation and the responses would show that whether the described pronunciation is FNE provoking. In this part, there are four main situations in which the participants might feel FNE. Three items are assigned for each situation. Item 1 (While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I use a similar Turkish sound instead of some English sounds I feel anxious if others finds that strange.), item 5 (While I am speaking English in the classroom, if my intonation is similar to Turkish intonation patterns I feel anxious that others will think about me negatively.) and item 9 (While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I use stress which is similar to Turkish stress patterns I feel anxious that others will think about me negatively.) aim to evaluate how participants feel when they speak English with Turkish pronunciation and intonation. Item 2 (While I am speaking English in the classroom, I feel anxious when I emulate sound (vowels, diphthongs, consonants) production of British or American people, I feel anxious if others think that I am exaggerating.), item 4 (While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I emulate intonation of British or American people I feel anxious if others think that I am exaggerating.) and item

8 (While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I emulate stress use of British of American people I feel anxious if others think that I am exaggerating.) refer to the feelings of the participant when they attempt to use native like pronunciation. Item 3 (While I am speaking English in the classroom if I utter some sounds when I shouldn't utter them at all the idea of being negatively evaluated by others makes me anxious.), item 7 (While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I have intonation mistakes the idea of being negatively evaluated by others makes me anxious.) and item 10 (While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I have mistake about use of stress I feel anxious that others will think about me negatively.) stands for participants' feelings when they make pronunciation mistakes. Finally, item 6 (While I am speaking English in the classroom, if my pronunciation is different from the others I feel anxious.), item 11 (While I am speaking English in the classroom it is important for me that others approve my pronunciation.) and item 12 (While I am speaking English in the classroom, others' ideas about my pronunciation do not make me anxious.) are to evaluate if speakers are affected by other students' ideas when they are speaking English in the classroom. A detailed explanation for the responses for each situation is given in the following tables.

Table 4.13: Summary of the responses for FNE experienced when speaking English in the classroom

	1	2	3	4	5	N
D6. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if my pronunciation is different from the others I feel anxious.	N=0	N=18 31.0%	N=13 22.4%	N=18 31.0%	N=9 15.5%	58
D11. While I am speaking English in the classroom it is important for me that others approve my pronunciation.	N=3 5.2%	N=16 27.6%	N=5 8.6%	N=31 53.4%	N=3 5.2%	58
D12. While I am speaking English in the classroom, others' ideas about my pronunciation do not make me anxious.	N=6 10.3%	N=27 46.6%	N=14 24.1%	N=8 13.8%	N=3 5.2%	58

Note. Column values: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree, N= Population

The responses for item 6 show that nearly half of the participants feel anxious if their pronunciation is different from the others (SA=15.5%, A=31.0%). According to the results for item 11, others approval for their pronunciation is important for most of the students (SA=5.2%, A= 53.4%). For item 12 most of the participants strongly disagree (10.3%) or disagree (46.6%) with the statement that they don't feel anxious about others' ideas about their pronunciation. It is clear from Table 4.13 that approval of his/her pronunciation by other students is of great importance for the students and they experience FNE when they speak different from the others. In addition, the learners experience FNE when speaking English because of potential negative evaluations and ideas about their pronunciation assumed to appear in others minds.

Table 4.13 shows that speaking English in the classroom increases FNE of the speakers because they are affected by others' ideas. Here the results show that speaking English in the classroom is a FNE provoking activity in its nature. In the following three Tables, the results provide specific information about the specific ways of pronunciation that trigger FNE.

Table 4.14: Summary of the responses for FNE experienced when speaking with native like pronunciation

	1	2	3	4	5	N
D2. While I am speaking English in the classroom, I feel anxious when I emulate sound (vowels, diphthongs, consonants) production of British or American people, I feel anxious if others think that I am exaggerating.	N=2 3.4%	N=11 19.0%	N=3 5.2%	N=40 69.0%	N=2 3.4%	58
D4. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I emulate intonation of British or American people I feel anxious if others think that I am exaggerating.	N=4 6.9%	N=30 51.7%	N=9 15.5%	N=14 24.1%	N=1 1.7%	58
D8. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I emulate stress use of British of American people I feel anxious if others think that I am exaggerating.	N=2 3.4%	N=17 29.3%	N=10 17.2%	N=27 46.6%	N=2 3.4%	58

Note. Column values: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree, N= Population

Table 4.14 shows that most of the respondents experience FNE when they pronounce sounds native like (SA=3.4%, A= 69.0%) and use native like stress (SA=3.4%, A= 46.6%). Nevertheless, more than half of the participants do not feel

FNE when they speak with native like intonation (SD=6.9%, 51.7%). In other words some native like pronunciation emulations are not FNE provoking while attempting to use some native like pronunciation rules might trigger FNE.

Table 4.15: Summary of the responses for FNE experienced when speaking with pronunciation mistakes

	1	2	3	4	5	N
D3. While I am speaking English in the classroom if I utter some sounds when I shouldn't utter them at all the idea of being negatively evaluated by others makes me anxious.	N=0	N=10 17.2%	N=7 12.1%	N=31 53.4%	N=10 17.2%	58
D7. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I have intonation mistakes the idea of being negatively evaluated by others makes me anxious.	N=8 13.8%	N=33 56.9%	N=9 15.5%	N=7 12.1%	N=1 1.7%	58
D10. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I have mistake about use of stress I feel anxious that others will think about me negatively.	N=5 8.6%	N=30 51.7%	N=11 19.0%	N=8 13.8%	N=4 6.9%	58

Note. Column values: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree, N= Population

As can be seen from Table 4.15 most of the participants strongly disagree (13.8%) or disagree (56.9%) with the statement explained in item 7. More than half of the participants claim that having intonation mistakes does not make them feel FNE. Besides, more than half of the respondents strongly disagree (8.6%) or disagree (51.7%) with the situation explained in item 10. This indicates that using inappropriate stress is not FNE provoking for more than half of the learners. However, most of the students strongly agree (17.2%) or agree (53.4%) with the

statement in item 3. In other words, many of the learners experience FNE when they have mistakes in pronouncing English sounds. Similar to the results obtained for the emulation of native like pronunciation, all the mistakes are not FNE provoking. The results indicate that pronunciation mistakes trigger FNE while mistakes in intonation and stress do not make students feel FNE.

Table 4.16: Summary of the responses for FNE experienced when speaking with Turkish-like English pronunciation

	1	2	3	4	5	N
D1. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I use a similar Turkish sound instead of some English sounds I feel anxious if others finds that strange.	N=1 1.7%	N=30 51.7%	N=10 17.2%	N=15 25.9%	N=2 3.4%	58
D5. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if my intonation is similar to Turkish intonation patterns I feel anxious that others will think about me negatively.	N=2 3.4%	N=30 51.7%	N=7 12.1%	N=14 24.1%	N=5 8.6%	58
D9. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I use stress which is similar to Turkish stress patterns I feel anxious that others will think about me negatively.	N=5 8.6%	N=40 69.0%	N=6 10.3%	N=5 8.6%	N=2 3.4%	58

Note. Column values: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree, N=Population

Most of the participants point out that they do not feel FNE when they speak English with Turkish like sounds (SD=1.7%, D=51.7 %), intonation (SD=3.4%, D=51.7%) or stress (SD=8.6%, D=69.0%). According to the results Turkish-like English pronunciation does not trigger FNE.

4.2.2 Analysis of interview responses: “Feelings of the speaker”

In the interview sessions most of the interviewees mentioned that feelings and thoughts of the speaker might depend on one’s personality.

Table 4.17: Personality difference and FNE

	f	%
Highly confident students are not affected by others’ ideas about their pronunciation when speaking English.	7	70%

According to the results displayed in Table 4.17, 70% of the interviewees agree that personality of the student might affect whether s/he will be affected by others’ ideas (f=7). If the student is highly self confident s/he would not take others’ ideas and attitudes into consideration. However, if the person is not confident enough s/he would be affected by others’ attitudes and evaluations.

If the person is really self confident and has a high self confidence, if s/he thinks “OK I am open to both negative and positive criticism, I pronounce words as I know them. If it is wrong I correct it. My friends also warn me when I have wrong pronunciation.” This is a very appreciated case. S/he tries to pronounce the words with their correct pronunciation, American or British. But, if the person is worried about making himself cheap in others’ eyes, definitely, I mean, himm, s/he pronounces the words like others, or uses the way of pronunciation that s/he has heard commonly until that time. (Interviewee 8)

Besides, some of the participants stated that the number of highly confident students who do not take others ideas’ into consideration is very low compared to

the students who have low self confidence and are affected by others' ideas about his/her pronunciation.

Definitely there are very few students with a high self confidence, very very few. For instance, if I am not mistaken, 105 students were admitted into the department this year, among these students we get 10 highly self confident students at most. (Interviewee 8)

Responses gathered from the interviewees confirm the results of the questionnaire items 6, 11 and 12 which indicate that most of the learners give importance to others' ideas about their pronunciation and they experience FNE when they are in an evaluative situation.

Although speaking English in the classroom is a FNE provoking situation in general, some situations specifically trigger FNE while some others don't. In Table 4.18, it is shown that if the learners attempt to speak with a native like pronunciation they will feel pressure on themselves caused by the possible reactions of the others.

According to the answers of the interviewees 5 main feelings are determined to be observed when a speaker attempts to speak like a native speaker of English. Fear of raising negative ideas in others' minds is the most commonly mentioned feeling among the participants (f=7). The students claimed that the speaker also has negative ideas about a person who attempts to use native like English; therefore, s/he thinks that others will have the same ideas when s/he emulates native pronunciation.

Since I find any of classmates who speaks native like strange, I would be aware of the fact that others will find my attempts for native like pronunciation strange as well. If I pronounce as /wel/ I will know that my classmates also think that I am like a boastful person. (Interviewee 8)

Table 4.18: Interview responses regarding FNE experienced when speaking with native like pronunciation

	f	%
If I speak with a native like pronunciation....		
others might think about me negatively	7	70%
others might think that I am boasting	4	40%
I will be different from others	4	40%
others will look down on me	3	30%
others will pick me up	2	20%

The students stated that if they use native like pronunciation, others would think that they are boasting (f=4). Besides, fear of being different from others is another reason for avoiding from the emulation of native pronunciation (f=40). One of the interviewees stated:

For me, if others do not use native like pronunciation of a structure while I know its correct pronunciation and can use it, I still don't pronounce it if that pronunciation is obviously different from the commonly used one. (Interviewee 3)

Another student stated that if a speaker emulates native like pronunciation s/he thinks that s/he will be different from the others and being noticed.

The speaker thinks that s/he might pick up others attention in the classroom, s/he shouldn't come into prominence. You know, we don't want to be noticed and be under attention. (Interviewee 7)

Fear of being looked (f=3) down on and picked up (f=2) are other two feelings that are triggered by the emulation of native like pronunciation. The participants state that when trying to imitate native like pronunciation, being humiliated by their friend is not a good experience for them. This might prevent the speaker even from taking a chance.

If the person is like speaking with exaggeration and other students on pick him/her for that reason, this person may change his/her pronunciation accordingly. She would try to speak like other students in the classroom, I mean, try to use the Turkish like version. I mean, she will try not to exaggerate. She might do that not to be alienated, I mean, to be like others when she is with them. I mean, although her American or British pronunciation is the normal one she will do that since her friend might evaluate her negatively. (Interviewee 10)

If the person has that experience once, I mean, if s/he is regarded as strange by his/her friends because of his/her pronunciation of a word and the speaker realizes others' reaction, this is a very difficult situation for the speaker. She starts to perspire not only when pronouncing that significant word but also when pronouncing other unknown words. I mean a great trouble, depression. Even with the words s/he knows very well s/he would feel that. Because, I mean, it is very important, when a person is within a society, every person's ideas in that society become important for him/her. Actually, nobody, I mean, wants to make himself/herself cheap in others' eyes. (Interviewee 8)

Since being negatively evaluated or humiliated by others is an expected reaction and the students are conscious about these reactions they feel fear of being negatively evaluated when they want to speak with native like pronunciation.

What they will say about me, they might laugh at me, now they might ridicule me, actually nobody wants to be picked up. I mean, indeed, it does not bother when they pick me up but, I mean, still I cannot bring myself to be in that situation. (Interviewee 5)

Even the idea of being negatively evaluated affects them negatively and prevents them from trying to use native like English.

