



UNIVERSIDAD DE CUENCA

Facultad de Filosofía, Letras y Ciencias de la Educación
Carrera de Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nacionales y Extranjeros

**Learners' Perspectives and Outcomes towards Native and Non-native Instruction
with respect to Pronunciation**

Trabajo de titulación previo a la
obtención del título de Licenciado
en Pedagogía del Idioma Inglés

Autor:

Víctor Fernando Tibillín Villa

C.I: 0107384125

Correo: tibillinfernando@gmail.com

Tutora:

Mgtr. María Gabriela Tobar Espinoza

C.I: 0102729514

Cuenca – Ecuador

-10/03/2022-



Resumen

La enseñanza del componente hablado del inglés ha estado en constante debate y cambio para decidir seguir, ya sea, una pronunciación similar a la nativa o una extranjera inteligible. Consecuentemente, esta síntesis de investigación apuntó a establecer, con la ayuda de 16 estudios primarios, si los educadores nativos o no-nativo hablantes son los modelos más apropiados para la enseñanza de la pronunciación en el estado actual del idioma inglés. Los resultados demuestran una discrepancia en lo que está aclarado en investigaciones con lo que realmente es percibido en escenarios reales de educación. No obstante, existe actualmente una clara mejora del estatus de los docentes no-nativo hablantes para enseñar pronunciación inglesa que sea comprensible para cualquier hablante del idioma, en vez de generar en los estudiantes una imitación de una pronunciación nativa. Los resultados de esta investigación ayudan también a establecer una idea más clara sobre los futuros objetivos y percepciones de la enseñanza de la pronunciación y de sus modelos, como también puntos de discusión para completar brechas de conocimiento sobre el tema, especialmente en nuestro contexto.

Palabras clave: Pronunciación. Percepciones de pronunciación. Modelos de pronunciación. Nativo vs. No nativo.



Abstract

The speaking component of the English language has been in constant debate and change to decide following either a native-like or an intelligible-foreign pronunciation. Consequently, this research synthesis aimed to establish, with the aid of 16 primary studies, whether Native or Nonnative Speaking Teachers are the most appropriate models for pronunciation teaching in the current state of the English language. The results demonstrate a discrepancy of what is stated in papers to what is actually perceived in real educational scenarios. Nevertheless, there is nowadays a clear raise of status for non-native speaking teachers to teach an English pronunciation that is comprehensible for any speaker of English, rather than making students imitate a native pronunciation. The findings of this research also help to establish a clear perspective of what are the future goals and perceptions for pronunciation teaching and their models as well as several discussion points to fill certain gaps of knowledge about the topic, especially in our context.

Keywords: Pronunciation. Perceptions of Pronunciation. Pronunciation models. Native vs. Nonnative.



Table of Contents

Resumen	2
Abstract	3
Acknowledgments.....	9
Dedication.....	10
Introduction	11
1. CHAPTER I: Description of the Research	13
1.1. Background	13
1.2. Problem Statement.....	15
1.3. Rationale	16
1.4. Research Questions.....	18
1.5. Objectives.....	18
1.5.1. General Objective	18
1.5.2. Specific Objectives	18
2. CHAPTER II: Theoretical Framework	19
2.1. Fundaments of pronunciation.....	19
2.2. Current principles of pronunciation teaching.....	21
2.3. English pronunciation teaching	24
2.3.1. Historical view of pronunciation teaching.....	25
2.4. Priorities of English pronunciation teaching.....	30
2.4.1. Reasons to teach pronunciation	31
2.4.2. Why pronunciation is neglected?	32
2.4.3. Goals of pronunciation learning and teaching	33
2.5. Pronunciation Models in English Teaching.....	33
2.5.1. Native Speaking teachers.....	33
2.5.2. Non-native speaking teachers	35
3. CHAPTER III: Literature Review	37
3.1. Trends of pronunciation teaching: Nativeness and Intelligibility	38
3.1.1. Learning objectives.....	38
3.1.2. Linguistic features and restrains	39
3.1.3. Perspectives of researchers and educators.....	41
3.2. Models of Pronunciation: NSTs and NNSTs	42
3.2.1. Native Speaking Teachers in English Pronunciation Teaching.....	44



3.2.2.	Nonnative Speaking Teachers in English Pronunciation Teaching.....	46
3.3.	Perceptions of learners in English Pronunciation Teaching.....	48
3.3.1.	Learners' reasons for preference	54
3.3.2.	Possible effects of students' preference.....	58
3.4.	Similarities and Differences in the Learners' Pronunciation Outcomes ..	61
4.	CHAPTER IV: Methodology	67
5.	CHAPTER V: Analysis of the data	69
5.1.	Introduction.....	69
5.2.	Publication Year of the Studies	70
5.3.	Location of the Studies	72
5.4.	Educational Levels	73
5.5.	Pronunciation Teaching Shifting.....	74
5.6.	Accurate Model of Pronunciation according to Studies.....	76
5.7.	Accurate Model of Pronunciation according to Perceptions	78
5.8.	Similarities or differences on the teaching of pronunciation	80
	CHAPTER VI: Conclusions and Recommendations	82
6.1.	Conclusions	82
6.2.	Recommendations	85
	References.....	86



List of Tables

1. Publication Year of the Studies	70
2. Continent of the Conducted Studies	72
3. Educational Level of the Conducted Studies	73
4. Perspectives towards Pronunciation Trends.....	74
5. Accurate Model of Pronunciation according to Studies	76
6. Accurate Model of Pronunciation according to Perceptions.....	78
7. Similarities or Differences in the Teaching of Pronunciation	80




Cláusula de licencia y autorización para publicación en el Repositorio Institucional

Yo, Víctor Fernando Tibillín Villa, en calidad de autor/a y titular de los derechos morales y patrimoniales del trabajo de titulación “Learners’ Perspectives and Outcomes towards Native and Non-native Instruction with respect to Pronunciation”, de conformidad con el Art. 114 del CÓDIGO ORGÁNICO DE LA ECONOMÍA SOCIAL DE LOS CONOCIMIENTOS, CREATIVIDAD E INNOVACIÓN reconozco a favor de la Universidad de Cuenca una licencia gratuita, intransferible y no exclusiva para el uso no comercial de la obra, con fines estrictamente académicos.

Asimismo, autorizo a la Universidad de Cuenca para que realice la publicación de este trabajo de titulación en el repositorio institucional, de conformidad a lo dispuesto en el Art. 144 de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior.

Cuenca, 10 de marzo de 2022



Víctor Fernando Tibillín Villa

C.I: 0107384125



Cláusula de Propiedad Intelectual

Yo, Víctor Fernando Tibillín Villa, autor/a del trabajo de titulación “Learners’ Perspectives and Outcomes towards Native and Non-native Instruction with respect to Pronunciation”, certifico que todas las ideas, opiniones y contenidos expuestos en la presente investigación son de exclusiva responsabilidad de su autor/a.

Cuenca, 10 de marzo de 2022

Víctor Fernando Tibillín Villa

C.I: 0107384125



Acknowledgments

First of all, I would like to thank God as I would be nothing without the strength and the capacity he gave me to push myself and overcome any drawback, not only now, but during my whole life.

Also, I am sincerely grateful to all the teachers that I had throughout my academic development, not only during university, but from the very first moment I had one. A special gratitude, nevertheless, to Mgs. Gabriela Tobar and Mgs. Adriana Mora. Their guidance, help, and patience were extremely remarkable to complete this project that marks the ending of an incredible stage in my life.

Finally, my deepest gratitude to all my friends, colleagues, and classmates that supported and helped me to improve in academic, professional, and human aspects. Without them, I would not have got so far.



Dedication

To my always beloved and supportive parents, Víctor and Rosa. Your effort, strength, and dedication to make me move forward my own expectations is priceless. There are no words to express how thankful I am for the things that you both have made for me. You are my inspiration and my strength to keep making efforts in life. I know that you have always felt proud of my achievements, yet my biggest proud is having you two as my parents; I love you forevermore.

To my brother, Gustavo (+), we could not spend the time I would have wanted, but at least I know you are always with me, taking care of your silly little brother.

To my sister, Claudia, your occurrences and your attitude always cheer up my days. Thank you for being there whenever I need and forgive me for being so rude with you. Also, thanks for letting me experience some of the happiest moments in my life with your daughter, María Belén.

To my dearest love, Clarita. With a simple glance at your smile, you took my heart, my soul, and my life off; I beg you, never give them back.



Introduction

According to Ketabi (2015) there is still a reluctance of many English-course institutions that refuse the idea of non-native pronunciation teachers, as the native ones are the most efficient in this task. However, is it true that one or another model of pronunciation provides better outcomes? As a result, this paper tries to establish if NSTs (Native Speaking Teachers) or NNSTs (Non-Native Speaking Teachers) are the best model for pronunciation based principally on the perceptions of students towards these instructors and their teaching in the subskill; furthermore, these perceptions are also contrasted with students' overall performances in pronunciation after they have been taught by these two models. Additionally, the trends of pronunciation teaching and different theoretical studies that validate one or another model are also analyzed to give a clear statement about the most accurate model of pronunciation.

To accomplish this goal, the research synthesis contains five chapters that encompasses all information related to the topic of the article. The first chapter focuses on explaining the background, problem statement, rationale, research questions, and objectives in which the synthesis is sustained.

The second chapter develops the theoretical framework where the basic concepts and theories used in this paper are stated and covered to establish a common base knowledge.

The third chapter, the literature review, presents the most essential and specific information about the topic in order to generate a debate among the different results and conclusions presented in them.



The methodology of the study, the procedure, and the criterion for selecting the analyzed documents is exposed in the fourth chapter of this research synthesis.

The fifth chapter uses the bases established in the third chapter to compare and contrast their findings, relating these interpretations to the topic and purpose of this research synthesis.

Finally, the sixth chapter displays the conclusions and recommendations obtained afterwards the analysis and interpretation of the author.



CHAPTER I:

Description of the Research

1.1. Background

Speaking a foreign language requires the domain of several specific areas of the language during a complex learning process (Bodorík, 2017). As a matter of fact, one of the areas included in the acquisition and mastery of the speaking skill of any language is pronunciation. This is conceived as the physical realization of common sounds that allow people to speak and comprehend between them (Gilakjani & Saubori, 2016). In the English teaching process, according to Arcaya (2020), oral production abilities have always been relevant, yet there is an educational whole in the teaching of pronunciation. As a result, according to Szpyra-Kozłowska (2014), the lack of a correct pronunciation, a vital component of any language, leads to a non-efficient communication.

Nevertheless, the idea of *correct pronunciation* has been the object of discussions and divisions of different viewpoints for the teaching of English pronunciation through the years. Traditionalists did not place emphasis on the learning of pronunciation but rather on other features and skills of the language, like reading or grammar (Afshari & Ketabi, 2016b). Derwing and Munro (2015) pointed out that in some methodological approaches to teach English, like the Audio-Lingual method, the repetition of utterances would be taken directly from native speakers' models. On the other hand, in recent years, more attention has been placed upon the improvement of intelligibility and comprehensibility principles to achieve the believed "ultimate" aim of pronunciation which includes the presence of a foreign accent students (Ketabi & Saeb, 2015).