Even I haven't tried it (*speaking with native like pronunciation*) thinking that they might say that I am boasting. For example, I imitated a scene from a film in a presentation, I spoke like them, everybody liked it very much, but I feel suspicious when I speak in normal cases. It was just an imitation; nobody says something, just an imitation. (Interviewee 6)

The responses obtained from the interview verify the results of the items 2 and 8 in the questionnaire. The students feel FNE when they attempt to use native like pronunciation. However, the results for item 4 are not verified by the interview because the interviewees did not mention that they feel or not feel FNE when they use native like intonation.

According to the responses gathered from the interviewees, many people in the classroom have similar pronunciation mistakes and mispronunciation is accepted as far as the message is understood by the others. If a person mispronounces a sound which is overemphasized by the instructors and well

known by the students, this is criticized by others. The participants did not make much comment on their fears caused by making pronunciation mistakes. The learners stated that they all have mistakes in English pronunciation and making pronunciation mistakes does not make them feel anxious if it is not considered to be a serious mistake among their friends. Nevertheless, making pronunciation mistakes is still a source of fear for the students.

We do not want to make mistakes because some people, though many do not do that, have some reactions which we do not want to face when we have mistakes. (Interviewee 7)

The results gathered through the interview are parallel with the results of the questionnaire items 3, 7 and 10. In the questionnaire, the results suggest that learners feel FNE when they make mistakes in sound production, however, intonation mistakes and mistakes in stress do not affect them. Likewise, in the interview it is found out that only some rules which are overemphasized in the classroom are taken into consideration. In the classrooms, producing some sounds is overemphasized by the instructors and the students give importance to these rules. However, intonation and stress are not so commonly emphasized in the classrooms by the instructors. One of the respondents explains that some mistakes are not approved by the students while some others are commonly made and accepted.

If a mistake is not commonly made in the classroom, it irritates students much. Otherwise, I mean, everybody makes some intonation and stress mistakes; however, they are not taken into consideration. For example,

/bicoz/-/bicauz/, if it is pronounced too long, like /bicauz/ or some letters which shouldn't be uttered at all are pronounced. These are regarded as strange in the classroom. (Interviewee 2)

Although native like pronunciation and making some pronunciation mistakes trigger FNE, speaking with Turkish like pronunciation, intonation and stress does not provoke FNE. The results gathered from questionnaire items 1, 5 and 9 are verified with interview results. Most of the respondents claimed that they feel more comfortable when they are using Turkish-like English pronunciation (f=8) (Table 4.19).

Table 4.19: Interview responses regarding FNE experienced when speaking Turkish-like English pronunciation

	f	%
I feel comfortable when I use Turkish-like English pronunciation.	8	80%

The students claim that they might make mistakes when trying native like pronunciation. However, if they use Turkish like pronunciation, it is less likely that their mistakes will be accepted as a mistake.

If I speak with exaggeration (try native like pronunciation) maybe my pronunciation will be wrong, but if I say it with a pronunciation which is known by everybody, it will be regarded as normal. It is not something that I do consciously, but we are used to it, everybody speaks like that. We accept it (Turkish-like English pronunciation) as correct. (Interviewee 10)

Moreover, the respondents claim that Turkish like pronunciation is safer because it is used by everyone, understandable and they feel confident when they are speaking with Turkish- like English pronunciation.

For example, Chinese or Japanese people, I am not sure about the country. They don't have /u/ or /ü/ sounds and they cannot pronounce them, also they cannot pronounce some names (including these vowels). It is something like that, I mean, since we are not used to these sounds we cannot pronounce them like native speakers; therefore, I do not want to utter something that is difficult to pronounce for me when I am speaking. Therefore, I use a similar sound which is used in my mother tongue, and this makes me feel relaxed. And also others can understand my message. (Interviewee 9)

The same respondent added that they do not need to speak in another way because they are very well understood when they speak Turkish-like English pronunciation.

We are in Turkey now, in Ankara, in the classrooms at METU, we do not have any necessity to do that (speak with another accent). Now the most important thing is to understand each other. People question that if I won't understand you, what is the value of speaking for two hours? (Interviewee 9)

It is obviously seen from the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data that Turkish-like English pronunciation is commonly used in the classroom and learners' educational background has an effect on the common use of it. Most of the students accept that there are tacit rules that determine English pronunciation which will be used in the classroom. According to these rules speaking Turkish-

like English pronunciation is approved. Sounding native like is appreciated; however, attempting to use native like speaking but not having a native like pronunciation is not approved. Some mistakes which are common in the classroom are accepted; nevertheless, making mistakes with well-known and overemphasized grammar rules is not appreciated. If a person does something which is not accepted according to in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation other students evaluate that attempt negatively, sometimes they show overtly observable reactions like sneering, talking in whispers etc. Students feel comfortable when they speak with the pronunciation which is approximated to the commonly used pronunciation in the classroom. When they speak with a pronunciation which is out of the framework determined by the injunctive norms they might feel FNE. Nevertheless, personality of the speaker might affect the feelings of the speaker.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.0 Presentation

This chapter consists of the summary of the study, discussion of the findings, pedagogical implications and recommendation for further research.

5.1 Summary of the Study

The aim of the present study is to elucidate in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation and the relationship between these norms and fear of negative evaluation. A 25-item questionnaire was designed for the study. Since the study is the first research which focuses on in-class injunctive norms and their relation with FNE the researcher had a preliminary study to prepare the questionnaire items and the questions for the interview. Besides, different questionnaires and research studies were examined to prepare the questionnaire. The items in the questionnaire were evaluated by a Turkish instructor for its language, a psychologist, a testing expert and a specialist in ELT. After necessary changes, the items were evaluated by 22 first year students and according to the feedback gathered from the students the items were revised. Finally, the revised version of the questionnaire was evaluated by five first year students and they discussed each item in detail to make the items more understandable for the students. The final version of the questionnaire was piloted with 31 second year

students in the department of Foreign Language Education at METU. The sample size of the research was 58 freshman students studying at the same university. The quantitative data were gathered through the questionnaire and it is fostered and broadened with qualitative data obtained from the open ended questions in the questionnaire and the interviews. 10 students (M=4, F=6) took part in the interviews. The interviews were semi-structured and 10 main questions were asked to the participants. The sessions were in the mother tongue of the participants. In order to analyze quantitative data SPSS 13.0 (Statistical Package of Social Sciences) was used. Qualitative data were analyzed through content analysis. Then the results were presented under four themes which were listed under two main categories. The first main category is the “social perspective” of the issue and it is related to the first research question. Under that heading three themes were listed successively; i.e. *features of the commonly used pronunciation, reasons for its common use and in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation*. The second main category is the “psychological perspective” of the issue. It is relevant to the data gathered to answer the second research question. *Feelings of the speaker* is the only theme placed under that category. The research findings were interpreted and presented in accordance with this classification.

5.2. Results

Through quantitative and qualitative techniques pieces of data were gathered in the study and they were presented in the previous chapter. Here the aim is to put the pieces of the puzzle and get the whole picture. The current study intended to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation for freshman students in the Department of Foreign Language Education at METU?

- 1.5 Which English pronunciation, i.e. native like, nonnative or wrong pronunciation, is the most appreciated one among the students?,

- 1.6 Which English pronunciation, i.e. native like, nonnative or wrong pronunciation, is the least appreciated one among the students?

2. What is the relationship between in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation and fear of negative evaluation?

- 2.1 Do the students feel anxious about their peers' negative evaluation when they make mistakes while speaking English?

- 2.2 Do the students feel anxious about their peers' negative evaluation when they attempt to imitate native speakers' performance?

- 2.3 Do the students feel anxious about their peers' negative evaluation when they adapt their English pronunciation according to their native language?

The first research question aims to find out in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation. Therefore, before figuring out English pronunciation supported by in-class injunctive norms, a preliminary study was conducted to define basic ways of pronunciation observed in the classrooms. According to the preliminary study three main types of pronunciation were determined to be taken into consideration. The first one is native like pronunciation. The students are exposed to native pronunciation via course materials provided by the instructors or they access them on their own. Native like pronunciation is desired by the instructors and they develop lesson plans to help learners reach that level. The second type of pronunciation is nonnative pronunciation, which is Turkish- like English pronunciation for the study group of that research. Turkish- like English pronunciation includes some prosodic characteristics of Turkish. Since these nonnative prosodic characteristics are observed in many students' pronunciation they are not labeled as mistakes but as a different way of pronunciation. Finally, speaking English with pronunciation mistakes is accepted as the third type of pronunciation observed in the classroom. Although the students make pronunciation mistakes which derive from their mother tongue they are not considered as mistakes. Rather the mistakes which are not common among the students are accepted as mistakes. Turkish-like English pronunciation, native like English and pronunciation mistakes are very broad categories and to get a detailed information the questionnaire items were designed in a way that some items

questioned the acceptability of segmentals and some others asked the approval for suprasegmentals .

Keeping these three types of pronunciations in mind, the first research question aimed to find out the most and the least appreciated one among the students. The results indicated that Turkish-like English pronunciation (nonnative pronunciation) is the most commonly used and appreciated type of pronunciation. As for the least appreciated way of pronunciation which is questioned in the second part of the first research question, it is difficult to name one of these three types of pronunciations as the least appreciated one. The results show that native like pronunciation is the least preferred way of pronunciation in the classroom; however, it is also one of the appreciated ways of pronunciation among the students. Here it looks as if there is a dilemma with the answers gathered through the questionnaire. However, the results obtained from the interviews clarified that native like pronunciation is appreciated; however, attempting to use native like pronunciation is not appreciated among the students. Therefore, it can be claimed that not sounding native like but attempting to use native like pronunciation is the least appreciated way of pronunciation in the classroom.

Describing the features of the most commonly used pronunciation in the classroom and eliciting reasons for its common preference it would be possible to provide information about the descriptive norms for English pronunciation. Therefore, both in the questionnaire (in part B) and in the interview sessions the questions aimed to unearth the characteristics of the commonly used pronunciation

in the classrooms. Although descriptive norms are not as strong as injunctive norms in terms of their power on the formation of a behavior, they show the strength of the norms. Hence, defining the descriptive norms for English pronunciation would provide information about the most commonly preferred behavior and the strength of the norms that suggest that behavior.

Descriptive norms refer to individuals' beliefs about how widespread a particular behavior is among their referent others. They provide information about the strength of the norm. The greater the perceived prevalent behavior, the greater the likelihood that individuals will believe that engaging in the behavior is normative, that is, within the prevailing norms of conduct. It does not necessarily follow, however, that the strength of the perceived norm will bear a one to one relationship with individuals' propensity to engage in the behavior themselves. (Rimal & Real, 2003; p. 185-186)

When injunctive norms and descriptive norms are parallel to each other, peer influence increases (Borsari & Carey, 2001). Therefore, discovering descriptive norms for English pronunciation would show us how strong in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation are. According to the data, the most commonly preferred pronunciation is Turkish-like English pronunciation (87.5%) and the least preferred one is the emulation of native like pronunciation (5.4%). The data of the interview indicated the same results (f=10, 100%), and presented more detailed information. According to the responses gathered through the interview, Turkish intonation is used when speaking English, and the sounds are neither native like, nor pure Turkish sounds, they are in between. Considering the overall prosody of the speech, the speaker does not sound native like. Open ended questions in part B indicated that most of the learners use Turkish-like English

pronunciation because they do not have necessary knowledge and practice. During their previous education they focused on a paper based University Entrance Exam and they couldn't have sufficient courses to improve their speaking skills. They are all Turkish speakers of English and they have similar backgrounds; therefore, they can understand Turkish-like English pronunciation, express themselves with the same way of pronunciation easily. They are all in EFL context and do not feel an urgent need to have native like pronunciation. They mainly focus on conveying the message. Since everybody uses the same pronunciation, and this pronunciation serves for their aims, they generally do not attempt to change their pronunciation. Furthermore, emulating native like pronunciation requires extra effort and one can be picked up by the others if they try that. Results of the interviews overlap with the results gathered through the questionnaire. All these reasons foster the common use of Turkish-like English pronunciation among the students. Therefore, learners' English pronunciation does not approximate to native like pronunciation though most of the students will be English language teachers after graduation. Even after graduation they have problems with their spoken English. Şallı-Çopur (2008) conducted a study with the graduate students of the same department and the results showed that the graduate students consider themselves weak in language use, especially in speaking skills.