As a consequence of these different perspectives to teach pronunciation, the idea of the most appropriate model of English speaker arises among the proponents of the methods. Two models are clearly highlighted in the context of teaching speaking for communicative purposes: native speaking teachers (NSTs) and non-native speaking teachers (NNSTs). Therefore, many studies have been carried out in order to have a concrete idea about the best English-speaking model to teach pronunciation nowadays. At first, Díaz (2015) expressed that students are more likely to prefer native speaker teachers in terms of pronunciation and oral production situations. Similar results are inferred according to Jingxia (2013), and, in this case, the preference could be based on the prestige of a native speaker of knowing the language perfectly. In these two investigations, one of the assumptions for the selection was a more successful speaking proficiency caused by the presence of a native speaker.

Still, Levis, Sonsaat, Link, and Barriuso (2016) show real data that demonstrates that there is not a relationship on the provenance of a teacher with the improvement of oral skills. Additionally, for topics related to grammar, culture, and vocabulary, the selection was for nonnative speaking teachers (Díaz, 2015). Even though this last data provides opposite results of those from Díaz and Jingxia, the results of several papers demonstrate a consistency in the preference of students towards NSTs in spite of the conclusive data that indicates no difference between them.

With this range of conclusions, it is noticeable that the reasons for a selection of a teacher in terms of better results of pronunciation efficiency in students are still based on mistaken concepts that should be clarified, taking into account the current status of pronunciation teaching. As a consequence, this current synthesis would attempt to demonstrate with proven information the reasons of students to decline one



or another teacher based on their pronunciation and how, if it happens, the pronunciation is improved with one or another instructor.

1.2. Problem Statement

In a globalized world, where English has already taken an important role in communication, the awareness of an understandable oral production is vital. Nevertheless, a point should be taken into consideration: What degree of pronunciation should be considered as understandable? Afshari and Ketabi (2016a) claim that in recent years, instructors and researchers on the field agree that the aim of pronunciation is to promote an intelligible pronunciation in students, which can be considered as the essential component of language that makes a person understands another's speech and does not mean to have a native-like accent (Derwing and Munro 2015).

However, as expressed earlier in this document, the perspectives to teach pronunciation go from not teaching it, follow a native-like-speaker instruction or a teaching based on principles of understanding rather than the elimination a foreign accent. Evidently, traditional methods that have decreased the status of pronunciation have been completely replaced due to the great importance of oral production in global communication (Ketabi & Saeb, 2015). On the other hand, methodologies that require and impose a native-like pronunciation are still relevant for ideas of oral proficiency standards on the acquisition of the spoken language (Aneja, 2016). Moreover, a higher motivation in students and a preference by institution administrators when hiring teachers are reasons that validate a high NSTs necessity (Levis et al, 2016). These pre-concepts have created ideals and wrong perspectives in NNSTs and learners of the language. As an example, Martinez and Robinson (2014) have described that NNSTs are frequently idealized to have a lower professional



status regarding to their native co-workers. As in the case of students, Li and Zhang (2016) state that, even though students do not have negative assumptions of foreign-accent teachers, there is a more positive attitude towards teachers with native accent. Those effects in both students and teachers should be understood in further research.

Nonetheless, the aim of this research is to demonstrate by the use of empirical papers and information from previous research that the perspectives for the *best model of English pronunciation teaching* should be broaden to more criteria rather than only the country where the English speaker is from.

1.3. Rationale

Speaking, one of the most important skills in English, is composed by several subskills, and one of those is pronunciation. Thir (2016) expresses that the teaching of pronunciation should be stronger, as an inaccurate pronunciation leads to misunderstandings and breakdowns. Nonetheless, its teaching has caused many debates about how it should be taught, and which trend teachers should use, and which model should be exposed for students to follow.

Murphy (2014) expresses that from the several proposed models, two have called the attention in recent years: the native-like model that has been emphasized because of its preference of native English-speaking teachers for the pronunciation instruction, and the intelligibility perspective that needs to be placed into serious consideration as its development does not decrease the participation of non-native English-speaking teachers in the teaching.

Historically, the methodologies to teach pronunciation have suffered dramatic changes because of the development of different methodologies for learning English throughout the years. With traditional methods, pronunciation was completely skipped, as the focus was not communication. Afshari and Ketabi



(2016a) claim that, as time went by, this subskill gained relevance as the new teaching perspectives aimed to use the language in a communicative manner. Nevertheless, the attention to pronunciation brought a new problem: the new teaching methods addressed students to have a native-like pronunciation by learning the articulation a native speaker has when speaking the language. From that moment, many institutions and teachers have strongly pointed out the necessity of having NSTs to make learners achieve the expected native-like pronunciation (Afshari & Ketabi, 2016a). Furthermore, this viewpoint created another problem among NNSTs: the new methods focused on pronunciation required teachers to have a native-like pronunciation, but most of the teachers had a foreign accent when speaking English. As a result, many NNSTs felt different from NSTs for their lack of a native-like accent, creating two major concerns: professional low self-esteem and the omission of the pronunciation teaching due to their, so-called, *difference* compared to NSTs (Pae, 2017). However, new methodologies have suggested that the native-like pronunciation is not a requirement to teach and communicate ideas. As a prime example, it could be said that the intelligibility approach has been proposed since this new model requires only basic aspects of native pronunciation for its teaching (Gilakjani, & Sabouri, 2016).

Consequently, this research also attempts to establish the current and most appropriate trend and model of pronunciation teaching based mainly on the learning outcomes that occur with NSTs or NNSTs and the perspectives students have towards their instruction. The importance of this synthesis falls in the necessity of teachers to make students achieve an appropriate pronunciation, and therefore, an understandable communication in English. Still, that does not necessarily mean that instructors must impose a native pronunciation in a world where English is considered a Lingua Franca.



Furthermore, the purpose of this paper is to demonstrate whether the ultimate perspective in pronunciation is to achieve principles of intelligibility and comprehension among speakers or not.

1.4. Research Questions

1. Which is the most appropriate English model for the teaching of pronunciation?
2. Which principle (Nativeness or Intelligibility) leads the teaching of English pronunciation currently?
3. What are the students' perceptions about NSTs' teaching pronunciation opposed to NNSTs'?
4. How does the influence of a NST affect the students' pronunciation outcomes compared to the results obtained by a NNST?

1.5. Objectives

1.5.1. General Objective

- To determine the most appropriate model to teach English pronunciation.

1.5.2. Specific Objectives

- To determine which ideology (Nativeness or Intelligibility) is the most appropriate trend to influence pronunciation teaching.
- To establish students' perceptions towards NSTs and NNSTs during the process of teaching pronunciation.
- To demonstrate if the students' final pronunciation outcome is affected by the instruction of a NNST compared with a NST's teaching.



CHAPTER II:

Theoretical Framework

Understanding a text requires the establishment of precedents and a common ground for all participants to keep track of the discussed ideas or explained topics for a complete comprehension of the purpose of the author. In this case, this research synthesis already establishes in general terms the antecedents, reasons, and purposes that were considered to develop this document. Even though the current data may seem enough to establish an accurate relationship of information, it is still necessary to discuss and develop the terminology and concepts this article uses. More importantly, the development of ideas, concepts and terms leads the author to identify the theory in which the arguments find a common ground for later discussion.

As a result, this part of the synthesis will contribute with data about pronunciation and its current teaching trends and models, the history and development of the teaching of pronunciation, and definitions and characteristics about NSTs (Native Speaking Teachers) and NNSTs (Non-Native Speaking Teachers).

2.1. Fundamentals of pronunciation

This research synthesis finds its basis in the English pronunciation. This aspect of not only English but of all other spoken languages is composed by several components. According to Derwing and Munro (2015), these components are segments, prosody, accent, comprehensibility, intelligibility, and fluency. In the same book these are described as following:

- Segments are the phonological individual sounds of every consonant and vowel that compose a language that tend to vary from language to language.



- Prosody, or most known as suprasegmentals, are the superimposition of speech features that affect and change words, phrases, and larger units in spoken aspects. Some of these features are stress, rhythm, intonation, juncture, and tone.
- Accent is considered as a different form of pronunciation in a specific speech community. These variations in talking are determined by geographical limitations, demographical conditions, and social dimensions. Accents could include lexical, syntactical, and phonological variations, but this last one is the clearest to identify among community speakers of a tongue. For instance, an English native speaker with a Canadian accent will recognize Australian, British, or New Zealand English accents. In the same way, An Argentinian Spanish native speaker will identify the different variations in pronunciation of Spanish in Mexico or Chile. In an educational context, L2 (Second Language) speakers commonly show in their speaking some phonological characteristics of their L1 (First Language). In these cases, it is easy to differentiate a native speaker from a non-native one. Yet, several circumstances decrease accentedness, allowing a classification as high or low accent depending on the spoken perception.
- Comprehensibility is a concept that defines the needed effort that must be put in order to understand another's speech. The comprehension in the speech is fully achieved at the end depending on the work placed upon its understanding, and this effort could be cataloged as high or low. Low comprehensibility is normal even with L1 interlocutors due to language variations produced by speaking elements such as mumbling or speech disorders. In those circumstances, the understanding comes after the struggling of one interlocutor. If we refer to L2 speakers, the same circumstances may produce a high comprehensibility (effort)



with L1 listeners, yet prosody, segments, and voice quality may increase the comprehensibility as a native speaker is not used to hear them with different pronunciation patterns that are common in non-native speakers.

- Intelligibility is the most essential feature of a successful oral communication. When producing an utterance, speakers try to communicate an established idea of their minds. Intelligibility determines the level of the received message in an attentive listener as it was intended by the speaker. Contrasted with comprehensibility, if intelligibility is low, the message may differ from the intention of the speaker. In other words, the understanding is not fully achieved at the end.
- Finally, fluency is used to describe the degree of fluidity of the speech, and it takes into account aspects like the presence or absence of hesitation, repetitions, and pauses.

With these dimensions defined, it is now clear to say that pronunciation is the speaking way of creating language through the articulatory apparatus that involves speech components and principles of comprehensibility and intelligibility. Derwing and Munro (2015).

2.2. Current principles of pronunciation teaching

The research and pedagogy of pronunciation has been influenced by two contradictory ideologies that are still present in the teaching of this subskill. These are the nativeness principle and the intelligibility principle (Levis, 2005, as cited in Derwing & Munro, 2015).

Before the proper development of these theories, it is important to mention that, according to Levis (2005), the role, and consequently, the teaching of pronunciation in



language acquisition has been determined by intuition of instructors rather than careful research. For instance, in the last 25 years, segmentals have been placed upon importance in the teaching of pronunciation although its importance in communication is uncertain and some native characteristics that this branch of linguistic studies are considered as *not learnable*, especially for adults.