Now we are clear with the idea that according to the descriptive norms speaking Turkish-like English pronunciation has been the most commonly preferred pronunciation in the classrooms. Part C in the questionnaire investigates

what kind of pronunciation is approved by the students, and together with the data obtained from the interviews the borders of in-class injunctive norms are depicted. The results obtained from the questionnaire (part C) showed that both native like and Turkish like pronunciation are approved in the classroom. Besides, some mistakes are approved while some others are not. At first glance, it looks like the descriptive norms and injunctive norms are clashing with each other. The descriptive norms indicate that Turkish like pronunciation is the most commonly used one and native like speaking is the least preferred way of pronunciation while the injunctive norms suggest that both native like and Turkish like pronunciation are approved in the classroom. Data gathered through the interview provided more information and it pointed out that the results are not conflicting with each other. According to the results of the interviews, using Turkish like segmental and suprasegmentals when speaking English in the classroom is approved; however, if a pronunciation rule is known by everyone and also emphasized by the instructors frequently making mistakes with these rules is not approved. These are accepted as a mistake rather than an adaptation of Turkish prosody to English pronunciation. In a similar study conducted by Lefkowitz & Hedgcock (2002) it is pointed that native like pronunciation is admired and appreciated among students. The participants in the current study also admire native like English pronunciation. If a person sounds native like to the students that is appreciated; nevertheless, if the person tries to sound native like but cannot achieve it that is disapproved by others students. In the questionnaire, the results gathered through Part C showed that

native like pronunciation is approved, which is also confirmed by the results of the interview. Consequently, it can be claimed that although native like pronunciation is an appreciated behavior according to injunctive norms, the students still prefer speaking Turkish-like English. If one elaborates on the issue it is understood that the students use Turkish-like English pronunciation because they are comfortable with it, they are used to it and they can perform it easily. Since they are good at Turkish-like English pronunciation, it is less likely that they might deviate from in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation when they prefer it. However, if they try to speak native like English in the classroom, they might not sound native like and violate the norms; furthermore, others may react that. One of the interviewees claimed that she uses Turkish-like English pronunciation because it is used by everyone and the probability of making mistakes is very low with that one compared to the native like pronunciation. She claimed that there are many mistakes with Turkish like pronunciation; however, it is accepted by everybody (see Appendix H, Interviewee 10-4)

The results indicated that making some mistakes is allowed in the classroom while some mistakes are not. From the questionnaire data it is concluded that mispronunciation of a diphthong is not negatively evaluated; however, mispronunciation of a consonant is not approved among the students. Responses to the interview questions showed that learners are conscious about the pronunciation rules that are commonly known by the students and highlighted by the instructors. The qualitative and quantitative data verify each other. Consonant

and vowel production has been emphasized by the instructors and nonnative pronunciations are pointed to be incorrect. However, mispronunciation of diphthongs, incorrect use of stress patterns and intonation are not emphasized in the lessons as much as mistakes in vowel and consonant articulation. Therefore, nonnative pronunciation of some vowels and consonants are not approved in the classroom; nevertheless, nonnative use of diphthongs, intonation and stress patterns are approved. It can be concluded that mistakes are not defined according to the rules of the native language, rather, common or rare use of a rule or the emphasis put on that rule determines whether it will be approved in the classroom or regarded as a mistake.

After the definition of in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation, others' reaction to a deviant behavior were questioned. Sanctions of others are an important part of injunctive norms (Lapinski & Rimal, 2005) and questioning others' reactions would show whether these pronunciation norms are really injunctive norms or whether they are only descriptive norms. It is concluded that if a person does not speak according to the framework provided by the norms mentioned above other students might evaluate this person negatively. Especially when a student attempts to speak native like, others regard him/her as boastful. Similar results are gathered in another research conducted by Lefkowitz & Hedgcock (2002). Sometimes, students might have an observable reaction toward their friends who attempts to speak native like such as, sneering, talking in whispers etc. Making mistakes is also disapproved by other students since they

regard these mistakes as strange. However, it must be emphasized that only mistakes related to the well-known pronunciation rules are regarded as mistakes. Students' sanctions to the violations of these norms show that these norms are injunctive norms for English pronunciation.

The results indicated that the hypotheses for the first research question are verified. At the very beginning of the study it was proposed that the learners would approve nonnative pronunciation and flat intonation, which reflects Turkish intonation. Besides, it was expected that imitating native sounds and prosody, and making some pronunciation mistakes are not approved among the students. Furthermore, considering learners' pronunciation preference the results are parallel with the hypotheses such that the most commonly preferred pronunciation is Turkish-like English pronunciation while speaking with native like pronunciation is the least preferred one.

In that study it is assumed that there is a cause-effect relationship between in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation and fear of negative evaluation. It is known that disobedience to injunctive norms evoke anxiety or guilt (Christensen et. al., 2004). More specifically, it triggers fear of negative evaluation.

With regard to injunctive norms, one potential motivation to conform is a fear of negative evaluation. Students who want to avoid negative evaluation from peers may match their behaviors with perceived approval from others (Schroeder & Prentice, 1998). Violating these norms can make one appear different, which is especially undesirable in social situations. (Borsari & Carey, 2001; p. 412)

Here the question is whether deviance from in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation evokes FNE. The second research question is designed to find an answer to that question. Like the first research question, the second research question is also based on the three types of pronunciation figured out after the preliminary study; i.e. native like English pronunciation, Turkish- like English pronunciation and speaking with pronunciation mistakes. It aims to identify the feelings of the students when they violate in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation. With that aim, we questioned which of these three create anxiety when used in the classroom. The results of the questionnaire items in part D and interview responses were assessed. Then the parallelism between the results for anxiety provoking pronunciation and the type of pronunciation suggested by in-class injunctive norms were evaluated. Whether the students have FNE in general when they are speaking English in the classroom was evaluated. The results showed that most of the students experience FNE when they are speaking English in the classroom context. Others' ideas are of great importance for them. It is a fact that speaking is the most anxiety provoking language skill (Horwitz, 1986). However, according to the results of the interview self confidence of a student might affect the effects of FNE experienced when speaking English.

Speaking English with Turkish like intonation, stress and sounds do not evoke FNE. Besides, making mistakes in suprasegmentals do not evoke FNE while mispronunciation of highlighted segmentals evokes FNE. These results have a parallelism with in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation.

Speaking with Turkish-like English pronunciation, giving importance to the emphasized rules (i.e. pronunciation of segmentals), and ignoring the others (i.e. intonation and stress) are within the frame of the injunctive norms.

Considering the emulation of native like pronunciation it is known that sounding native like is appreciated but if the person cannot sound native like but when s/he is attempting to emulate them, others evaluate that attempt negatively. Therefore, the students do not want to try native like pronunciation when they are in the classroom. Similar results are stated by Lefkowitz & Hedgcock (2002): “In the micro-culture of the classroom contexts sampled, status might be achieved by sounding non-target-like vis-à-vis preferred, pedagogical target norms” (p. 240). Some of the students mentioned that they will be able to use native like pronunciation only when they have practice outside. They claimed that they never ever try a native like pronunciation in the classroom before they become proficient in using it outside the classroom. One of the students stated that she would not try using native like pronunciation as long as they have these tacit norms in the classroom. According to her, the only way of broking these norms is to go to the countries where English is the native language (see Appendix H, Interviewee 3- 9).

The quantitative results related to the feelings of the students when speaking with native like pronunciation show that more than half of the students agree (A= 69.0%) or strongly agree (SA= 3.4%) with the idea that they would feel FNE when they pronounce native like sounds. Nearly half of them stated that they would feel FNE (A=46.6, SA=3.4) when they use native like stress. However,

most of the students claimed that they disagree with the idea that they feel FNE when they use native like intonation (SD=6.9%, D=51.7). The first two claims are parallel with the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation according to which attempting to speak with native pronunciation is approved only if the speaker sounds native like. The students do not feel proficient enough in speaking English. Therefore, speaking with native like stress and sounds make them feel FNE. As mentioned earlier the students do not want to try native like pronunciation in the classroom before they become proficient outside the classroom. They experience FNE when they have to try them in the classroom. For intonation, we have an interesting case, the learners stated that they do not feel anxious when they are using native like intonation. The reason for that claim might be the fact that the learners' awareness is very low in terms of intonation. Lefkowitz & Hedgcock (2002) also state that learners are not knowledgeable and skillful enough to evaluate their own pronunciation according to the target one. Besides, only segmentals have been taught in the lessons and suprasegmentals are recently taken into consideration in language courses which are based on communicative activities (Morgan, 1997). Therefore, learners are not talented enough to recognize and identify their intonation mistakes. They are not even conscious about the fact that they are using wrong intonation. Although in order to answer the questionnaire they heard one sample sentence, most probably hearing only one sentence to judge the statement they were misled. That lack of knowledge

must be the reason for students' ideas that point out they do not feel FNE when they are speaking with native like intonation patterns.

According to the research findings there are in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation and deviations from these norms evoke FNE in the speaker. There is a parallelism between descriptive and injunctive norms; therefore, it can be concluded that normative influence of in-class injunctive norms for English speaking would be very strong. Nevertheless, the speaker's personality might affect his/her feelings. Some students with high self confidence might not be affected by others' ideas and they do not experience FNE when s/he deviates from the norms. Students with low self confidence are affected by others' ideas and they prefer following the mainstream when they are speaking English. They experience FNE when they are out of the injunctive norms. Unfortunately, the number of highly self confident students is very low compared to the other group.

The findings show that the hypotheses for the second research question are verified because it is investigated that students experience FNE when they attempt to use native like pronunciation, while they do not feel FNE when they are speaking with Turkish-like English pronunciation. Although it was hypothesized that learners feel FNE when they make pronunciation mistakes, the results showed that that is a very general assumption. It was understood from the results that the learners feel FNE when they make mistakes that are over emphasized by the instructors and well-known by others. However, if a pronunciation mistake is

commonly observed in the classroom, speaking with such pronunciation mistakes does not trigger FNE.

One of the striking results of this research is that common use of a pronunciation rule and instructors' attitudes towards that rule are two important factors that determine whether following the rule will be a part of in-class injunctive norms or not. Although instructors aim to improve learners' pronunciation, when they emphasize some rules more than some others, these emphasized rules become a part of the norms while others are excluded from the frame of the norms. Therefore, learners only focus on the ones that are included in the norms and they cannot improve other pronunciation skills which are not comprised by the norms. The results of the research provide a new perspective for instructors and offer suggestions to improve pedagogical implications.

5.3. Pedagogical implications

Understanding learners' anxiety is very important for language teachers because the gap between the learners and the teacher might increase students' anxiety (Ohata, 2005). Therefore, research on learners' feelings provide useful information for instructors who aim to foster learners' performance. It is known that anxiety is one of the individual difference factor that influence language learners' achievement (Gardner et al., 1997). Understanding socio-affective factors that influence language learning and developing teaching strategies accordingly would promote language learning. Anxiety is one of the most important factors

that affect language learning and learning about language anxiety (Phillips, 1991) and discovering different dimensions of that issue through research would allow us to prepare better language learning environments.

One of the current challenges in second foreign language teaching is to provide students with a learner-centered, low-anxiety classroom environment. In our push to create such an environment we need to consult research and theory on language anxiety for classroom implications. (Young, 1991; p. 426)

Teachers should keep in mind that unsatisfactory pronunciation of learners might be related to the social and psychological dynamics in the classroom. As stated by Lefkowitz & Hedgcock (2002), foreign language instructors should question whether these unsatisfactory productions are a result of social dynamics, lack of foreign language speaking skills, or a combination of both. The current study focuses on one aspect of language learning anxiety; namely, fear of negative evaluation, and relates it to the injunctive norms for English pronunciation accepted in the classroom. According to the results of the current study, in addition to the attitude and aptitude of the language learner, some psychological states derived from the sociological structure of the classroom could affect the speaking performance of students. Hence, socio-psychological perspective of learning speaking should be taken into consideration by the instructors.

From the research, it is concluded that teachers are an important part of the norm construction procedure. Pronunciation rules that are emphasized by the

instructors become a part of in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation. Therefore, the teachers should be aware of their effects on that procedure and use that power for the benefits of the students. Their benefits can be twofold. First, the teachers can emphasize both segmental and suprasegmental structures in the classroom and all the rules would become a part of in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation. Now, we are clear with the fact that the learners are affected by in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation and any rule within the lines of the norms are likely to be followed by the students. Therefore, if the teachers emphasize both segmental and suprasegmentals in the classroom the learners would feel that they should give importance to the correct use of them. Second, being aware of the norms and their effects on the learners the instructors can point to the norms that prevent learners from practicing native like pronunciation in the classroom and work on these norms to change them. The teachers can prepare lessons accordingly and also they can discuss these norms and their effects on learning with their students. Foss and Reitzel (1988) suggest that discussing students' fears about learning the language in the classroom would show learners that they are not alone in their anxiety. Through this discussion the learners recognize that the instructor is concerned about their fears and they get relaxed.