In the same article, Levis (2005) details that both nativeness and intelligibility principles still have weight in the following educative dimensions: language acquisition curriculum, relationship between pronunciation and identity, and English language pronunciation context. Regarding to the language acquisition curriculum, the nativeness principle has a vast influence, especially for speakers that are influenced by external factors. In the case of context of the pronunciation, many speakers tend to adjust their speaking in professional and formal context to decant for an ideology based on nativeness, so it affects the pronunciation conception and teaching. In addition, the English pronunciation, and most relatively the accent, is related to the identity of the speaker, and they are likely to change their origin group and language to gain a group membership of a certain exclusive groups they want to be part of. Again, pronunciation is influenced by nativeness.

It is already established how these principles influence the research, the learning, and the use of pronunciation, yet these concepts are not properly developed until this point. In order to assure that these principles are covered correctly, they are described below.

2.2.1. Nativeness

Levis (2005) establishes that “the nativeness principle holds that it is both possible and desirable to achieve native-like pronunciation in a foreign language” (p. 370). Its ideology is based on the accent reduction industry, which assures learners that



an accurate motivation with special pronunciation techniques can eliminate a foreign accent. Besides that, in language acquisition settings, students are willing to eliminate completely their own accent. The same happens with teachers that are unfamiliar with pronunciation research since they are willing to drive students to a native-like pronunciation without any exception (Levis, 2005).

This ideology was the predominant guide for the pronunciation teaching around the 60s. Later, it diminished its influence due to several research about the incapacity to achieve its purpose before adulthood caused by biological conditions. Plus, in real teaching contexts, very few adults achieve an indistinguishable speech, just as a native speaker's pronunciation. Even though factors like a correct motivation, amount of L1 use, and training in pronunciation constitute a positive enhancement; they cannot avoid the fact that adults already passed their critical learning period and the effect of aging. In this scenario, a native-like pronunciation was and still is unlikely guaranteed for teaching and learning (Levis, 2005).

For Derwing and Munro (2016) nativeness has been replaced by the Intelligibility principle. Nevertheless, pedagogical postures have been against this last-mentioned principle due to the willingness of both teachers and students to decrease their accent to be understood although accentedness and intelligibility are partially independent. In addition, it was already established that Nativeness has still influence in the teaching of pronunciation.

2.2.2. Intelligibility

“The Intelligibility principle holds that learners need to be understandable” (Levis, 2005, p. 370). Mainly, it claims that the success when communicating between interlocutors must happen in spite of the presence of a noticeable or strong accent. Indeed, an accurate understanding and a marked accent do not present a proper relation



regarding intelligibility, and that the relationship of comprehensibility with certain pronunciation errors is disproportionated.

Levis (2005) also determines that intelligibility focuses on certain pronunciation characteristics that are actually necessary for comprehension and understanding; in the same way, the ideology decreases the pronunciation practices that are unhelpful for the correct assimilation of some of the pronunciation components (comprehensibility and intelligibility). For example, speaker intelligibility is achieved quicker if this is focused on the study of suprasegmentals instead of segmentals.

Derwing and Munro (2015) adds to their analysis of intelligibility that, besides the clear difference in the pronunciation results compared to nativeness, language acquisition learners need only an intelligible pronunciation to use the language for communicative purposes. Moreover, the increase in the research of intelligibility has led to obtain, at first, empirical evidence of the supremacy of intelligibility over nativeness, especially in the case of adult learners, and also deduct the best strategies to improve students' pronunciation of specific sounds that are hard to achieve.

From the previous descriptions of both Nativeness and Intelligibility, their descriptions, and their relevance in the teaching of pronunciation, it is deductible to say that both principles are still considered to influence methodologies for teaching pronunciation. Yet, the discussion of which should be accepted as a standard is explained later in this paper.

2.3. English pronunciation teaching

After the description of the most basic terms and ideologies that have guided pronunciation teaching throughout the years, the next step is to analyze its teaching. Thus, this part includes the development of the teaching of pronunciation, from the



conception of teaching English with a pedagogical method until our times, where research has played an important role on the way the learning of pronunciation is carried out. In the same way, there is also a need to expose the current needs of pronunciation in students to see how the pronunciation in general and English itself has been adapted and even changed to fit these needs.

2.3.1. Historical view of pronunciation teaching

According to Ketabi (2015), the teaching of pronunciation has an important role into an intelligible speech and a successful oral communication although it is not considered as important as other linguistic parts of the language. As a consequence of this lack of importance for its teaching, pronunciation has been constantly reformulated in order to set into the different methodologies and approaches that have guided English teaching. Ketabi establishes periods where pronunciation and its components have changed according to the teaching patterns over the years, and these periods will be analyzed below.

2.3.1.1. The 1800 and early 1900s

During these periods, according to Ketabi (2015), the methodologies to teach English were established by the Grammar-Translation method and the Direct Method. Kaharuddin (2018) establishes that the GTM (Grammar-Translation Method) was considered a good method to teach about language, but not enough to teach spoken language as its main focus was the learning of the grammatical patterns that constitute a language, in this case English. Kaharuddin (2018) also mentioned that Grammar-Translation Method was criticized because it allows students to read and write correctly in the target language, yet these students are unable to obtain a communicative competence to maintain a conversation. In general terms, the Grammar-Translation method did not appeal to the pronunciation teaching.



Because of this big drawback of the GTM and as a response to give importance to the communicative skills, the Direct Method gained popularity during the early stages of the 1900s. In this case, this approach gave pronunciation a place into the English learning and teaching, yet its teaching was based on intuition and imitation of the sounds and rhythms of the language. The basis for this manner of teaching was that it was believed that foreign learners can learn a second language in the same way they learned its mother tongue. As a result, there was no explicit teaching of pronunciation, but rather an internalization of the system of sounds, whose results were debatable in most cases. Years later, the lack of a proper pronunciation instruction led researchers and linguistics to create the International Phonetic Association and the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) to start a proper training in the pronunciation in second language learners and to place speech, and therefore pronunciation, as a major concern in second language acquisition. This revolution in the pronunciation teaching was called *the Reform Movement* (Ketabi, 2015).

2.3.1.2. The 1940s and 1950s

The establishment of the Reform Movement achieved the placement of pronunciation and oral skills as the most important language feature to acquire; thus, this period was marked with the predominance of both the Audio-Lingual and the Oral Methods (Ketabi, 2015). These methods share similar characteristics, so the Audio-Lingual approach will be described to show how pronunciation was taught during this time.

Alemi and Tavakoli (2016) establish that the Audio-Lingual Method uses Skinner's Behaviorism theory of reinforcement and feedback for the pronunciation teaching. These authors explain that the reinforcement of pronunciation was based on the use of drills (memorization and repetition) of grammatical sentence patterns. These



drills have a big impact into the learning of correct pronunciation, stress, intonation, and rhythm. As a remark, this method tried to create habit formations of pronunciation and the use of inductive grammar in students. Additionally, for Ketabi (2015) there is a real awareness in the elimination of native language influences, study in isolation of segmentals, and presence of phonetic rules into the curriculum (influence of Nativeness).

This period exploited the purposes of the Reform Movement as the predominant approaches follow the purposes of reinforcing the speech instruction in second language acquisition and the establishment of training procedures for pronunciation. Nevertheless, that does not mean that this period was the most successful for oral communication in English (Ketabi, 2015).

2.3.1.3. The 1960s and 1970s

Post-research discovered that language is not a process that is successfully acquired through habit formation and adoption of isolated patterns of grammar and pronunciation. Moreover, these systems of learning did not show great and immediate results but weaknesses in some aspects (Alemi and Tavakoli, 2016). As a result, the importance of pronunciation teaching and its main approaches (Audio-Lingual and Oral Method) were diminished. According to Ketabi (2015) these were not the only factors that decanted the downfall of pronunciation teaching. Several of these are detailed below.

- The introduction and elevation of the Cognitive Approach, developed by Chomsky and based on conscious and explicit learning activities to activate innate grammatical patterns of the language. In the same way, pronunciation was



previously set, so it only required activities to promote pre-established patterns in the brain.

- The development of comprehension methods that deemphasized the status of pronunciation. Some of these such as the Natural Approach, Total Physical Response, Suggestopedia, etc., are based into the proposal that a second language is acquired in the same way a first language is acquired. As a consequence, all comprehension approaches placed an emphasis into listening and avoided the teaching of pronunciation as it was believed that this language feature is developed over time without intervention.
- Several studies that pointed out the effectiveness in pronunciation teaching and the correct time for its teaching. Some of these articles showed as a result that there is no relationship between the pronunciation teaching and an actual pronunciation proficiency.
- The creation and influence of the Communicative Language Teaching that proposed teaching practices based on communicative fluency without taking care the accuracy. Furthermore, this approach criticized most of the practices of pronunciation teaching by saying that the teaching of pronunciation interferes with the communicative goals, affects and decreases students' motivation, alters the natural implicit acquisition of pronunciation, and is not relevant for learning as pronunciation practice is not based in real scenarios.

Even though pronunciation was neglected in most of the predominant approaches of this age, it was not completely erased in the English teaching with the development of The Silent Way Method. Its focus was on the correct pronunciation of letters and words using realia like charts or rods with the implication that there is no



need of paying attention to a global speaking but to the segments that compose the speaking (Ketabi, 2015)

2.3.1.4. The 1980s

This entire decade tried to bring pronunciation to the curriculum. As the previous case, several factors contributed the slow return of pronunciation. One of these factors was the increase of papers that analyze in depth the role of pronunciation and the problems of the methods when dealing with its teaching. Up until now, the pronunciation was guided until the fundamentals of nativeness, but in this period the intelligibility principle starts to be formed when questioning the lack of interest into the formation of an accurate communication among interlocutors, especially after the global and international communications (Ketabi, 2015).

2.3.1.5. The 1990s and the 2000s

The end of the millennium and the expectations for the new one was the scenario where the pronunciation teaching was taken for a big reform after the ups and downs during the English teaching processes explained before. Because of globalization, major topics were considered for discussion among pedagogists and linguists about the guidelines and development of pronunciation teaching. The most remarkable were the Nativeness vs. Intelligibility, Segmentals and Suprasegmentals, and the English language as a Lingua Franca (Ketabi, 2015).

Referring to the first one, it was previously explained that even though Nativeness has been replaced almost completely by the Intelligibility principle in papers, it is still influent in English learning scenarios. On the other hand, segmentals and suprasegmentals are considered as part of pronunciation, so its teaching requires a balance as they may seem relevant in the topic of pronunciation teaching. Finally, the



establishment of English as a lingua franca has placed pronunciation into a big role that has been discussed and accepted globally for several social aspects.