The results indicated that learners do not have sufficient practice to improve their pronunciation skills. Increasing speaking activities that allow learners to practice pronunciation is urgently necessary. In addition to some

classroom activities like discussions and presentations through which the learners have a chance for free practice, some mirroring activities in which the students imitate an authentic listening part or a selected scene must be included in the lessons abundantly. These activities would not only provide a context to practice pronunciation but they also create an atmosphere in which the learners can practice native like pronunciation without feeling pressure on themselves. Since these activities require every learner to attempt sounding native like, and all the learners do the same thing, the students aim to have the model pronunciation rather than the one which is suggested by the norms.

Besides, learners do not try some pronunciation rules even if they know its correct use because they do not want to be regarded as strange by others. Here, it can be understood that students put pressure on each other in the social structure of the classroom. This pressure increases FNE when the learners attempt to try new pronunciation and sound different from other learners. Young states that “the social context that the instructor sets up in the classroom can have tremendous ramifications for the learners” (1991; p. 428). Therefore, developing a friendly classroom atmosphere in which students feel secure enough to try new learned structures without being suppressed by possible negative reactions is very important to foster speaking skills. The instructors would augment learners’ self confidence within that congenial context. Teaching students to give constructive peer feedback and developing classroom activities accordingly can be a good way of decreasing FNE and increasing the compatible atmosphere in the classroom.

Keeping the points discussed above the following suggestions might be helpful for teachers who prepare syllabus for foreign language pronunciation courses:

1. In the first lesson of the semester the instructors should share the aim of the course with the students and emphasize that their aim is to reach native like pronunciation. They should encourage learners to set their goals as achieving native like pronunciation. During the semester teachers should have the same encouraging attitude so as to emulating native pronunciation will be a prestigious attempt among the learners.

2. At the very beginning of the semester the instructor should inform learners that achieving native like pronunciation is not an overnight improvement but it is a gradual progress. The instructor should encourage learners to define achievable, realistic goals for themselves.

3. The students haven't had abundant listening input and they didn't have enough chance to practice their pronunciation skills in their previous education. Therefore, during the first semester the learners should have listening activities intensively and the listening sessions should be followed by pronunciation activities such as mirroring, role plays, or etc. (see Appendix I for sample activities)so as to that they would have a chance to practice what they heard during the listening activities.

4. Instead of watching long videos or listening longer recordings, having listening practices with shorter recordings or videos and practicing pronunciation through

activities designed on the listening passages would be more practical for the learners to improve their pronunciation in the first run.

5. During the first semester having mirroring activities through which learners can have a chance to imitate native pronunciation will make students get accustomed to hearing themselves and their friends speaking native like. Therefore, a student's attempts to sound native like would be no longer considered to be a strange or deviant behavior among the learners.

6. Requiring learners to make presentations before they get sufficient input and pronunciation practice increases learners' anxiety. Besides, they focus on conveying the meaning and they do not give attention to the accuracy of their pronunciation. Therefore, incorporating presentations in the second run, after the learners get sufficient practice and input would be more beneficial for them to improve their pronunciation skills.

7. Learners are not knowledgeable enough in suprasegmentals; therefore, they cannot evaluate their pronunciation skills efficiently. In addition to teaching segmentals, supplying learners with sufficient information about suprasegmentals and their usage, and providing opportunities for them to assess themselves would increase learners' awareness about their own progress. Besides, educating learners to give constructive feedback would not only decrease the socio-psychological pressure on them, but it would also increase learning opportunities of the students through peer learning.

5.4. Assessment of the study and Suggestions for Further Research

The present study evaluated pronunciation performance of English learners from a socio-psychological perspective and it aimed to unearth the in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation and its relation with FNE. The results gathered from the quantitative data enriched with the qualitative data allowed us to answer the research questions. Through these results the frame for in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation is defined and the relationship between these norms and FNE was questioned. Although the study is grounded on a preliminary study and the instruments are tested through piloting, having another study, with another group and getting test-retest reliability is necessary.

Since that is a case study the sample for the research is limited to the freshman students at the department of Foreign Language Education at METU and it is female dominant, which reflects the general gender distribution of students in the department.

There are many variables that determine the relationship between language learning and anxiety; i.e. setting, the definition of anxiety, anxiety measures, age and language skills of the subjects, an research design (Young, 1991). Since FNE is a constituent of foreign language classroom anxiety (Horwitz, 1986), further studies with different samplings and research designs would provide a wider scope for us. A further study with a larger sampling with equal gender discrimination would be more informative. The samples of the current study are all candidate English teachers; therefore, evaluating the same research questions with

learners from different departments with different motivations would allow us to learn the differences regarding in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation according to the learner characteristics. Besides, the features and effects of these norms might change according to the cultural background of the learners. Therefore, applying similar studies with EFL learners from different cultural backgrounds we can understand the relationship between culture and the social structure of the classrooms. Furthermore, studying in-class injunctive norms for English pronunciation in multi-lingual classrooms would also provide meaningful results for language teachers and SLA researchers.

REFERENCES

- Aida, Y., (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's construct of foreign language anxiety: the case of students of Japanese. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 155-168.
- Alpert, R., & Haber, R. N. (1960). Anxiety in academic achievement situations. *J. Abnorm Psych*, 61, 207-215.
- Bany, M. A., & Johnson, L.V. (1964). *Classroom group behavior; group dynamics in education*. New York: Macmillan
- Batumlu, Z. D., Erden, M. (2007). Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu hazırlık öğrencileri yabancı dil kaygıları ile İngilizce başarıları arasındaki ilişki. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 3 (1), 24-38.
- Borsari, B., & Carey, K. B. (2001). Peer Influences on College Drinking: A Review of the Research. *Journal of Substance Abuse*, 13, 391-424.
- Bowen, T., Marks, J. (1992). *The pronunciation book*. Singapore: Longman Singapore Publishers
- Cheng, Y., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language Anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning*, 49, 417-446.
- Christensen, P. N., Rothgerber, H., Wood, W., & Matz, D.C. (2004). Social norms and identity relevance: A motivational approach to normative behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1295-1309.

- Cialdini, R.B., Reno, R.R., & Kallgren, C.A. (1990). A focus theory of normative conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 1015-1026
- Collins, K. A., Westra, H. A.; Dozois, D. J. A., & Stewart, S. H. (2005). The validity of the brief version of the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale. *Anxiety Disorders*, 19, 345-359.
- Çelik, M. (2003). *Lerning stress and intonation in English as a second/ foreign language: A practical course for intermediate and advanced students*. Gazi Kitabevi: Ankara.
- Dogancay-Aktuna, S., & Kızıltepe, Z. (2005). English in Turkey. *World Englishes*, 242, 252-265.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 783, 273-284.
- Duke, D., Krishnan, M., Faith, M., & Storch, E. A. (2006). The Psychometric Properties of the Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders* In Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Erling, E. (2002). I learn English since ten years: The global English debate and the German university classroom. *English Today*, 70, 182, 8-13.
- Foss, K. A. & Reitzel, A. C. (1988). A relational model for managing second language anxiety. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22 (03), 437-454.

- Fraenkel, R. J. and Wallen, N. E. (2003). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* New York, NI: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002) Language Learning and Perfectionism: anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance, *Modern Language Journal*, 864, 562-570.
- Gardner, R. C., Tremblay, P. F., & Masgoret, A. M. (1997). Toward a full model of second language learning: An empirical investigation. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 344-362.
- Horwitz, E.K. (2000). Horwitz comments: It ain't over 'till It's over: On foreign language anxiety, first language deficits and the confounding of variables. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84, 256-259.
- Horwitz E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70, 125–133.
- Kitano, K. (2001). Anxiety in the college Japanese classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 549-566.
- Lapinski, M.K., & Rimal, R.N. (2005). An explication of social norms. *Communication Theory*, 152, 127-147.
- Leary, M. R. & Kowalski, R. M. (1995). *Social anxiety*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Leary, M. R. (1983). Social anxiousness: The construct and its measurement. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 47, 66-75.

- Lee, L.E. (2007). Linguistic and cultural factors in East Asian students' oral participation in U. S. university classrooms. *International Education*, 362, 27-106.
- Lefkowitz, N. & Hedgcock, J. (2002). Sound barriers: influences of social prestige, peer pressure and teacher (dis)approval on FL oral performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 6 (3), 223-244.
- Liu, Meihua., 2006. Anxiety in Chinese EFL students at different proficiency levels. *System*, 34, 301-316.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent. Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- MacIntyre, P.D. & Gardner, R.C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning*. 44 (2), 283-305.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Methods and results in the study of anxiety and language learning: a review of the literature. *Language Learning*, 41, 85-117.
- MacIntyre, P.D.,Gadner, R.C.(1989)., Anxiety and second language learning : Toward a theoretical clarification. *Language Learning*, 39,251-275.
- Mackey, A. & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research : Methodology and design*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Matsuda, S., & Gobel, P. (2004). Anxiety and predictors of performance in the foreign language classrooms. *System* 32, 21-36.

- Matsuda, S., & Gobel, P. (2001). Quiet apprehension: Reading and classroom anxieties. *JALT*, 232, 227-47
- Mejias, H., Applbaum, R.L., Applbaum, S.J., & Trotter, R.T., (1991). *Oral Communication Apprehension and Hispanics: An Exploration of Oral Communication Apprehension Among Mexican American Students in Texas*. in *Language Anxiety: From Theory and Research to Classroom Applications*, ed. by Elaine K. Horwitz and Dolly J. Young, pp.87-98, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Morgan, B. (1997). Identity and Intonation: Linking Dynamic Processes in an ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 431-49.
- Murphey, T. (1993). *Music & Song*. Oxford University Press.
- Ohata, K. (2005a). Potential Sources of Anxiety for Japanese Learners of English: Preliminary Case Interviews with Five Japanese College Students in the U.S. *TESL-EJ*, 9 (3), 1 - 21.
- Ohata, K. (2005b). Language anxiety from teacher's perspective: Interviews with seven experienced ESL/EFL teachers. *Journal of Language and Learning*, 3 (1), 133-155.
- Onwuegbuzie, A.J., Bailey, P., & Daley, C.E. (1999). The validation of three scales measuring anxiety at different stages of the foreign language learning process: the input anxiety scale, the processing anxiety scale, and the output anxiety scale, *Language Learning*, 50 (1), 87-117.
- Phillips, E.M. (1991). Anxiety and Oral Competence: Classroom Dilemma. *The French Review*. 65 (1). 1-14.

- Price, M. L. (1991). The Subjective Experience of Foreign Language Anxiety: Interviews with Highly Anxious Students', in E. K. Horwitz and D. J. Young eds., *Foreign Language Anxiety: From Theory to Research to Classroom Practices*. Engle-wood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall .
- Reno, R. R., Cialdini, R. B., & Kallgren, C. A. (1993). The transsituational influence of social norms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 104-112.
- Rimal, R.N., & Real, K. (2005). How behaviors are influenced by perceived norms. *Communication Research*, 323, 389-414.
- Rimal, R.N., & Real, K. (2003). Understanding the influence of perceived norms on behaviors. *Communication Theory*, 132, 184-203.
- Saito, Y., E.K.Horwitz., & T.J.Garza.(1999).Foreign language reading anxiety,*Modern Language Journal* 83, 202-218.
- Saito, Y. & Keiko S. (1996). Foreign language anxiety and language performance: A study of learner anxiety in beginning, intermediate, and advanced-level college students of Japanese. *Foreign Language Annals*, 292, 239-251.
- Salli-Çopur, D. (2008). *Teacher effectiveness in initial years of service: A case study on the graduates of METU Foreign Language Education program*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Scales, J. Wennerstrom, A. Richard, D. Wu, S. H. (2006). Language Learners' Perceptions of Accent. *TESOL Quarterly* 40 (4), 715-738.

- Schroeder, C.M., Prentice, D.A. (1998), Exposing pluralistic ignorance to reduce alcohol use among college students, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 2150-80.
- Scovel, T. (1978). The effect of affect on foreign language learning: A review of the anxiety research. *Language Learning*, 28, 129-42
- Shoemaker, P. J., Breen, M., & Stamper, M. (2000). Fear of social isolation: testing an assumption from the spiral of silence. *Irish Communications Review*, 8, 65- 78.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1972). *Anxiety: current trends in theory and research*. New York: New York Academic Press.
- Taylor, L. (1993). *Pronunciation in action*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Watson, D., & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 33, 448-451.
- Weeks, J.W., Heimberg, R.G., & Rodebaugh, T.L. (2007). Exploring the Relationship Between Fear of Positive Evaluation and Social Anxiety. *Journal of Anxiety Disorder* 4,1-15.
- Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and speaking English as a second language. *RECL Journal* 37, 308-326.
- Yang, T.K. (2005). *Measurement of Korean EFL College Students' Foreign Language Classroom Speaking Anxiety: Evidence of Psychometric Properties and Accuracy of a Computerized Adaptive Test (CAT) with*

Dichotomously Scored Items Using A CAT Simulation. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Texas at Austin, US.

Young, D. J. (1992). Language anxiety from the foreign language specialist's perspective: Interview with Krashen, Omaggio Hadley, Terrell, and Rardin. *Foreign Language Annals*, 25, 157-172.

Young, D.J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: what does the language anxiety research suggest? *Modern Language Journal*, 75(4), 426-437.

Young, D.J. (1990). An investigation of students' perspectives on anxiety and speaking. *Foreign Language Annals*, 23, 539-53

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE IN PPT FORMAT

Slayt 1

- Bu kısımda yer alan hiçbir soru için doğru ya da yanlış cevap yoktur. Toplam 22 adet soruyu içermektedir ve ortalama 25 dakika sürmektedir. Lütfen sorulara içtenlikle cevap veriniz ve düşüncenizi en iyi ifade eden seçeneği işaretleyiniz.
- C bölümündeki soruları cevaplandırdıktan sonra D bölümündeki sorulara geçilecektir.

Slayt 2

C Bölümü

- *Lütfen ilerleyen 10 slaytta açıklanan ifadelerdeki durumun **sınıfınızdaki sosyal yapı** için uygun olup olmadığına karar veriniz.. Uygun olan seçeneği **'X'** ile işaretleyin.*

Slayt 3

1. Herhangi bir arkadaşım sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken kullanılan ünsüz harfleri **İngilizlerin veya Amerikalıların** telaffuz ettiği biçimde telaffuz etmeye özen gösterdiğinde diğer arkadaşlarım bunu **yadırgar**.

Örnek telaffuz biçimi:

Aşağıda yanyana verilen sözcüklerdeki kalın ve mavi yazılan sesleri ses kaydındaki İngiliz ve Amerikalı konuşmacılar gibi birbirinden **farklı** biçimde okuması.

* **Thin** **Tin** 🇧🇷 🇺🇸 Br. Am. 🇺🇸 🇺🇸

(ilk sesi /θ/, ikinci sesi /t/ olarak söylemek)

* **Went** **Vent** 🇧🇷 🇺🇸 Br. Am. 🇺🇸 🇺🇸

(ilk sesi /w/, ikinci sesi /v/ olarak söylemek)

Slayt 4

2. Herhangi bir arkadaşım sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken kullanmaya alışık olmadığımız bazı ünsüzlerin yerine **Türkçe'de** kullanılan benzer **ünsüzleri** kullandığında sınıftaki diğer arkadaşlarım bunu **yadırgar**.

Örnek telaffuz biçimi:

Aşağıda yanyana verilen sözcüklerde kalın ve mavi yazılmış seslerin her ikisini de **aynı** biçimde okuması.

* **Thin** **Tin** 🇺🇸

(her iki sesi de /t/ olarak söylemek)

* **Went** **Vent**

(her iki sesi de /v/ olarak söylemek)

Slayt 5

3. Herhangi bir arkadaşım sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken kullanılan **ünlü harfleri İngilizlerin veya Amerikalıların** telaffuz ettiği biçimde telaffuz etmeye **özen gösterdiğinde** diğer arkadaşlarım onun telaffuz biçimini **yadırgar**.

Örnek telaffuz biçimi:

Aşağıda yanyana verilen sözcüklerdeki kalın ve mavi yazılan sesleri ses kaydındaki İngiliz ve Amerikalı konuşmacılar gibi birbirinden **farklı** biçimde okuması.

* **Sad** **Said** Br. 🇺🇸 Am. 🇺🇸 🇺🇸

(ilk sesi /æ/, ikinci sesi /e/ olarak söylemek)

* **Bad** **Bed** Br. 🇺🇸 Am. 🇺🇸 🇺🇸

(ilk sesi /æ/, ikinci sesi /e/ olarak söylemek)

* **Dad** **Dead** Br. 🇺🇸 Am. 🇺🇸 🇺🇸

(ilk sesi /æ/, ikinci sesi /e/ olarak söylemek)

Slayt 6

4. Herhangi bir arkadaşım sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken kullanmaya alışık olmadığımız bazı ünlülerin yerine **Türkçede** kullanılan **benzer ünlüleri** kullandığında diğer arkadaşlarımız onun bu telaffuzunu **yadırgar**.

Örnek telaffuz biçimi:

All kelimesini /ol/ şeklinde okuması.

/ɔ/ sesi yerine /o/ sesini kullanması.

Sad kelimesini /sed/ şeklinde okuması.

/æ / sesi yerine /e/ sesini kullanması.

Slayt 7

5. Herhangi bir arkadaşım sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken bazı **iki ünlülerin (diphthong)** yerine **tek ses** kullandığında diğer arkadaşlarımız bu telaffuz biçimini **yadırgar**.

Örnek telaffuz biçimi:

Home kelimesini /hom/ diye söylemesi

/ou/ sesi yerine /o/ sesini kullanması.

April kelimesini /eprel/ diye söylemesi

/ei/ iki ünlüsünün yerine /e/ sesini kullanması.

Slayt 8

6. Herhangi bir arkadaşım sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken yazılı olduğu halde telaffuz **edilmemesi gereken** bazı ünsüzleri **açıkça telaffuz ettiğinde** bu telaffuz biçimi diğer arkadaşlarımızın **yadırgar**.

Örnek telaffuz biçimi:

Answer kelimesini /enswər/ olarak söylemesi

/w/ veya /v/ sesini açıkça telaffuz etmesi.

Yellow kelimesini /yellov/ olarak söylemesi

/l/ sesi yerine /ll/ seslerini, ve/veya kelime sonunda okunmayan /w/ sesini açıkça telaffuz etmesi.

Slayt 9

7. Herhangi bir arkadaşım sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken **İngilizlerin veya Amerikalılarınkine benzer bir kelime vurgusu** kullanmaya özen gösterdiğinde diğer arkadaşlarım onun bu konuşma biçimini **yadırgar**.

Örnek telaffuz biçimi: Aşağıdaki sözcükleri söylerken, ses kaydındaki İngiliz ve Amerikalı konuşmacılar gibi, farklı hecelere vurgulaması.

"Photograph", "photographer", "photographic"



Slayt 10

8. Herhangi bir arkadaşım sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken **Türkçedekine benzer bir kelime vurgusu** ile İngilizce kelimeleri telaffuz ettiğinde diğer arkadaşlarım bunu **yadırgar**.

Örnek telaffuz biçimi:

Her zaman en sondaki heceyi vurgulu söylemesi.

"Photograph", "photographer", "photographic"



Slayt 11

9. Herhangi bir arkadaşım sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken **İngilizlerin veya Amerikalıların kullandığı gibi inişli çıkışlı tonlama** biçimini kullanmaya özen gösterdiğinde diğer arkadaşlarım bu konuşma biçimini **yadırgar**.

Örnek telaffuz biçimi:

a. Don't you like him?

b. Well, not really, but I like his friend.



Slayt 12

10. Herhangi bir arkadaşım sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken **Türkçedekine benzer bir tonlama** biçimi ile konuştuğunda bu konuşma biçimini **yadırgar**.

Örnek telaffuz biçimi:

a. Don't you like him?

b. Well, not really, but I like his friend. 🗣️

Slayt 13

C bölümü bitmiştir. Yenide gözden geçirmek istediğiniz maddeler için ilgili slaytı tekrar okuyabilirsiniz.

Slayt 14

D Bölümü

➤ **Lütfen aşağıda belirtilen ifadelerdeki durumun sizin için uygun olup olmadığına karar veriniz.. Uygun olan seçeneği 'X' ile işaretleyin.**

Slayt 15

- **Lütfen ilerleyen 12 slaytta açıklanan ifadelerdeki durumun sizin için uygun olup olmadığına karar veriniz.. Uygun olan seçeneği 'X' ile işaretleyin.**

Slayt 16

1. Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken bazı İngilizce seslerin yerine Türkçedeki benzer sesleri kullandığımda arkadaşlarımla hakkında olumsuz düşüncelerinden endişe ediyorum.
- Örnek: Aşağıdaki cümlede mavi ile yazılmış sesleri okurken olduğu gibi.
I think that is a good answer. 🗣️

Slayt 17

2. Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken sesleri (ünlü, ünsüz ve iki ünlüleri) İngilizlerin veya Amerikalıların kullandığı biçimde telaffuz etmeye çalıştığımda arkadaşlarımla abarttığımı düşüncelerinden endişe duyuyorum.
- Örnek: Aşağıdaki cümlede mavi ile yazılmış sesleri okurken olduğu gibi.
Well, this is my answer. 🗣️

Slayt 18

3. Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken **telafuz edilmemesi gereken yerlerde bazı sesleri telafuz ettiğimde** arkadaşlarımın hakkımda **olumsuz** düşüneceği fikri beni **endişelendiriyor**.

Örnek: Aşağıdaki kelimedeki mavi ile yazılmış sesi okurken olduğu gibi.

Answer 🗣️

Slayt 19

4. Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken kullandığım **tonlamaları İngilizlerin veya Amerikalılarınkine benzetmeye çalıştığımda** arkadaşlarımın **abarttığımı** düşüneceklerinden endişe duyuyorum.

Örnek:

Aşağıdaki diyalogu kayıttaki gibi söylemeye özen gösterdiğimde:

a. Don't you like him? 🗣️ 🗣️

b. Well, not really, but I like his friend.

Slayt 20

5. Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken **tonlamalarım Türkçedeki tonlama biçimine benzerse arkadaşlarımın** hakkımda olumsuz düşüneceğinden **endişe duyuyorum**.

Örnek:

a. Don't you like him?

b. Well, not really, but I like his friend. 🗣️

Slayt 21

6. Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken telafuzum diğer arkadaşlarımdan farklı olduğunda arkadaşlarımdan hakkında olumsuz düşüneceğinden endişe duyuyorum.

Slayt 22

7. Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken tonlamalarda hata yaparsam arkadaşlarımdan hakkında olumsuz düşüneceği fikri beni endişelendiriyor.

Slayt 23

8 . Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken İngilizlerin veya Amerikalılarınkine benzer bir vurgu kullanmaya çalıştığımda arkadaşlarımdan abarttığımı düşüneceklerinden endişe duyuyorum.

Slayt 24

9 . Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken **Türkçedekine benzer bir vurgu** kullandığımda arkadaşlarımla hakkında olumsuz düşüneceğinden **endişe duyuyorum.**

Slayt 25

10. Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken kelime vurgularını **hatalı kullanırsam** arkadaşlarımla hakkında olumsuz düşüneceklerinden **endişe duyuyorum.**

Slayt 26

11. İngilizce konuşurken telaffuzumun arkadaşlarımla tarafından **onaylanması** benim için **önemli.**

Slayt 27

12. İngilizce konuşurken diğer öğrencilerin telaffuzum hakkında ne düşünecekleri beni **endiselendirmez**.

APPENDIX B

ANSWERSHEET FOR THE PARTICIPANTS

Bu çalışma, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümü tarafından yapılmaktadır. Elde edilecek veriler sadece bu araştırmayla sınırlı kalacak ve kişisel bilgiler kesinlikle gizli tutulacaktır. Detaylı bilgi için 210 64 98 i arayarak veya zolcu@metu.edu.tr ile Araştırma Görevlisi Zeynep ÖLÇÜ'ye ulaşabilirsiniz.

A. Kişisel Bilgiler

Aşağıdaki bilgileri doldurunuz.

Cinsiyetiniz : Kadın Erkek

Yaşınız : _____

Sınıf ve Şubeniz : _____

Uyruğunuz : TC Diğer

Ana diliniz : Türkçe Diğer

Lütfen sayfayı çeviriniz →

B. Bölümü

1. Aşağıdaki seçeneklerde belirtilen ifadelerden hangisi arkadaşlarınız arasında sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken en yaygın kullanılan konuşma biçimini tanımlamaktadır? Belirtmek istediğiniz başka özellikleri varsa lütfen sorunun hemen altındaki boşluğa yazınız.
 - a) İngilizce konuşurken Türkçenin ses ve tonlama özellikleri konuşmasına yansır.
 - b) İngilizce konuşurken söylediği sesleri ve kullandığı tonlama biçimini İngiliz veya Amerikalılarınkine benzetebilmek için çaba sarfeder.
 - c) İngilizce konuşurken söylediği seslerin ve kullandığı tonlamanın hatalı olup olmadığını umursamaz.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2. 1. soruda yaygın kullanıldığını belirttiğiniz konuşma biçiminin diğer şıklarda verilen konuşma biçimlerine göre daha yaygın olmasının sebepleri neler olabilir?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3. 1. Soruda yaygın olarak kullanıldığını belirttiğiniz konuşma biçimini tanımlayan ifadenin dışındaki seçeneklerde belirtilen konuşma biçimleri neden daha az tercih ediliyor veya hiç tercih edilmiyor?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Lütfen sayfayı çeviriniz →

C Bölümü

C Bölümü için vereceğiniz cevapları aşağıdaki tabloda her soru için uygun gelen kutucuğa X işareti olarak belirtiniz.