2.3.1.6. Current Status

The development and role of pronunciation teaching has had a long path until our days. With the appearance of new methods of acquiring pronunciation such as textbooks or even technological devices, the pronunciation teaching now has a permanent role in the second language acquisition. Nowadays, there is a concern (but not implementation) to include pronunciation into the big skills of English due to the spread of English and the awareness of mutual intelligibility among dialects and accents. This awareness is no longer based on repetition of exact native models, but rather on the goal of achieving intelligibility and comprehensibility. Yet, there is still a big remanent of native-like pronunciation practices reflected into the posture of institutions and learners that still do not consider a non-native speaker as a model to teach pronunciation (Ketabi, 2015).

As a conclusion, pronunciation teaching has been prioritized, ignored, or influenced principally by the most claimed approached and methods of each period. As for today, the teaching of pronunciation needs to keep moving forward to fit into the global scenario of English.

2.4. Priorities of English pronunciation teaching

As it was mentioned before, the current aim of pronunciation is to achieve in learners an intelligible pronunciation for all dialects and accents of English. As a result, the teaching of pronunciation has become an important linguistic element in second language acquisition curriculum; nevertheless, its teaching has not been a priority during these years. Thus, it is necessary to include the reasons of why teaching



pronunciation is important nowadays, as well as the reasons for its lack of teaching.

Finally, there is a general overview of the goals of pronunciation in a broader manner.

2.4.1. Reasons to teach pronunciation

In a communicative situation, a listener will have to analyze deeply another person's speech to determine the correct use of grammar or lexicon, yet few seconds will take to a person in order to determine if a person has a correct pronunciation. This is one of the first reasons of pronunciation teaching: creating a good impression.

However, creating a good impression is not the most important reason to teach pronunciation. This component of language is vital for a successful oral communication.

If pronunciation is not carried out successfully, it may lead to misunderstandings among the interlocutors and listeners of the conversation. Sometimes, these errors will be solved with a simple explanation, but in the cases of foreign speakers with a strong accent, it may create not only confusion, but also annoyance and irritation. These linguistic situations create social stigmas; for instance, German speakers with strong accent are considered to have an impolite or rude attitude, or Spanish speakers are believed to be bored or uninterested to others' conversation. If this pronunciation is not corrected, it may lead to major problems than stigmatization, such as discrimination or negative stereotypes. Yet, it is important to mention that a correct pronunciation does not necessarily mean eliminate an accent. This is necessary only when a strong accent affects intelligibility. Finally, in a personal dimension, people with a poor pronunciation tend to have a lack of confidence when speaking. This missing confidence may affect the proficiency of English when assessing the student's speaking skill. On the other hand, people with a correct pronunciation are seen as confident, and that even brings better educative and even professional opportunities. (Szpyra-Kozłowska, 2014)



To summarize, the teaching of pronunciation is important for not only creating a good impression, but also to achieve a successful communication in English without misunderstandings. The problems of not domaining pronunciation may lead to social problems and even less opportunities in educational or occupational dimensions. Yet, it is necessary to have in mind that a correct pronunciation is not eliminating an accent.

2.4.2. Why is pronunciation neglected?

The possible advantages of teaching pronunciation and the possible consequences of its prohibition were referred previously. Even though they may create a solid argument for teaching pronunciation, it is still abandoned in most of English Language Teaching classes. The first reason is the difficulty to achieve pronunciation. This aspect of language is considered as the hardest to master in another language learning, even more when the purpose is to get a native-like pronunciation. Thus, instructors tend to ignore pronunciation for the time and effort it requires and the insufficient results in all students. Instead, they rather prefer to teach other simpler aspects of the language as vocabulary or grammar. The second reason is that most language teachers consider pronunciation as the least useful of all language components. This is conditioned as most teachers and students are evaluated through test results which may not require a pronunciation mastering, so pronunciation teaching is considered as a waste of time. This thinking is called *the washback effect*. Another reason is the deficiency in pronunciation awareness in teaching books and materials that usually guide the curriculum of institutions. The last more important reason is the predisposition of teachers to teach pronunciation due to their perception about their own pronunciation way and the absence on training in most of cases (Szpyra-Kozłowska, 2014).



2.4.3. Goal of pronunciation learning and teaching: Nativeness or Intelligibility?

With this background of pronunciation teaching, now it is time to explain the goals of pronunciation teaching and learning in the acquirement of English following the principles. Traditionally, the teaching of pronunciation is conceived for learners to achieve either a native-like or intelligible pronunciation depending on the ideology of the teaching. Nevertheless, the adoption of the native like pronunciation was criticized as now there are an enormous amount of foreign English speakers who are proficient in the language. As expected, these speakers do not have native-like pronunciation, and the cases where native-like pronunciation is achieved are extremely rare. That is why in these days, the ultimate goal of pronunciation is the acquisition of intelligibility. However, this intelligibility is often biased by the influence of Nativeness and the pronunciation models of English language (Szypra-Kozłowska, 2014). At the end, there is no real consensus on what to follow.

2.5. Pronunciation Models in English Teaching

As it was mentioned above, the ultimate goal of pronunciation (intelligibility) is influenced by the principle of Nativeness that is still relevant, and by the election in the models of English pronunciation. This final part of the theoretical framework will define the prominent models of English pronunciation. The election of these models for the purpose of pronunciation teaching will be analyzed later in the article. As for now, the descriptions, characteristics, and influence of these models in second language acquisition are reviewed below.

2.5.1. Native Speaking teachers

During the first moments of the teaching of English pronunciation, a native speaker would be considered as a great learning opportunity. Commonly, the simple



term *native speaker* would lead to the description of people who know exactly how their language works, what is their language in depth, and knows exactly if something is not their own language (Boyle, 1997). This author may bring the questioning of the *native speaker* to its deepest descriptions. It was not clear what exactly described a native speaker, specially of English. Some of the arguments that make this clarification complex was that researchers consider that the term is very broad; for example, even non-native speakers that have accomplished a great study of the target language may be considered native ones. Plus, the different dialects of English around the globe broaden the term.

Boyle (1997) expresses that the first two characteristics are the simplest when determine native speakers: 1) place of birth and 2) dominance of the first language (L1). Because of their simpleness, they are very easy to refute, especially in the cases of little children that acquire a language and then move on to another place where the previously learned language is not used. In these cases, the children may progressively lose its first language, and therefore he/she may not be considered native speaker of neither of those implied languages. As a result, Boyle expresses five elements to fit in order to be considered a native speaker in relationship with the language (1997, p. 167):

- Inheritance / Birth / Early start;
- Expertise / Proficiency / Fluency;
- Continual use as dominant language;
- Loyalty / Allegiance / Affiliation;
- Confidence / Comfortable identification

After this clarification of the characteristics that make any person a native speaker of a language, now we can define what are the features of a native speaker in a L2



classroom. For this purpose, we will use the characteristics that Boyle (1997) uses to describe native speaking teachers of English:

- NSTs have the language already established from the moment of their birth or at early ages, so this language is hardly erased after long periods of abandon.
- Their proficiency level in educative context is considered as very high. Their dominance and use of language components such as grammar, vocabulary, or idioms is very fast and accurate.
- Even though the social setting, NSTs tend to keep English as their predominant language. In these cases, a NST will find a place of micro communities where their first language is used in most of the communicative actions.
- There is a strong bond of relationship with the culture of the mother tongue.
- In most of the cases, and in educative and pedagogical dimensions, there is a high level of self-trustiness when using the language.

2.5.2. Non-native speaking teachers

In the world, there are around 375 million speakers of English as a second language according to the British Council. Because of this vast majority of English speakers, it is obvious to think that most of the teachers of English are Non-Native Speakers. In the same way there is a traditional description of native speakers, there is also a common definition for non-native ones. Walkinshaw and Oanh describe that a non-native speaker was considered as a person who knows the language but are not able to achieve the same level of proficiency that a native speaker has (2012). The same authors explain that this idea is easily refuted as there is a large number of non-native speakers of English that are involved in the field of applied linguistics.

However, the standard definition of non-native speaker is much simpler than the



definition of its counterpart. According to Brown (2013, p. 8) A non-native speaker is “someone who learned a language other than English as a first language and is learning/has learned English as an additional one.”

With this final clarification of the aspects and concepts that may present a difficulty for readers, it is possible to pass to the discussion of the points exposed in the research questions and objectives of this paper.



CHAPTER III:

Literature Review

After the complete explanation of the critic points and topics that this paper deals with, it is now time to mention the most important research studies on the field in order to describe the most appropriate model of English pronunciation, the perspectives that students have regarding to the models of this subskill, and the possible similarities and differences in the learning outcomes depending on the model of pronunciation.

However, before reporting the main topics explained before, there is the need to contrast the ideologies or trends that influence directly the teaching of pronunciation. In other words, the principles of Nativeness and Intelligibility are analyzed critically in the following subchapter. The purpose of outlining the most accurate trend nowadays determines a strong argument to one or another model according to research and current goals of the English education. Indeed, determining the most accurate trend to teach pronunciation serves as a strong argument to infer the most appropriate model for this oral feature of the language. For instance, the primal pillar of Nativeness is to develop a native-like pronunciation as it was exposed before. Consequently, it may appeal to models that have this native pronunciation, that means Nativeness prioritizes Native speaking teachers for the pronunciation model to be taught in class. On the other hand, Intelligibility does not have this preference regarding to the speaking model of English. In other words, Non-native speaking teachers are considered accurate models for English oral communication.

With this description of how the information is covered in the next paragraphs, the first reasoning is to resolve the accurate trend of English pronunciation.



3.1. Trends of pronunciation teaching: Nativeness or Intelligibility

3.1.1. Learning objectives

The teaching of pronunciation in the history of English learning has had its peaks and downfalls depending on the methodologies and strategies that have been applied during the different decades of the teaching and learning of English as a foreign language. This idea comes from the previous development of the pronunciation teaching history detailed in the previous chapter.

Nonetheless, the investigation and development of these methodologies, their strategies, and activities are sustained on the two contradictory principles or trends: Nativeness, the approach focused on the acquisition of a native-like pronunciation that takes seriously the election of a native speaking model to guide a correct acquisition of the oral subskill; and Intelligibility, the trend that switches the previous and most vital statement of its rival with the idea of the successful learners' communicative competence (Afshari & Ketabi, 2016b).

According to Othman and Zahawi (2020), both principles have in common the ultimate goal of pronunciation for communication. Yet, the nativeness principle has a more specific communication goal. It centers in the accurate and understandable communication with native speakers. In opposition to this idea, Bøhn and Hansen (2017) explained that aiming a native-like pronunciation with the purpose to communicate with native speakers of the target language is not an important goal to learn pronunciation as nowadays the majority of English speakers are nonnative ones. To complement this idea, Afshari and Ketabi (2016b) pointed out that the current needs of English learners' is to achieve an understandable oral communication and that a native-like pronunciation may be dispensable for most of them.