	1- Kesinlikle katılmıyorum	2- Katılmıyorum	3- Kararsızım	4- Katılıyorum	5- Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
1. Madde					
2. Madde					
3. Madde					
4. Madde					
5. Madde					
6. Madde					
7. Madde					
8. Madde					
9. Madde					
10. Madde					

Lütfen sayfayı çeviriniz →

D Bölümü

D Bölümü için vereceğiniz cevapları aşağıdaki tabloda her soru için uygun gelen kutucuğa X işareti olarak belirtiniz.

	1- Kesinlikle katılmıyorum	2- Katılmıyorum	3- Kararsızım	4- Katılıyorum	5- Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
1. Madde					
2. Madde					
3. Madde					
4. Madde					
5. Madde					
6. Madde					
7. Madde					
8. Madde					
9. Madde					
10. Madde					
11. Madde					
12. Madde					

Lütfen sayfayı çeviriniz →

Anketimi yanıtladığınız için teşekkür ederim☺

Araştırmamıza, röportaja katılarak katkıda bulunmak veya çalışmanın sonuçlarından haberdar edilmek isterseniz, ilgili kutucuğu işaretleyiniz ve iletişim bilgilerinizi yazınız, en kısa zamanda sizinle iletişim kurulacaktır.

Röportaja katılmak istiyorum

Araştırmanın sonuçlarından haberdar edilmek istiyorum

Telefon :.....

E-mail :.....

APPENDIX C

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE AFTER PILOTING

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	31	100,0
	Excluded(a)	0	,0
	Total	31	100,0

a Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,728	22

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
C1	56,10	54,157	,387	,709
C2	56,13	58,183	,104	,733
C3	56,03	54,099	,417	,707
C4	56,42	56,052	,368	,713
C5	56,48	60,925	-,060	,737
C6	54,68	59,426	,080	,731
C7	56,42	58,652	,099	,732
C8	56,19	55,361	,218	,726
C9	56,35	57,837	,147	,729
C10	56,61	58,645	,096	,732
D1	56,00	55,667	,287	,718
D2	55,55	52,256	,508	,698
D3	55,19	54,228	,394	,709
D4	56,16	56,940	,211	,724
D5	56,58	57,118	,255	,720
D6	55,97	50,832	,724	,683
D7	56,52	56,058	,313	,716
D8	56,00	54,667	,360	,712
D9	56,55	57,323	,335	,717
D10	56,48	54,191	,560	,701
D11	55,68	56,226	,223	,724
D12	55,48	54,325	,241	,725

APPENDIX D

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	58	100,0
	Excluded(a)	0	,0
	Total	58	100,0

a Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,703	22

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
C1	57,78	60,809	,206	,698
C2	58,07	62,802	,135	,702
C3	57,47	59,972	,271	,692
C4	58,10	62,270	,148	,702
C5	58,22	61,054	,293	,692
C6	56,22	61,510	,192	,699
C7	58,00	60,000	,248	,694
C8	57,86	58,998	,290	,690
C9	57,91	60,221	,244	,695
C10	58,02	63,070	,074	,708
D1	57,59	57,194	,463	,675
D2	56,86	62,016	,135	,704
D3	56,66	59,984	,275	,692
D4	57,74	59,985	,262	,693
D5	57,53	58,464	,311	,688
D6	57,05	59,243	,275	,692
D7	58,05	61,032	,215	,697
D8	57,19	56,788	,470	,674
D9	58,07	61,364	,206	,697
D10	57,78	57,019	,426	,677
D11	57,10	57,919	,356	,684
D12	58,33	59,101	,206	,701

APPENDIX E

ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

<p>B1. Which of the following statements describe the most commonly used English pronunciation in your classroom?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) When speaking English Turkish sound and intonation patterns are heard from the speaker's speech.b) The speaker shows effort to approximate the sounds and the intonation that s/he uses to the the one used by British or American people.c) The speaker does not consider his/her pronunciaiton mistakes when speaking English.
<p>B2. What can be the reasons for the common use of that pronunciation compared to other two ways pronunciation described in the other options?</p>
<p>B3. What can be the reasons for the common use of that pronunciation compared to other two ways pronunciation described in the other options?</p>
<p>C1. When one of my classmates emulates consonant pronunciation of British or American people, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.</p>
<p>C2. When one of my classmates uses similar Turkish consonants instead of some English consonants that we are not used to pronouncing, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.</p>
<p>C3. When one of my classmates emulates vowel pronunciation of British or American people, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.</p>
<p>C4. When one of my classmates uses similar Turkish vowels instead of some English vowels that we are not used to pronouncing, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.</p>
<p>C5. When one of my classmates utters a single sound in the place of a diphthong, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.</p>
<p>C6. When one of my classmates pronounces a consonant which are scribed but not uttered, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.</p>
<p>C7. When one of my classmates emulates word stress of British or American people, other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.</p>

C8. When one of my classmates utters English words with Turkish word stress other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.
C9. When one of my classmates emulates intonation of British or American people other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.
C10. When one of my classmates speaks English with a Turkish like intonation other students in the classroom find that pronunciation strange.
D1. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I use a similar Turkish sound instead of some English sounds I feel anxious if others finds that strange.
D2. While I am speaking English in the classroom, I feel anxious when I emulate sound (vowels, diphthongs, consonants) production of British or American people, I feel anxious if others think that I am exaggerating.
D3. While I am speaking English in the classroom if I utter some sounds when I shouldn't utter them at all the idea of being negatively evaluated by others makes me anxious.
D4. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I emulate intonation of British or American people I feel anxious if others think that I am exaggerating.
D5. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I use a similar Turkish sound instead of some English sounds I feel anxious if others finds that strange.
D6. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if my pronunciation is different from the others I feel anxious.
D7. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I have intonation mistakes the idea of being negatively evaluated by others makes me anxious.
D8. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I emulate stress use of British of American people I feel anxious if others think that I am exaggerating.
D9. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I use stress which is similar to Turkish stress patterns I feel anxious that others will think about me negatively
D10. While I am speaking English in the classroom, if I have mistake about use of stress I feel anxious that others will think about me negatively.

D11. While I am speaking English in the classroom it is important for me that others approve my pronunciation.

D12. While I am speaking English in the classroom, others' ideas about my pronunciation do not make me anxious.

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken arkadaşların tarafından yaygın olarak kullanılan telaffuz ve tonlama biçimi İngiliz veya Amerikalıların kullandıkları ile büyük oranda benzerlik gösteriyor diyebilir miyiz?
2. Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken arkadaşların tarafından yaygın olarak tercih edilen telaffuz ve tonlama biçiminin özellikleri nelerdir?
3. Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken İngilizlerin veya Amerikalıların telaffuz ve tonlama biçimi ile konuşmaya çalışan bir öğrencinin bu çabası arkadaşları tarafından nasıl karşılanır? Neden?
4. Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken dinleyenleri rahatsız edecek derecede telaffuz ve tonlama hatası yapan bir öğrencinin bu davranışı arkadaşları tarafından nasıl karşılanır? Neden?
5. Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken diğer öğrencilerin telaffuz ve tonlama biçimine göstereceği tepkiler konuşmacının kullanacağı telaffuz ve tonlama tercihini etkiler mi? Neden? Nasıl?
6. Sınıf içinde birbirinizin aksanını ve konuşma performansını etkileyen gizli, örtük kurallar vardır diyebilir miyiz?
7. Varsa bu kurallara göre sınıf içinde İngilizce konuşurken en çok kabul gören telaffuz ve tonlama biçiminin özellikleri nelerdir?
8. Sınıf içinde İngilizce konuşurken konuşmacı bu kurallara uymadığında sınıftaki öğrencilerin tepkisi nasıl olur?

9. Kişisel olarak, sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken öğretmen tarafında model olarak sunulan İngiliz veya Amerikalıların kullandığı telaffuz ve tonlama biçimine benzeterek konuşmayı mı yoksa sınıfın genelinde kullanılan telaffuz ve tonlama biçimini kullanmayı mı tercih ediyorsun? Neden?
10. Sınıfta İngilizce konuşurken kendinizi en güvende hissettiğiniz aksan İngiliz aksanı mı, Amerikan aksanı mı yoksa sınıfta yaygın olarak kullanılan aksan mıdır? Neden?

APPENDIX G

ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Can we claim that the type of pronunciation and intonation used by your friends within the classroom is very similar to the one used by British or American people?
2. What are the features of the pronunciation and intonation that are commonly preferred by your friends when speaking English in the classroom?
3. How are the efforts of a student who gives importance to sound native like are found by his/her friends? Why?
4. How is a student's performance, who speaks with pronunciation mistakes such that listeners get irritated his/her friends found by his/her friends? Why?
5. Does the possible reactions of other students' to a student's pronunciation and intonation affect the pronunciation and intonation preference of the speaker? Why? How?
6. Can we claim that we have tacit rules in the classroom that affect each others' pronunciation performance?
7. If there are such rules, according to these rules what are the features of the most approved English pronunciation and intonation in the classroom?
8. How are the reactions of other students to a student who does not obey these rules when speaking English in the classroom?

9. Do you prefer speaking by approximating your pronunciation to the American or British pronunciation and intonation suggested by the teacher or using English pronunciation and intonation used by other students? Why?
10. Which one is the type of pronunciation that you feel confident when you are speaking English in the classroom: British, American accent or the one which is used commonly in the classroom? Why?

APPENDIX H

TURKISH VERSION OF THE INTERVIEW SCRIPTS

Interviewee 1

1. Sadece kelime İngilizce oluyor. Türkçe vurgu oluyor. Yani ne İngilizce ne Türkçe araya karışık bir şey oluyor.
2. Bir tane sarışın Rusya'dan gelen bir arkadaşımız var sadece edebiyat dersinde aynı sectiondayız. O böyle konuşunda böyle biraz anlatmaya başlayınca yani güzel Amerikalı ya da İngiliz gibi konuşmaya başlayınca arkadaşlarımız böyle hafif gülmeye başlıyor falan, ağızlarını kapatıyor ki ben de dahilim buna maalesef. Yani biraz garipsiyoruz. Garipsememiz de çok normal çünkü yani nerdeyse hepimiz Türk aksanı ile İngilizce konuşuyoruz. Garipsemek istemiyorum ama içimden gelmiyor. Garipsiyorum yani.
3. Bu arkadaşım Türk de olsa kesinlikle yine aynı tepki olurdu. Yani 100 kişi varsa 90 ı aynı mantıkla konuştuğu için 10 kişi konuşunca 90 kişiye birden grip geliyor yani arkada kıs kıs böyle gülmeler falan oluyor yani.
4. Fısıldaşırılar, ağız altından gülerler, dersten çıkışta kendi aralarında konuşurlar. Ama konuşmacıya direk birşey söylenmiyor ama o hissediyordur.

Interviewee 2

1. Bizimkisi daha çok kendi konuştuğumuz Türkçenin İngilizceye uyarlanmış hali gibi. Yani mesela Türkçede kullandığımız tonlama daha çok düz bir yapıya sahip, İngilizler daha inişli çıkışlı bir tonlama

kullanıyorlar. Bizim kullandığımız buna pek benzemiyor. Sesler, hani benzemeye çalışıyor tabi gitgide de onlar gibi olmuyor.

2. Daha önce hepimizin genelde öğrendiği şeyler, onlara benziyor, hani değiştiremiyoruz ya bir süreden sonra ya da daha zor değiştirmek. O eskiden gördüğümüz şeylerin kabul gördüğünü söyleyebiliriz. Ya da eğer işte hocanın öğrettiği belli şeyler varsa telaffuz açısından onlar da ön planda oluyor.
3. Farklı geliyor... Tam benzese hani kimse bir şey demeyecek de hani daha değişik birşey yapmaya çalıştığını düşünüyor olabilirler. İngiliz aksanına benzemiyor, Amerikan aksanına benzemiyor, Türkçeden de çıkmış oluyor... Daha değişik bir şey ortaya çıkıyor..
4. Genelin yapmadığı bir hata ise o daha çok göz önüne batıyor. Yoksa hani herkesin tonlama ve vurgu hataları var onlar pek dikkate alınmıyor. Mesela /becoz/ -/becauz/ aşırı uzatılırsa böyle /bikauz/ ya da tam yazıldığı gibi okunan şeyler bazen olabilir. Bunlar yadırganır.

Interviewee 3

1. Yani tam yerinden çıkartılmıyor o sesler deyim o zaman da Türkçedekine daha benzer oluyor. Tam Türkçe de değil ama tam doğru noktasından da çıkartılmıyor.
2. Daha önce öğretilmemiş arka planda kalmış olanlar kullanılmıyor, kullanmaya çalıştığımızda da arkadaşlarımız tarafından pek hoş karşılanmıyor.

3. Zaten bizde böyle çok konuşulmuyor sınıflarda. Bir de o var zaten de konuşulduğu zaman da daha çok belirgin olan kuralları uygulamaya çalışıyoruz o belirgin kurallar da herkes tarafından bilindiği için pek bir farklılık yaratmıyor. Hani nasıl desem daha ince kurallar mesela pek uygulanmıyor.
4. Şimdi bütün sınıfı koysak mesela hocamız gelse bize direk o aksanı koysa işte böyle konuşacaksınız, doğrusu budur dese. Herkes onu öğrense, herkes onu kullanmaya başlasa hiçbir sorun olmaz. Ama böyle herkes o şeyi öğrenemiyor, öğrenmiyor, herkes o şeyi doğru bilmiyor ama doğru bilenler de diğerlerinden tepki görmemek uğruna kullanmıyor.
5. Burada herkes doğru konuşmuyor, sen doğruyu yapıyor olsan bile toplum içinde farklı bir şey yapan insan olduğun için yanlış hani böyle ters algılanıyorsun.
6. Eğer o sesleri doğru çıkartıyorsa çok güzel karşılanır aa çok güzel konuşabiliyor diye överiz biz onu ama eğer hani güzel bir şey yapmaya çalışırken o şeyi batırıyorsa aaa yapmaya çalışıyor ama beceremiyor diye şeyapılır, ama eğer doğru bir şekilde yapıyorsa çok hoşumuza gider yani.
7. Artık bu yaşa gelmişiz ODTÜ de birinci sınıf öğrencisi olmuşuz bu da yanlış eğer okunuyorsa küçümsenmesi de çok normal yani kızılması.
8. Ben kendi adıma konuşayım, hani diğerleri kullanmıyorsa ama ben kullanıyorsam ama doğrusunu biliyorsam ve çok böyle kulak

tırmalayıcı bir şekilde hani normal söylenenden çok farklı bir telaffuz varsa ben onu kalkıp söylemem.

9. O kurallar değişmedikten o insanlar değişmedikten sonra fikrimin de değişeceğini pek sanmıyorum. Ama mesela inşallah Allah izin verirse gittim geldim yüksek lisansımı yaptım falan işte böyle masterımı yurt dışında yaptım geldim, her şeyi çok iyi biliyorum, böyle arkadaşlarımla oturuyorum konuşuyorum o zaman çok daha rahat uygulamam

Interviewee 4

1. Biz şu anda 1. Sınıf öğrencisiyiz lisede lise 2 ve lise 3 de kendimizi YDS ye odakladığımız için sadece test tekniğimiz gelişti ve lisede fazla listening ve speaking yaptığımız söylenemez bu yüzden ilk defa burada listening ve speaking yapmaya başladık.
2. Dudaklarımızı bükmek onlar gibi konuşmak hani özentisi gibi göstermek kendimizi belki onların düşüncesi de odur diye tahmin ediyorum. Direk olduğumuz gibi konuşmamızı istiyor olabilirler. Türk aksanı ile. Yani Turgut Özal gibi.

Interviewee 5

1. Hepimiz birbirimizi etkiliyoruz ve bizim sınıfta kimse böyle söylemez. Böyle söylersem bana gülerler diye düşünüyoruz.
2. Ben genelinde olanı kullanıyorum, çünkü tepkilerden korkuyorum
3. Herkes birbirine bakar ne diyor bu falan deriz, ya aslında doğru olanı yaptığını biliyoruz ama hiç kimse öyle yapmadığı için bize bir çıkıntılık gibi geliyor.

4. Ne derler gülerler şimdi benimle dalga geçerler, sonuçta kimse dalga geçilmek istemez. Hani, benle dalga geçmelerini önemsemiyorum, hani bunu ben kedime yakıştıramıyorum.

Interviewee 6

1. Derler mi diye hiç deneyim bile yapmadım, derler mi diye. Mesela bir sunumda imitasyon yaptım herkes çok beğendi tam öyle konuşuyordum, ama normal konuşmada şüphe ederim. O zaten taklit, kimse birşey demez, zaten taklit.

Interviewee 7

1. Teori bize işte Amerikan, British olacak diyor ama arkadaşlarının baskısı altında hissediyorlar ki sen Türk gibi konuşmalısın.
2. Hani bize farklı geliyor. Çünkü biz ODTÜ ye gelmeden önce gittiğimiz okullardaki öğretmenlerimiz böyle konuşmuyorlardı. Sonuçta bizim de alışık olduğumuz bir telaffuza biçimi var hani garip karşılanıyor o yüzden çünkü burada yeni bir şey ile karşılaştık gibime geliyor. O yüzden yadırgamaları normal bence.
3. Yok, biz aynı lisede öğrendiğimiz gibi konuşacağız, evet bunu çok yadırgamıyorlar. Hani çok bariz kulağa batan bir hata olmadıkça ya da sınıfta biz onun üzerinde çok durmadıysak yadırgamıyor ama yine sınıfta tartışıldıysa bu telaffuz o zaman artık herkes böyle aa ama yeter artık falan dediğimiz oluyor. Öyle deme falan dediğimiz oluyor.
4. Sınıfta belki dikkat çekerim, öne çıkmayayım, hani sivrilmek istemeyiz ya ortalarda olalım.

5. Hata yapmak istemiyoruz çünkü diğerlerinin, çoğu kişi bunu yapmasa da, birkaç kişinin tepkisinden çekiniyoruz hata yaptığımızda.

Interviewee 8

1. Arkadaşlarından en çok hangi biçimde duymuşsa o şekilde telaffuz eder. Hoca değil de arkadaşları. Çünkü hocalarımız bizi telaffuzumuzdan dolayı yadırgamaz ama arkadaşlarımız yadırgar.
2. Speaking dersinde öğrendiğimiz sadece speaking dersinde geçer, o bir nevi ders ve dediğim gibi öğrencinin asıl amacı derste başarılı olmak yani nota yansıdığı için onu, herkes o şekilde çünkü. Speaking dersinde herkes o şekilde.
3. Kendini büyük görüyor, kendini sanki onlar gibi adapte etmeye çalışıyor. Hani bizden üstün göstermeye çalışıyor kendini. Bu tür düşünceler olabilir.
4. Hata yadırganır. Her ne kadar mükemmel derecede telaffuz edemeyiz belki ama sonuçta buraya boş öğrenciler olarak gelmedik. Sınavda maksimum 5 yanlış sonuçta belirli bir zeka ve öğrenme seviyesine sahip.
5. Eğer kişi gerçekten kendine güveniyorsa, öz güveni varsa tamam ben olumlu eleştiriye de olumsuz eleştiriye de açığım, kelimeleri ben doğru bildiğim gibi telaffuz ederim, yanlışsa da bunu düzeltirim. Arkadaşlarım da uyarıyor. Kişi eğer böyle düşünüyorsa ki bu çok taktir edilecek bir durum. Kelimeyi bildiğince yani gerçekten Amerikan ya da İngiliz yani o şekilde biliyorsa, yani o aksanı biliyorsa o şekilde telaffuz

etmeye çalışır. Dediğim gibi eğer arkadaşları önünde gülünç duruma düşmekten korkuyorsa kesinlikle yani aaa geneli nasıl telaffuz ediyorsa ya o zamana kadar en çok hangi telaffuzu duymuşsa yine o şekilde telaffuz eder.

6. Sonuçta ben native-like konuşan bir arkadaşımı yargıladığım için başkalarının da beni yadırgayacağını farkında olurum. /well/ şeklinde telaffuz edersem onların da ben kendimi büyük gösteriyormuşum gibi bir düşünceye kapılacaklarının ben de farkında olurum.
7. Kesinlikle öz güveni olanlar çok az, çok çok az. Mesela bu sene 105 öğrenci alında yanlış hatırlamıyorsam bunların içinde toptasak bir 10 kişi ancak çıkar.
8. Eğer bir kere insan yani o duruma düşerse hani arkadaşları bir kelimeyi telaffuzundan dolayı arkadaşları tarafından yadırganırsa ve o kişi de bunu fark ederse, bu kişi için gerçekten çok zor bir durum. Sadece o kelimeyi telaffuz için değil hani tüm bilmediği kelimeleri telaffuzda terlemeye başlar hani büyük bir sıkıntı büyük bir buhran. Bildiği kelimelerde de. Çünkü yani çok önemli sonuçta insan bir çevrede olunca çevredeki herkesin düşüncesi kendisi için önemli oluyor. Sonuçta kimse hani çevresinin gözünde hani çevresinin nazarında gülünç duruma düşmek istemez.

Interviewee 9

1. Ya yapacaksın çok güzel olsun ya da yapmayacaksın bizim gibi konuşuyor.

2. Çinli miydi Japon muydu onlar mesela, onlarda “u”, “ü” falan olmadığı için yapamıyorlar ya da bazı isimleri şeyapamıyorlar, söyleyemiyorlar. Bu onun gibi yani biz onlara alışık olmadığımız için onlar gibi çıkartamıyoruz dolayısıyla ben şimdi çıkartamadığım bocaladığım bir şeyi de söylemek istemiyorum. O yüzden onu kendi dilimde ona benzeyen bir şeyle söylüyorum bu da beni hem daha rahat hissettiriyor hem de karşımdaki beni anlıyor.
3. Biz şu anda Türkiye’ de, Ankara’ da ODTÜ de sınıftalardayız, bunu yapmalarımız için bir sebep yok, onlar için şu anda en önemli şey birbirlerini anlamaları. Eğer ben seni anlamayacaksam, iki saat konuşmuşsun neye yarar derler.

Interviewee 10

1. Hani çok özeniyor gibi gelebilir, niye doğru düzgün konuşmuyor da niye özeniyor. Niye o kadar abartıyor şeklinde, pek hoş karşılanmayabilir. Ama güzel yapıyorsa takdir edilebilir.
2. Abartıyor gibi yapıyorsa ve dalga geçiliyorsa onun da belki kötü yönde de olabilir düzeltilmesi. Sınıfta diğerlerinin konuştuğu şekilde hani Türkçeye yakın versiyonunu belki kullanmaya çalışacaktır. Hani o abartmaları yapmamaya çalışacaktır. Bunu arkadaşları arasında gene hani dışlanmamak için yapabilir hani onların arasında onlar gibi olmak için yapabilir. Hani belki o Amerikan şeklinde ya da İngiliz şeklinde konuşması normal olsa bile arkadaşları o şekilde düşündüğü için öyle yapar.

3. Bir kelimenin fonetiğini şimdi hani çok abartarak bir şey söylersem belki o yanlış çıkacak ama herkesin bildiği gibi söylersem daha normalmiş gibi geliyor. Bilinçli olarak yaptığım bir şey değil, artık hani ona alıştığımız için, herkes o şekilde kullanıyor. Artık onu doğru olarak biliyoruz.

4. Herkes onu kullanıyor. Amerikan ya da İngiliz aksanı kullanırken yanlış yapma olasılığı da daha fazla, ama bunda kullanırken zaten yanlış kullanıyoruz, yani herkes o şekilde kullandığı için ben de bunda belki kendimi daha güvenli hissediyor olabilirim... Herkes onu kullanıyor, kulağımız onu duymaya alışmış beklide onu doğru olarak kabul ediyoruz.

APPENDIX I

ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE INTERVIEW SCRIPTS

Interviewee 1

1. Only the words are English. We use Turkish stress patterns. I mean neither English nor Turkish; it is a mixture of both.
2. There is a blonde student from Russia. We are in the same section only for Literature courses. When she speaks, I mean when she starts to talk about something with a good native like accent our friends sneer at her closing their mouths with their hands. Unfortunately, I am one of those sneering students too. I mean, we find her pronunciation a little bit strange. That is quite normal because, I mean, nearly all of us speak English with Turkish accent. I do not want to regard it strange but I don't feel like. I mean, I find it strange like my friends.
3. Even if that student is Turkish, we would give the same reaction. I mean, since 90 people out of 100 people speak in the same way and only 10 people attempt to speak native like, all 90 people find that pronunciation strange. I mean, students sitting at the back rows sneer at the speaker etc.
4. They talk in whispers, sneer at the speaker, they talk about the speakers' pronunciation after the lesson. Although they don't say anything directly to the speaker, the speaker might notice their sarcastic attitudes.