Thus, a minimal contrast between Nativeness and Intelligibility shows that the



former is the proper method for teaching English based on the teaching objectives and actual use of English in real situations. Even though this may serve as one strong basis to declare Intelligibility as the most appropriate trend to teach English pronunciation, there are more arguments that validate this principle in today's English education.

3.1.2. Linguistic features and restrains

Both principles of English pronunciation center their attention not only on the learning outcomes that they establish but also on the linguistic features of the target language that require a special attention at the moment of studying and practicing oral skills. According to the principles, these specific parts of the spoken language may help developing a native-like or intelligible pronunciation depending on the trend focused on. Still, there are some limitations that highly decrease the opportunities of correctly developing either an accurate native or intelligible accurate pronunciation.

Nativeness is very clear at the beginning to point out that the purpose is to achieve a native-like pronunciation in learners. As a result, the teaching of pronunciation has to follow norms and standards of native speakers (Bøhn and Hansen, 2017). In other words, a learner must follow, imitate, and assimilate all the segmental (phonological elements) and suprasegmental (superimposed elements) features of the target language without any exception. Afshari and Ketabi (2016a) indicated that there are restraints in learning all the linguistics aspects of English. First, it is extremely hard for adults to acquire the segmentals and suprasegmentals to a degree of a native speaker due to the critical period of acquiring a language, that is the most optimum time to assimilate a spoken language. Second, other factors such as the exposure to the language, practice, and motivation diminish the almost unlikely scenario of acquiring a native-like pronunciation. Finally, segmentals and suprasegmentals tend to vary depending on the dialect that is being taught. Moreover, Othman and Zahawi (2020)



believed that adulthood is another limitation for nativeness; thus, this statement produced a fast diminution of the relevance and influence of the Nativeness trend. As a result, Intelligibility surged to cover up the previous limitations of the previous trend.

Because of the aim of Intelligibility is to promote an understandable pronunciation, it did not follow the idea of acquiring all the linguistic characteristics of English. Bøhn and Hansen (2017) suggested that even though there is no proper research to deduce which segmentals and suprasegmentals are the most accurate to teach in all teaching scenarios, there are some linguistic features that should be prioritized during the pronunciation instruction. In the segmental aspect, there should be a target into certain consonants and vowels sounds. Yet, some consonants sounds, like theta (θ) or dark l (l), should not be prioritized. In the suprasegmental field, vowel lengthening, stress, reductions, and deletions must be studied in detail.

Therefore, Intelligibility has got restrains as it depends on the practice of certain linguistic features to improve pronunciation. Afshari and Ketabi (2016a) claimed that this trend makes a special emphasis on the helpful components of language that allow a complete understanding of a speech. Nonetheless, it was mentioned at the beginning that there is not enough research to conclude which linguistic features contribute in a deeper manner than others to achieve an intelligible pronunciation. For example, Bøhn and Hansen (2017) covered the discussion between segmentals and suprasegmentals to see which field is more important during the teaching of pronunciation, yet there is not enough information to decide which one its vital and which one should be understated.

Overall, Nativeness and Intelligibility have linguistic features to be covered and restrains that decrease the chances to achieve the goal of both trends. Still, Intelligibility depends more on controllable factors to achieve its comprehensible purpose. On the other hand, we have the adulthood problem to acquire a native-like pronunciation in



Nativeness. In this case, there is nothing educators can make to solve this limitation.

Thus, Intelligibility allows to achieve its goal without any limitation that may suppose a permanent and not controlled drawback by either the educator or learners. Thereby, there is another argument in favor of Intelligibility.

3.1.3. Perspectives of researchers and educators

By now in this paper, there are two strong arguments that determine that Intelligibility is the most acceptable trend of teaching pronunciation according to the current aims of this subskill, which are communicative oriented. Besides, Othman and Zahawi (2020) established that Intelligibility came to creation with the purpose of substituting Nativeness and their linguistic limitations. Yet, to conclude, there is an analysis of what are the perspectives of educators about Nativeness and Intelligibility.

Afshari and Ketabi (2016a) suggested that, when teaching pronunciation, it is important to have in mind the principles of Intelligibility, those are the acquisition of a comprehensible pronunciation in order to be understood and not necessarily by having a native-like pronunciation. As a conclusion of their paper, these authors expressed the concern that even though there is a lot of research that claims Intelligibility as the new trend to follow in the teaching of pronunciation, it has not achieved an important role in EFL and even ESL teaching. In theory, most arguments point out the supremacy of Intelligibility, yet in real scenarios it is either not relevant or decreased by nativeness influence as it is seen in the next article.

Othman and Zahadi (2020) stated in their paper, “The majority of Kurdish EFL teachers tend to be in favor of nativeness principle in their pronunciation” (p. 15). Their preference for nativeness is influenced with the idea of irrelevance of native-like pronunciation as a threat of their own culture, as well as their permanence in a country where English is a native tongue. Later in this paper, there is a discussion between the



preference of a native-like pronunciation based on cultural adaptation, but now, there is a clear orientation of several instructors to continue using principles of nativeness. As it was mentioned in the Theoretical Framework, Nativeness is still relevant in some educational contexts.

In the opposite side, Bøhn and Hansen (2017) exposed that the educators that participated in their study were willing and more oriented to Intelligibility, and they refused the supremacy of Nativeness. As a result, the assessment to students in pronunciation would be based on intelligible principles rather to evaluating how much a student is proximate to a native-like pronunciation.

As a conclusion, there seems to be a hard contradiction between what is investigated and what is really thought among the participants of the pronunciation teaching. Because of that reason, there is no clarity in which model of pronunciation should be taken into account based on the pronunciation principles that have been developed. As a consequence of this argument, there is a centered discussion between these models, not as it was done in the Theoretical Framework of this paper, but in a contrastive manner about the theme of the oral subskill in Chapter 5.

3.2.Models of Pronunciation: NSTs and NNSTs

As it was mentioned previously, the discussion of an accurate trend or principle for the guidance of English pronunciation teaching was to provide aid into the discussion of Native Speaking Teachers (NSTs) vs. Nonnative Speaking Teachers (NNSTs). Since the evident lack of enough papers that validate Intelligibility or Nativeness in all aspects of oral proficiency teaching and, therefore, not validating completely NSTs or NNSTs as the proper model of English pronunciation, there is the need to review these two models in a detailed manner to determine the best model for guidance based on the most recent necessities of English learners and how to



communicate by using this language.

Preceding the narrative of the arguments in favor or against a model, it is important to mention what is a “model” of pronunciation. At first, it was already established that models are divided into two groups: Native Speaking Teachers (NSTs) and Nonnative Speaking Teachers (NNTs). These models are clearly defined in the Theoretical Framework of this paper. Nevertheless, the idea of a model is still unclear. In general terms, and according to Archer (2017), a pronunciation model is simply the preferred choice of talking in L2 learners of the language. This paper has identified these models in two big groups previously mentioned (NSTs and NNSTs). Yet, it is clearly unlikely that all Native and Nonnative Speaking Teachers had the same pronunciation patterns such as the stress, tone, intonation, etc. In fact, both models have their division and classification. A prime example is established by Arcaya (2020). This author mentions that there are traditional models inside the big group of Native Speaking Teachers. These defined “traditional” models are not others but the known American and British standard accent users. In the other hand, many NNSTs models can come up depending on the mother tongue of the speaker and the level of accent that these speakers use when communicating in their second language.

Yet, the focus of this part of the paper is not to describe these traditional or specific foreign models. The real objective of this subchapter is to make a comparison between the two major groups of pronunciation guides and determine if one or another is the most accurate for today’s English learning based on their strengths and weaknesses that are covered in research papers. Students’ perceptions or results in pronunciation learning are covered later due to the focus of the paper and importance on it.



3.2.1. Native Speaking Teachers in English Pronunciation Teaching

According to Arcaya (2020), Native Speaking Teachers are considered by most people as the most truthful source of English language and, using that premise, many institutions that offer English courses advertise their classes with NSTs as a hook.

That perspective has been kept from several years. Chomsky (1965), as cited in claimed that Native Speaking Teachers only are the real models to follow into the learners' English proficiency. Most recently, Guo, Chen, and Sun (2021) confirmed that, against the global tendencies of globalization, ideals of intelligibility, and increase of English in an international context; there is still the idea of Native English-Speaking teachers as superior and accurate models for EFL classes. For that reason, these authors explained that there have been exchange programs for NSTs to take the charge of teaching English in their country.

Pae (2016) pointed out that there are some linguistic elements that a Native Speaking Teacher intuitively possess. Some of these specific attitudes are the inner knowledge of grammar use, a sense of identification with a language community, communication ability in different settings, and most importantly for this paper, authentic accents, and a fluent and spontaneous speech.

Additionally, this author mentioned that besides the linguistic “advantage” that a NST may have, they are more likely to boost student's motivation for the learning of English, and as a final conclusion he recommends increasing NSTs in the classrooms. However, in this case, motivation is the only factor for this claim. As a final idea, there is also the conception that a native speaker with the authentic knowledge of all components of the language may increase students' learning in English and intelligibility in their speech. Yet, this specific point is dealt in the next subchapters as it is a complex argument that should be treated separately.



With all these statements, it may be considered that Native Speaking Teachers are the most iconic model for pronunciation as they master the target oral proficiency on the language, increase motivation of English learning, and may improve students' oral proficiency. Yet, there are many counterarguments that may be against the conception of Native Speaking Teachers as accurate models of pronunciation. To start, there is not enough data of contrast within our education context. Arcaya (2020) established that for the Latin-American context, the research in the comparison between NSTs and NNSTs is not great to draw or assimilate assumptions. Nonetheless, to solve this problem this paper uses data from around the globe. Still, a certain consideration to be dealt in the future is to apply more research about pronunciation teaching models and perspectives in our context.

With the previous context, several papers disclaim the supremacy of NSTs in the oral subskill. Three major drawbacks to the idea of NSTs for the absolute model of pronunciation teaching are established by Dao (2019). First, a most appropriate model of EFL pronunciation is an instructor that has practical information of the oral linguistic components of both L1 and L2 languages. In this way, this instructor may know the from the simplest to the most complex oral component to learn. A NST may lack this perception of degree of difficulty that takes a learner to acquire oral linguistic components from another language. Second, the term "native-speaker" has been deformed until the point that nowadays a native speaker may be from United States, Great Britain, Ireland, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, etc. In other words, there is no real consensus of which of the previous dialects of spoken English in these countries are considered as the natives for guidance in EFL. Finally, nowadays the majority of English speakers of the world do not come from a country where this language is the mother tongue. As a result, there is no need for acquiring a "native-like" pronunciation.



These three major disadvantages decreased the NST influence in the teaching of English Language Teaching, affecting also the teaching of pronunciation, increasing the awareness of placing NNSTs as proper models of pronunciation. In the following subchapter, Nonnative Speaking Teachers' data is reviewed in the same way their "counterparts" were covered.