Interviewee 2

1. Our pronunciation is like an adaptation of Turkish into English. I mean, for example intonation that we use in Turkish has a flat structure, English people use a more fluctuating intonation. The one that we use is not like the one used by the natives much. Sounds that we use, I mean, of course they gradually become more approximate (to the native pronunciation), but still they are different from the ones that natives use.
2. Our pronunciation reflects the type of pronunciation that we all learnt before, I mean, we cannot change our pronunciation after a period of time or it is difficult to change. We can say that the things that we have learnt before are approved. Or, if there are some certain pronunciation rules that are underlined by the instructors, these rules are taken into consideration.
3. It (native like English pronunciation) sounds different. If it could absolutely resemble the native pronunciation, nobody would criticize. However, the students might think that the speaker is trying to do something different from others because it does not resemble British accent or American accent, also it does not sound like Turkish... A different accent comes out.
4. If a mistake is not commonly made in the classroom, it irritates students much. Otherwise, I mean, everybody makes some intonation and stress mistakes; however, they are not taken into consideration. For example, /bicoz/-/bicauz/, if it is pronounced too long, like /bicauz/ or some

letters which shouldn't be uttered at all are pronounced. These are regarded as strange in the classroom.

Interviewee 3

1. I mean, the sounds are not articulated from its correct place. Then, these sounds become more Turkish like. However, they are not exactly Turkish sounds, but they cannot be articulated from the accurate place (to be heard like a native sound).
2. The pronunciation rules which are not taught and remaining at the background are not used, when we try to pronounce it, it is not so appreciated by our friends.
3. Indeed, we do not speak much in the lessons... When we speak we try to follow very prominent rules. Since these rules are known by everyone obeying them does not create much difference. I mean, there are more detailed rules, for example they are not followed.
4. Suppose that to emphasize native like pronunciation our instructor says that we are supposed to use that pronunciation, and this pronunciation is the correct one. Therefore, everybody learns it and begins to use it, then attempting to use the native like pronunciation won't be a problem. However, today not everybody can learn the rules; everybody do not do not know native like pronunciation and others who know the rules cannot use it in order not to cause others' reaction.

5. Here, everybody does not speak correctly, even if you are speaking correctly, since you do not comply with the group you are in, I mean, regarded as strange....
6. If a person can pronounce these sounds (native sounds) correctly that pronunciation is appreciated. We appreciate that person claiming that s/he can speak very well. However, if, I mean, she messes it up when s/he is trying to speak (native like), we say that aa s/he is trying to do something but s/he cannot achieve it. But, if s/he can use native like pronunciation correctly we really like it.
7. Now that we are grown up and we are freshman students at METU, if that (a simple word) is pronounced incorrectly, it is quite normal that the speaker will be despised I mean others will get angry with her.
8. For me, if others do not use native like pronunciation of a structure while I know its correct pronunciation and can use it, I still don't pronounce it if that pronunciation is obviously different from the commonly used one.
9. As long as these rules and these people do not change, I don't think that my ideas would change. However, for example, if I could go abroad and come back, have my MA degree abroad, and I know everything very well, and I am speaking with my friends, then I would be comfortable when I am speaking native like English.

Interviewee 4

1. We are freshman students now. At high school, at 2nd and 3rd grade we focused on the University Entrance Exam. Therefore, only our test

taking skills developed and we cannot claim that we had sufficient listening and speaking courses at high school...

2. Curving our lips, speaking like them (native speakers), like affectation, I guess, maybe, their idea is that. They might want us to speak directly as we are. With the Turkish accent. I mean like Turgut Özal.

Interviewee 5

1. We all influence each other. We think that nobody in the classroom speaks like that and if I utter it, others might laugh at me.
2. I choose the commonly used one, because I am worried about the reactions.
3. Everybody looks at each other and we say “what is she saying, what is she saying?”. I mean, actually we know that they are doing the correct thing but since nobody does that (attempt to speak native like), according to us, it looks like s/he is boasting.
4. What they will say about me, they might laugh at me, now they might ridicule me, actually nobody wants to be picked up. I mean, indeed, it does not bother when they pick me up but, I mean, still I cannot bring myself to be in that situation.

Interviewee 6

1. Even I haven't tried it (*speaking with native like pronunciation*) thinking that they might say that I am boasting. For example, I imitated a scene from a film in a presentation, I spoke like them, everybody

liked it very much, but I feel suspicious when I speak in normal cases. It was just an imitation; nobody says something, just an imitation.

Interviewee 7

1. Theory suggests us that, I mean, we should speak with American or British English; however, under the pressure of their friends people feel that they should sound Turkish like.
2. I mean they sound (native like pronunciation) strange to us. Because in our prior schools our teachers were not speaking like that (with native like pronunciation). Actually, there is a pronunciation style that we have been used to, I mean it (native like speaking) is regarded strange. Therefore, it looks like we have faced with something new here (at METU). I mean it is new for us. Therefore, for me it is normal that they find that strange.
3. We should speak with the pronunciation that we learnt at the high school, yes they do not find that so strange. I mean, if we do not make a noticeable mistake it is not found strange. However, if it (pronunciation rule) was discussed in the classroom (and if someone has pronounced it wrong) everybody says “aaa that is enough”. We might warn the speaker about the mistake.
4. The speaker thinks that s/he might pick up others attention in the classroom, s/he shouldn't come into prominence. You know, we don't want to be noticed and be under attention.

5. We do not want to make mistakes because some people, though many do not do that, have some reactions which we do not want to face when we have mistakes.

Interviewee 8

1. S/he (the student) uses the pronunciation that s/he has heard from his/her friends frequently. Not the instructors, but the friends, because our instructors do not regard us as strange because of our pronunciation but our friends do.
2. The rules that we have learnt in speaking courses are used only in speaking courses. Speaking courses are a kind of lesson, and as I mentioned before the main aim of a student is to be successful in the lesson, I mean, because it affects the grades, because everybody is in that manner. Everybody is in that mood in the speaking lessons.
3. He is boasting, he is trying to adapt his pronunciation to the native speaker pronunciation. I mean, he is trying to show himself as if he is better than us. Such ideas might appear in students' minds.
4. A pronunciation mistake is found strange. Even though we might not have a perfect pronunciation, we did not come here (METU) as unknowledgeable students...The students had maximum 5 mistakes in the exam (University Entrance Exam) and they have a certain capacity of learning.
5. If the person is really self-confident and has a high self-confidence, if s/he thinks "OK I am open to both negative and positive criticism, I

pronounce words as I know them. If it is wrong I correct it. My friends also warn me when I have wrong pronunciation.” This is a very appreciated case. S/he tries to pronounce the words with their correct pronunciation, American or British. But, if the person is worried about making himself cheap in others’ eyes, definitely, I mean, humm, s/he pronounces the words like others, or uses the way of pronunciation that s/he has heard commonly until that time.

6. Since I find any of classmates who speaks native like strange, I would be aware of the fact that others will find my attempts for native like pronunciation strange as well. If I pronounce as /wel/ I will know that my classmates also think that I am like a boastful person.
7. Definitely there are very few students with a high self confidence, very very few. For instance, if I am not mistaken, 105 students were admitted into the department this year, among these students we get 10 highly self confident students at most.
8. If the person has that experience once, I mean, if s/he is regarded as strange by his/her friends because of his/her pronunciation of a word and the speaker realizes others’ reaction, this is a very difficult situation for the speaker. She starts to perspire not only when pronouncing that significant word but also when pronouncing other unknown words. I mean a great trouble, depression. Even with the words s/he knows very well s/he would feel that. Because, I mean, it is very important, when a person is within a society, every person’s ideas in that society become

important for him/her. Actually, nobody, I mean, wants to make himself/herself cheap in others' eyes.

Interviewee 9

1. People think that one should sound native like, if s/he can't achieve it s/he should speak like us.
2. For example, Chinese or Japanese people, I am not sure about the country. They don't have /u/ or /ü/ sounds and they cannot pronounce them, also they cannot pronounce some names (including these vowels). It is something like that, I mean, since we are not used to these sounds we cannot pronounce them like native speakers; therefore, I do not want to utter something that is difficult to pronounce for me when I am speaking. Therefore, I use a similar sound which is used in my mother tongue, and this makes me feel relaxed. And also others can understand my message.
3. We are in Turkey now, in Ankara, in the classrooms at METU, we do not have any necessity to do that (speak with another accent). Now the most important thing is to understand each other. People question that if I won't understand you, what is the value of speaking for two hours?

Interviewee 10

1. It might seem as if the speaker is making special effort to look like native speakers, they might question the reason why the speaker doesn't speak like them rather than s/he pays special effort to sound

native like. They might think that she is exaggerating. It (the speaker's attempts to pronounce English sounds) might not be appreciated.

2. If the person is like speaking with exaggeration and other students on pick him/her for that reason, this person may change his/her pronunciation accordingly. She would try to speak like other students in the classroom, I mean, try to use the Turkish like version. I mean, she will try not to exaggerate. She might do that not to be alienated, I mean, to be like others when she is with them. I mean, although her American or British pronunciation is the normal one she will do that since her friend might evaluate her negatively.
3. If I speak with exaggeration (try native like pronunciation) maybe my pronunciation will be wrong, but if I say it with a pronunciation which is known by everybody, it will be regarded as normal. It is not something that I do consciously, but we are used to it, everybody speaks like that. We accept it (Turkish-like English pronunciation) as correct.
4. Every body uses it (Turkish like pronunciation). When using British or American accent it is more probable that you might make mistakes; however, when we use that one (Turkish like pronunciation), it actually includes many mistakes. Since everybody uses it, I feel more comfortable with it.... Everybody speaks that way, our ears are used to hearing it, maybe we accept that one (Turkish-like English pronunciation) as correct.

APPENDIX J

SAMPLE PRONUNCIATION ACTIVITIES

Here there are some pronunciation activities suggested in different sources (Taylor, 1993; Maley, 1993; Bowen&Marks, 1992) through which the students can improve their English pronunciation and get accustomed to sounding native like and hearing their friends sounding native like within the classroom context. They can be adapted according to the aims of the course, characteristics of the students, and the setting.

Read my lips: The students are put into pairs. A list of problematic words is provided to each pair. One of the pairs read any of the words that's/he selected from the list and his/her partner tries to understand which word is read by his/her pair by looking at the jaw, tongue and lip movements of the speaker. This activity could be very useful especially when the aim is to teach learners to distinguish minimal pairs, long and short vowels etc.

Human computer: The problematic sentences, words or sounds are determined by the instructor, the students or they are defined together. Then the teacher puts these structures on the board. A volunteering student chooses one of these structures and the teacher reads it. Then, the learner repeats it. That continues until the student wants to stop. The same procedure is repeated with other learners is requested. The important point is it is the learner not the teacher who decides to star en finis repeating.

Intonation bodyline: Using their body movements when practicing intonation, retaining intonation patterns become easier for the students. When practicing

intonation the learners use their body to visualize falls and rises of the intonation used in the passage. They raise their arms when they use a raising intonation and lower them when practicing falling intonation. Besides, they can practice stressed syllables in a sentence by walking. When they pronounce stressed syllables they have longer steps and they have shorter steps with unstressed ones.

Tongue twisters: In order to study problematic sounds it is quite suitable to study with sentences in which these sounds are repeated frequently. Tongue twisters are very suitable for that kind of practice. However, finding user-friendly tongue twisters is very important. The learners study on individual words and then they study larger chunks. The students practice not only sound production but also intonation and word stress.

Jazz chants: The teacher can write a jazz chant or find an already written one according to the objectives of the lesson. It is very suitable for teaching intonation, stress or sound production. Besides, it is enjoyable. Then give the written form of it as a handout or write it on the board underlining or making the stressed syllables bold. First the teacher chants it and the students keep the rhythm by using their pencils, clapping or tapping. If they want they can read with the teacher. Then, they study on the chant line by line until the students get the sense of the rhythm. After that they read it together, or they work in groups or pairs and each group or pair reads a part of it.

Mirroring: The students listen to a piece of video or tape recording. That can be a part of a listening activity studied before. The teacher should be sure that the students do not have any problems with understanding. Typescript of the

listening part is given to the. It is very important that the materials should be from authentic resources. Then, students are required to study on the selected material and speak the same sentences with exactly the same speed and same pronunciation.