3.2.2. Nonnative Speaking Teachers in English Pronunciation Teaching

Wolff (2015) affirmed that an enormous portion of teachers on English are considered Non-Native. Plus, most of the students engaged in TESOL/ESL programs are from countries where English is considered a foreign language. In addition to this opening, Pae (2016) stated that Nonnative Speaking Teachers of English have only few linguistic characteristics that a NST clearly domains. This negative conception of Nonnative Speaking Teachers has caused many difficulties and challenges to them. Pae (2016) exemplified some of them. First, there is always the comparison between the linguistic components that a Nonnative Speaking Teacher is not able to achieve due to the cognitive limitations compared to NSTs. Second and because of the first one, the comparison creates a scenario of NNSTs trying to become a NST, not only in linguistic aspects, but also in sociocultural sets. This last one is easily an unlikely scenario since the definition of NST has been broaden nowadays, and additionally, it must not be any circumstance where NSTs lose their identity for a simple comparison.

All these effects of comparison created the denominated *Native Speakerism Questioning* that tried to place NNSTs as accurate models of English in an equal status than NSTs by stating two reasons explained by Aneja (2016). Firstly, NNSTs have the first-hand English learning experience that may serve as an aid in learners' journey of acquiring a Second Language. Secondly, both students and NNSTs share a mother tongue a cultural background that may influence in a minor or major way the



acquisition of English. Furthermore, Dao (2019) considered two extra reasons that validate and strength the shifting of NNSTs as accurate models of English, especially and most importantly for this article, in the pronunciation subskill. One, if students are guided with the Intelligibility principle, a Nonnative Speaking Teacher serves as an aspirational and accessible model of English pronunciation that may be willing to response students' needs in this oral subskill in an immediate and comprehensive manner; and two, the instruction and acquisition depends on a knowledgeable teaching practice than the repetition or imitation of native models.

It may appear that NNSTs are valid models for English pronunciation teaching as nowadays English has become a Lingua Franca and the per-excellence language to be used in international communication and businesses. Moreover, a native-like pronunciation is no longer necessary to keep a comprehensible speech as there are now specific principles and linguistics segmentals and suprasegmentals for intelligibility and comprehensibility. Nevertheless, there are contradictions for NNSTs as accurate models of English pronunciation. Arcaya (2020) expressed that there is no enough training in NNSTs of how to teach pronunciation. Even though Nonnative speaking teachers may develop a concern on how to transmit pronunciation to learners, it is still not enough. Plus, NSTs have been considered the unique models of pronunciation teaching for several years that it is still hard to break that ideal.

Thus, perceptions of learners are very important to determine NSTs or NNSTs as correct models of pronunciation as teachers try to cover students' needs and these students may express which one is the accurate model. As a result, the following subchapter is only focused on students' perspectives of Native and Nonnative Speaking Teachers when teaching pronunciation.



3.3. Perceptions of learners in English Pronunciation Teaching.

Now it is time to review the most critical point in this entire article. That is the points of view of learners of English language about the model they prefer to follow or even imitate when learning the pronunciation of a foreign language. Before the proper development of the assumptions and conceptions of learners, it is mandatory to explain why there is a focal point on the learners' perspectives rather than the ideas of teachers or administrators, as an example.

It is easy to deduce the reason, yet it is pertinent to write it down. Education, not only of a second language, but in general has changed to a student-centered status. The curriculum, objectives, contents, and methodologies are structured based on the preferences and needs of learners. As a result, their perspective about what they should follow to create new language outputs should be based on their needs and preferences. Besides, English in communication is done by people who has or is acquiring the language, so learners are the ones who will use the language to communicate on it. Thus, it is important to know how they want to do their oral communication. Educators or administrators' opinions in this topic is also valuable, but the learners' ideas, needs, and preferences influences in a heavier manner when determining a proper model to follow.

Having clarified that, the description of the learners' perceptions is detailed below. Research in this topic has been applied to determine the perspectives of students in the teaching of pronunciation by either a native or nonnative speaking teacher. Despite the insufficient data and papers about this topic, there are some valuable research that contributes to the topic.

Li and Zhang (2016) carried out a mixed-research case to determine in part "How (...) the participants evaluate the NST and the NNST as an L2 pronunciation



teacher” (pg. 91). This investigation took place during four months in a class of 56 students that were selected through a placement test to determine a regular intermediate English proficiency. As these participants claimed, most of them had already had previous experiences with both NSTs and NNSTs. The objective, as it was stated, was not only to determine the preferences but also the outcomes (that are evaluated later) that the participants would have after finishing a course in pronunciation imparted by, first, the NST and, posteriorly, a NNST. The class focused more on accentedness and comprehensibility just to evaluate pronunciation, and, in order to determine their preferences about the model they had, a closed-ended questionnaire was applied to all participants with an interview for more details. The analysis and results of the instruments conclude with a clear result a major preference for Native Speaking Teachers as their model of pronunciation. According to their opinions, “the majority of the 21 participants who chose NST over NNST said that they felt a NST could be a better model” (Li & Zhang, 2016, pg. 94)

Another prime investigation for the election of a proper model of English pronunciation teaching was carried out by Levis et al. (2016). These authors carried out a research based on a mixed-methods design to investigate the points of view and the results in pronunciation proficiency of 32 learners divided into two groups that would learn simultaneously during 7 weeks about pronunciation theory and practice. Each group had an interchangeable teacher during the duration of the course, but the difference was the precedence of these teachers. As the first one was an American Native Speaking Teacher of English, the second one was a Nonnative Speaking Teacher from Turkey. Finally, the level and precedence of the students were irregular. At first, their pronunciation level was determined through an aloud reading and spontaneous speech. The instruments ended up with results of students’ pronunciation proficiency



from intermediate to advanced. Second, the background was different not only in language background but also in their social setting. The participants were selected through messages from the university community, and among this groups there were students, spouses of students/staff, visitors, and people from the local community. In the conclusion part of the research, to determine the students' perceptions about their NST or NNST when teaching L2 pronunciation, interviews were applied after and before the investigation. During these interviews, participants do not show any preference for being taught by NSTs or NNSTs when the topic is related to grammar, vocabulary, and/or reading; nevertheless, when they were asked about what the most accurate teacher for the speaking skill would be, most of the participants replied confidently that a NST would be better.

The last article that addresses directly the topic of NSTs or NNSTs as an accurate model of pronunciation is the one conducted again by Levis, Sonsaat, and Link (2017). In this article, Levis et al focused in depth on the teaching of pronunciation when carried out by NST and NNSTs. Indeed, this study has more concepts related to pedagogical practices and accent difference of the two models of pronunciation teaching. Plus, it also reflects on the perspectives of students towards the different accents of teachers. However, this research synthesis concentrates on the perceptions of learners and their outcomes about pronunciation, which is also covered in this research synthesis. Unlike his previous work, this paper presents a view of EFL and ESL students. The field of ESL students has not been touched in this paper as the objective of English as a Second Language is to communicate in settings where the target language is spoken natively, yet Levis article may not be unpriced only because it has an ESL component for comparison. In fact, it offers a broader view that may enrich this synthesis work.



Going back to the analysis of the paper, Levis et al (2017) examined ESL and EFL students' perceptions about the teaching of pronunciation carried on by NSTs and NNSTs. As the previous papers, this is a mixed-method investigation, and one of the research questions is "what are students' attitudes and beliefs about native and non-native teachers regarding pronunciation teaching?" (pg. 199). Another difference with their work made in the year 2016, this research has the component that the participants were 160 undergraduate and graduate students from public universities from USA and Turkey whose major is English-related. The level of pronunciation was not measured this time as the focus of this paper is on perceptions rather than learners' final oral proficiency. On the other hand, the perceptions were measured through an interview with some of the participants with open-ended questions. The analysis and contrast of these opinions allowed the drawing of some conclusions. First, for both EFL and ESL students, the perceptions are clearly biased for NSTs when teaching pronunciation. However, for ESL students, they accept the teaching of pronunciation when carried out by NNSTs. Even if the preference of both ESL and EFL students is for Native Speaking teachers, it does not overwhelm preferences for Non-Native Speaking teachers.

As it was mentioned previously, there is not enough information about the contrast of perceptions and outcomes of learners when pronunciation is being taught by NSTs or NNSTs. The previous papers are vital to establish what is intended in this research synthesis. Still, the detailed information is not sufficient. As a result, some articles that contain the topic of students' ideas about NSTs and NNSTs in pronunciation are used below to contribute with more relevant information. In other words, these papers are not focused on the oral skill analysis, yet they contain valid pieces of information about the matter. Thus, papers that deal in general about perceptions of NSTs and NNSTs in English teaching are used.



Díaz (2015) conducted qualitative research with the aim to determine the attitudes regarding to the teaching of Native and Nonnative Speaking Teachers of 78 students of an Applied Foreign Languages Program at a French Brittany. In order to collect students' opinions, a survey designed to select preferences of NSTs and NNSTs in all English skills and subskills was taken. In the part of oral skills, specifically in oral production and pronunciation, students tend to appreciate more the teaching of a NSTs. However, in other English skills or devices, students assure that there is no distinction between NSTs or NNSTs.

In addition to this article, Adara (2018) performed an investigation concerning about the degree of motivation obtained when learners are under the instruction of the English models (NSTs and NNSTs). Just as the previous paper, this comparison was conducted under a mixed-method design with the use of both questionnaires and interviews. Still, one major difference between the previous papers is the level that students are at. Unlikely the previous participants that are under a third-level education or even a higher academic level, the involved students in this investigation are high school juniors. The result of the overview of data determined neutral preferences for both NSTs and NNSTs. But, for the purpose of this paper, NSTs are clearly decanted when pronunciation teaching is analyzed isolately. Finally, Fauzi and Hashim (2020) determined the students' preferences of learning when conducted by the models discussed. As Adara's paper, this study focuses on secondary learners of English. In total, 30 participants with previous experience of learning processes carried out by both models were selected to participate. Nevertheless, this paper only uses a qualitative method based on the technique of "essay writing." Continuing the tendency of the last two articles, there is a preference for NSTs for the teaching of oral skills, where pronunciation is clearly included.



Subsequently of these papers, these following two are the final ones to deal with learners' point of view of pronunciation teaching when conducted by Native Speaking and Nonnative Speaking teachers. Pae (2019) carried out a research study to determine effects on the motivation and attitudes that students have when being taught by the different models of English. Even though this article focuses on the differentiation and election on the most accurate model for English teaching, it analyzes learners' opinions about NSTs and NNSTs in pronunciation as one of the means to see the effects on learning when influenced by the instructor place of origin. 747 students from an English programme in Korea participated along with 23 NNTs and 16 NSTs. As for the methodology, it may appear as a quantitative-approach paper due to the scaled surveys and questionnaires. In order to cover the part of oral skills, classes of Conversation were held during the process. On the part of the conclusions, the author pointed out several positive attitudes towards Native Speaking Teachers; therefore, motivation of students to learn English are increased to learn a L2 language. On the other hand, it is showed that learners from that region consistently present negative connotations towards NNSTs when they are meant to teach oral skills. To finish, Dao (2019) performed research to determine the point of view of 157 first-year students from Vietnam University about their idea on the instruction of pronunciation. When referring to the instruction, it is not only mentioning the model but also methods and techniques. As expected, this article possesses important details for our analysis since one of the topics for teaching pronunciation is about the model to be based on. As a conclusion, Dao (2019) expresses that there is still a high value in students' opinion to receive pronunciation lessons with a Native Speaker.

With these range of perceptions towards both Native and Nonnative speaking instructors when teaching oral skills, it may be reasonable to draw conclusions to who is



the most appropriate and accurate model of pronunciation based on the preferences of the primal and most active participants of the learning system (learners). However, it is important to revise within these papers some of the arguments used in favor of the model that was selected to imitate and the possible effects in educators as this may bring a complex scenario and further information to understand the opinion of these students and compare them to the current ideals of pronunciation teaching.

3.3.1. Learners' reasons for preference

In order to gain order in the description of the possible reasons, they are not organized depending on their relevance, degree of development in the papers, or selection of the author(s). These are mentioned as they were detailed and with the order established in the preferences. That is, the reasons that appear in most of the publications that deal with preferences will be divided per papers and with the same order of the previous upper section. Additionally, if some of these reasons are essentially repeated, they will be developed only once in the earliest entry and then named in the rest. Any variation or contradiction of a reason will be detailed as well. To finish this introduction, it is critical to assume that these reasons are drawn by students' interviews, and they are essentially learners' notions developed by the author(s).

The first paper of Li and Zhang (2016) included some of the following learners' reasons to explain the maintenance of preferred attitudes towards NSTs:

- The teaching accompanied by a Native Speaker is a meaningful moment to expose to and assimilate the target language.
- The physical appearance of instructors to teach oral subskills are relevant to show a “real” native accent. Yet, this factor was not as relevant as the first factor, according to the authors.
- The different methodologies that are used by a foreign instructor may influence



positively or negatively to the judgements. In this case, several participants feel comfortable to change the traditional teacher-centered approach to a more student-centered class. The author makes an emphasis though that most of the learning institutions of the country (China) have traditional-methodology practices, so another considerable group of pupils denominated lessons as “too active”

The next paper to be developed in this subsection is Levis et al. (2016). As stated before, when the participants were asked about the model to choose in order to learn oral skills, undoubtedly the response was in favor on a Native Speaking model of English. When participants were questioned to give arguments to support their decision, they struggled to provide a well-constructed argument. The assumption of the authors was to assume that learners of English pronunciation are influenced by the fallacy that the teaching of English abilities, in this case Speaking, is closely influenced by the place of birth of the instructor. Levis et al. (2016) denominated this belief of implicit acquisition through exposure as “*catching a cold*.” In general terms, it expresses the believe of several English learners to consider the acquisition of pronunciation through exposure only. For instance, a NST’s pronunciation is better for “*catching*,” whereas a NNST’s pronunciation may even be considered by these learners as bad pronunciation.

Next on, another article of Levis et al. (2017) enters into consideration. This paper shows a minor chance in the previous conceptions of a strong dominance of NSTs into the thinking of learners of English at the moment of learning pronunciation. Even though NSTs are still preferred for oral skills teaching, is not an overwhelming percentage compared to the ones who prefer NNSTs. Nonetheless, two important points are remarked for the NSTs influence in the pronunciation teaching:

- Native Speaking Teachers may be seen as the ideal and ultimate aim for learners



of English when refereeing to this productive skill.

- The “catching a cold” effect in pronunciation.

The justifications for the elections in any of these papers were certainly based on the most complete sources of information that develop the topic of NSTs and NNSTs in the analyzed sub oral skill. From now on, reasons to be described in the next lines may not only refer to pronunciation only but also to the rest of the receptive or productive skills/subskills since these papers were taken as an analysis of NSTs vs NNSTs but not with the focus on the subskill analyzed in this research synthesis.

Diaz (2015) explained that the responses and the preferences of his paper follow the general line of preference to NSTs in oral skills like pronunciation. He attributes the election of learners to ideological constructions that are constantly related to native speakers. Within these assumptions, there are believes about a broader and better understanding of the culture of the language, more open-minded decisions about the different structures and use of language forms, and, most importantly for this paper, more fluency when speaking. Similarly, Adara (2018) expresses similar reasons to justify students’ notion of NSTs and NNSTs in pronunciation teaching. That is a cultural assumption that benefits Native Speaking Teachers.

Fauzi and Hashim (2020) exemplified many reasons why learners tend to prefer NSTs during the development of the oral proficiency skill based on the comments and assumptions of the participants:

- The pronunciation is considered “real” as it is similar or the same than the different audiovisual channels where students get the prompts of nativeness.
- Depending on the situation, like singing in their article, a NST tends to use suprasegmentals features to produce and change a speech form that fits into the educational situation. A NNSTs may remain with a similar tone of voice for



long periods of time.

- The exemplification of certain pronunciation patterns is better achieved with NSTs as they use a “standard” accent that is the objective of the class.

All these reasons are very specific and are directly drawn from students’ comments and opinions when the instruments were analyzed. Nevertheless, the author also mentions several instances where NNSTs are as equally capable as NSTs. These instances are immediate feedback, cultural and language similarities, use of L1, etc.

Dao (2019) expressed a strong argument of students as well to sustain their selection of NSTs:

- Learners are aiming at acquiring a native-like pronunciation rather than focusing on vital segmentals and suprasegmentals of the language.

For participants of this study, a standard English pronunciation will be very close to the way of speaking of a native person. A pronunciation model with a foreign accent is considered by them as “non-standard.”

Consequently, Pae (2016) made intensive research in the reasons and effects of the teaching of English carried out by NSTs and NNSTs. Yet, in this case they are considered as he did not ask for any reasons but rather, he implied them. Thus, these reasons are not considered as students’ notions. These reasons and effects may be covered in the following subchapter.

The final paper has a focus on teachers’ self-perception about their way of grading pronunciation to see if they themselves evaluate their students according to parameters of pronunciation of vowels, consonants, stress, and intonation. (Arcaya, 2020). According to the author, the objective to analyze this paper is to determine any difference in the grading of NST and NNST. If there is a difference when these



instructors evaluate students, this may serve as a reason of election of one or another model.

As claimed by Arcaya (2020), this research took place with some students involved in courses in a private University from Chile. These students needed to send the raters recordings of a controlled reading and an interview. Then, NSTs and NNSTs would receive the same recordings, evaluate them with an assessment instrument, and send them after two weeks to the author of the article. The results indicated that NSTs tend to evaluate students with higher grades as they focus more on comprehensibility rather than form, as some of the NNSTs were focused on. (Arcaya, 2020).

A final remark and as a final claim of these statements, the exposed reasons come from the literal or reported speech from participants that participated in the different studies performed by the cited authors. Being analytical, these assumptions of causes are students' opinions, so they are considered as longer additional descriptions of these opinions. As a result, they help us explain some of the students' ideas for their election of NSTs or NNSTs during the teaching of pronunciation.

3.3.2. Possible effects of students' preference

In this last part of the establishment of the perspectives of students regarding to the models of pronunciation and their teaching, there is a discussion about some effects that may take place as this students' points of view are stated in some educational contexts. Although the focus of this research paper is not centered in analyzing these positive or negative effects in the participants of the education of pronunciation and in language acquisition in general, some papers state these consequences right after the establishment of the preferences. Hence, it is appropriate to only mention them. These effects will not be analyzed during the discussion of the arguments but used as arguments for some conclusions. Furthermore, the effects in learners' final outcomes



and proficiency level are not reviewed in this part as that subtopic is covered separately due to its importance in this paper. Finally, not all the analyzed papers contain this information, so they will be taken indiscriminately.

With the previous opening, the first article to be mentioned is Pae (2016). In his article, he pointed out that the influence of NSTs towards learners may cause positive attitudes to pupils' participation and motivation to acquire the English language. Students' ideas about NSTs being in a higher educational and professional level are a powerful tool that can be exploited. Also, unlikely the negative comments of NNSTs, these teachers feel that their teaching is as adequate for the teaching of English pronunciation as the teaching of NSTs. For them, this article presented that the factor of nativeness is not a determinant to create or develop students' practices and tasks in order to teach pronunciation. As for institutions, one of the major changes that could happen is the inclusion of a professional to teach cultural oral activities. This effect may be carried out by the administration of certain English institutions. Yet, it needs a further analysis to be actually proven and determined as good or bad.

Dao (2019) put into consideration that some learners do not consider a foreign pronunciation as a standard. Therefore, a negative effect of this thinking is related to their educators. If any teacher did not have a native-like accent, negative questionings may be created towards the model of this class as students incorrectly perceived a "non-standard" variation of English from the person that is supposed to have a "standard" pronunciation, which they consider is a pronunciation model with most or all oral features of native speakers.

On the other hand, Díaz (2015) clarified that even though there is still a significant preference of NSTs for the teaching of pronunciation, this is radically changing as their participants affirmed that for the rest skills there is no difference in the



kind of instructors when teaching. Thus, the author considers that a possible effect of this shifting in ideals may be the disappearance of the terms “NNSTs” and “NSTs” in the future as every accent will become standard.

Finally, both Levis (2016) and Li and Zhang (2016) suggested that despite the preference that is exposed in the qualitative results and entries of their papers, the status of Native Speaking Teachers as the perfect models and instructors of pronunciation is decreasing due to the new ideals of comprehensibility and intelligibility. Yet, these authors coincide that the learners conditioning to the language has always been centered to achieving a pronunciation from books and judging their own mistakes they make during the learning process.

These immediate or long-term effects are taken by the authors as likely to happen. Nonetheless, education and, as it was covered early, pronunciation teaching is conditioned to the movements, ideals, and methodologies that come into validity during certain moments in time. Let us remember that these possible good or bad effects are an object of an exhaustive analysis which is not developed in this paper.

Now that there is clear that there is a big tendency for choosing NSTs as an accurate and most appropriate model from teaching English pronunciation, it is the moment to see if that statement is correct. An appropriate form to perform this is by analysis students' overall performance of pronunciation when they are taught by one or another instructor and see if their perceptions match with real results. In the following subchapter there is a description of comparisons that were done to see if there is a difference in the teaching of pronunciation conducted by Native and Nonnative Speaking Teachers.



3.4. Similarities and Differences in the Learners' Pronunciation Outcomes

The last part of this literature review revises the obtained conclusions from the some of the studies used in the earlier part of this analysis. Essentially, this research synthesis is based on the development of the concept of the most accurate model for English pronunciation. Again, these models are clearly divided into two, Native and Nonnative Speaking Teachers. For the purpose of this article, the decision of the most suitable model to follow in the oral subskill is based on three subcomponents: The establishment of the correct instructor based on the ideologies (Nativity and Intelligibility) that guide the teaching of the spoken skills, the perceptions students have towards the teaching of both models and their influence into the acquisition of a pronunciation proficiency, and the results and conclusions that several studies offer about contrastive empirical research where groups of students were taught with one or another instructor.

Two of these three subcomponents have been already exposed through arguments got in many papers. Their conclusions will be drawn in the table analysis; as for now, in this section, the third subcomponent is discussed. Before the development of this data, it is worthy to mention that not all the papers that were used in the part of the students' perceptions used before are included in this part. The justification of not including all of them is that they lack the component of contrast between the teaching of Native and Nonnative instructors in the pronunciation teaching. Also, it corresponds to Arcaya's claim (2020) that there is no enough data addressing this concern.

Naturally, in order to start this part, the papers that developed the topic of pronunciation teaching in a depth manner are first stated. Consequently, the articles that analyzed the differences between native and nonnative speakers are then considered as they evaluated in a much less manner this issue.



Li and Zhang (2016) used read-aloud activities with the interest of measuring students' oral proficiency after being taught by both a NST and a NNST during four months. These tests were taken before, during, and at the end of the course. Additionally, these tests had two different components to include a controlled reading and a speech for determining their spontaneous speech. The results of the responses and the spontaneous-speech activities were analyzed to determine which was the overall success of students. As to remain objectivity in this article, three American-native users of the language that participated in a Linguistics Bachelor's program and that had little influence of Chinese English were selected for the grading. The grades were assigned individually and based on the parameters of accentedness and comprehensibility. Both grading items used a 1 to 5 scale, where number 1 meant no accent and no difficulty to understand the students' talk respectively. After these grading, the results were converted into an average.

Another important consideration established by Li and Zhang (2016) is that this course was not divided to be taught simultaneously by a Native and Nonnative Speaking teacher. Instead, the participants instructors had a specialized text to teach pronunciation in this course called *College English: Pronunciation* with 12 units in total. The first six units were first covered by the NST and then the NNST imparted the next six. Furthermore, the teachers were asked to develop their own techniques and materials to satisfy their own needs. No additional instructions were given to the teachers to impart their lessons.

According to Li and Zhang (2016), the results were divided based on the controlled reading and the spontaneous speech practice. In order to notice any significant increase, the results of the three tests (before, middle, and final evaluations) were compared. The first score to be analyzed is the reading-loud task. In this, there is a



slightly decrease in students' accentedness. The initial average grade of 3.60 was diminished during the mid-test to 3.53 and finished in 3.36 during the post-course test. In the case of comprehensibility, the initial average of 3.40 at the beginning of the course passed to 3.36 and 3.20 to the end. On the other hand, the interviews had a similar slightly increase into students' proficiency in accentedness (3.65 at the beginning, 3.64 during the mid-test, and 3.51 at the end) and comprehensibility (3.49 at the beginning, 3.48 during the mid-test, and 3.36 at the end)

Surely, there is a participants' improvement when taught by both NST and NNST. Still, the difference in the level of increase is non-significant as both the Native and Nonnative Speaking instructors achieved similar results with a very small improvement difference in favor of the NNST. (Li & Zhang, 2016)

The second paper to be presented with a similar structure is the one from Levis et al. (2016). Unlike the previous study, this study took place with two different courses for a period of seven weeks. These courses had a NST and NNST respectively. Both of these instructors were students from a Linguistics PhD program. In the first case, the NST place of origin determined his native American English. Differently, the NNST was a Turkish citizen. The subcomponents to be evaluated are the same as the previous study; that is, both studies determined students' oral skills through the analysis of accentedness and comprehensibility. According to Levis et al. (2016), these two components were measured in a scale of 1 to 9, where 1 was a meaning of no foreign accent and extremely easy to understand, depending on the category.

Another difference with Li and Zhang paper is that the raters were divided into two groups, each one to validate accentedness and comprehensibility separately. Also, these groups were students from introductory courses of Bachelors' introductory programs in Linguistics and Writing. Nevertheless, these raters did not have or little



contact with foreign accents and abroad variations of English. This characteristic is very similar with the one that was previously stated. Still, raters from this study did also evaluate the participants that were assigned with the role of teachers to determine their level of accentedness and comprehensibility, which was reasonably favored to the NST as her scores were lower in the 1-to-9 scale; thus, some of the raters were excluded of the investigation as their results were clearly biased. (Levis et all, 2016).

In the same way, there is a slight difference when designing and taking the evaluations. These were only carried out previous the beginning of the courses and then retaken at the end of them., not in three steps as they are simultaneous courses. As mentioned before, comprehensibility and accentedness is evaluated, but this time there are measured with the analysis of students' reading of sentences and interviews for spontaneous speech. (Levis et all, 2016)

Finally, and most importantly, the most remarkable difference with Li and Zhang's research is that the methodology, activities, materials, and book was the same for both courses. As for the information of the book, this was an unpublished book of the same researchers with 13 units based on pronunciation features (segmentals, suprasegmentals, rhythm, intonation, etc.). Levis et all (2016) explained that the importance of imposing pedagogical features to the courses was to avoid any conflict into the analysis of the results. Additionally, a last sample of controlled sentences were given to the raters to verify if they could grade according to the requirements established by the researchers. In this case, sentences of 9 participants, where one was a native speaker, where given to them to give a final classification of objectivity and to test participants' ability to rate. No rater was separated during this process.

In the same way of Li and Zhang's paper, this study divided their rating conclusions based on the controlled read task and the interviews. Furthermore, these



were divided in the aspects evaluated, that is accentedness and comprehensibility. The first task exposed is the grading of the reading activity. The conclusive data for this activity regarding to accentedness is that the average score of the participants who had the NST did not show a significant difference with the result of the students' performance who had a NNST. There is only a small differentiation in terms of accent between these two courses in favor of the NST course. Analogously, there is a nonsignificant difference of the level of improvement between these two courses based on the compressibility component when they were evaluated using the spontaneous interviews and then comparing their results with the initial test. Levis et al, 2016).

As isolated cases, five participants (3 from the NST course and 2 from the NNST class) demonstrated a remarkable improvement in the accentedness and comprehensibility components based on their results of the reading and interview activities. As for the rest of the students in this pronunciation course presented mixed results with insignificant increase or decrease that is not valid for the purposes of this article. (Levis et al, 2016)

Levis et al (2017) presented another study focused more on the perceptions of students rather than validating of their assumptions were correct or not by making a field study, just as their previous paper. Nevertheless, it did evaluate students' perceptions in a different form. In this case, the participants (EFL and ESL students) after being asked for their preferences in the subject of the best model for English pronunciation, they were exposed to samples of both NSTs and NNSTs for the evaluation of the same components, accentedness and comprehensibility. The results of this small discrimination for students resulted in a tendency of EFL students of not being clear which samples were from a Native or Nonnative Speaking Teacher. On the other hand, some ESL students clearly recognized native samples as their values in



terms of accentedness is significantly better than the ones of the nonnative speakers, yet this was not a tendency for all. Thus, as a conclusion, the author establishes that even though students present a tendency for one model (NST), they are unable to recognize these speakers in accentedness and comprehensibility aspects. (Levis et al, 2017).

These final arguments present and end to the revision of the literature of the topic of election and perceptions of students towards the two marked models of English pronunciation. The following chapter describes the methodology used in this research synthesis and the procedure to analyze the information provided by the part of this paper.



CHAPTER IV:

Methodology

The methodology for this research synthesis is based on “the conjunction of a particular set of literature review characteristics” (Norris & Ortega, 2006). Its aim is to analyze empirical gathered data and create generalizations based on this research. Therefore, this document will take the form of an explanatory synthesis about the perspectives and differences in the teaching of pronunciation conducted by NSTs in contrast to NNSTs. Finally, this document also takes the form of a documentary research that, according to Scott (2015) is “a research that uses personal and official documents as a source material” (pg. 188).

The papers collected were taken from online databases, including Google Scholar, ProQuest, ResearchGate, EBSCO, and Taylor & Francis online. As for the narrowing of information regarding to the topic, the papers were taken according to the following inclusion criteria: First, the data need to relate to the topic of the differences between NSTs and NNSTs, specifically, they need to talk about the teaching on pronunciation. Second, they need to be empirical approaches as they show clear results that serve of great support for the arguments of this research. Third, they need to be academic publications as they offer data which was taken under a formal procedure and were revised before publication. Fourth, they need to be based on EFL (English as a Foreign Language) /ELF (English as a Lingua Franca) approaches as the nature of the research requires data from participants that are likely to use the language for communicative goals. ESL was excluded since their purpose is to teach English under academic and educational situations. Documents that mix EFL and ESL are acceptable as they offer a comparison between these two English



teaching approaches. Finally, the papers need to be published from 2015 to the current date since information nowadays is renewed and replaced in a relatively short time. Only few exceptions were taken from below this range as their information was relevant for the synthesis. Aspects, such as age, gender, educational level, or country were not considered as the author believes they are not a direct factor that can influence the results of the investigation.

As for the key words used to gather documents that could be relevant for this synthesis, they were the following: 1 . Non-native, 2 . Native, 3 . Pronunciation teaching, 4 . Non-native vs Native, 5 . Students' perspectives, 6 . Intelligibility, 7 . Nativeness, 8 . EFL pronunciation, 9 . ELF pronunciation, and 10 . Pronunciation model. Finally, several academic journals were revised. The list includes: *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *ELT Journal Advance Access*, *SYSTEM*, *Tesol*, *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics*, *Routledge*, among others that were considered not only because of the relevant academic papers they offer but also for their trustworthy and credibility in their research.



CHAPTER V:

Analysis of the data

5.1. Introduction

After the statement of the most decisive theories and current trends of the teaching of pronunciation; the description of the problems that this teaching of pronunciation had regarding to the current trends and models; and finally, after the assumptions that learners have towards Native and Nonnative Speaking Teachers with their corresponding reasons and outcomes, it is time to evaluate critically the data.

The previous description of 16 studies with their corresponding conclusions and implications were taken from different sources and analyzed to determine the degree of importance that the information contained within them apported to the present research synthesis. Because of their different backgrounds, years of publications, educational differences, study focus, etc., it is essential to contrast them to draw conclusions based on the different and meaningful data that they provide.

As a result, this part of this research is focused on classifying and interpreting the stated publications with the regular criteria for all papers: year of publication, continent where they were developed, and educational level of participants; and additionally with the criteria concerned to this investigation: contrast of pronunciation teaching trends and their shifting, accurate model of pronunciation according to studies, accurate model of pronunciation according to perceptions, and similarities and differences on the teaching of pronunciation. To achieve this purpose, comparative/contrastive charts are used as well as a subsequent analysis of the general implications and drawings of all articles.

Finally, these tables and the papers that appear in them are classified according to their use in the previous chapter. That means that not all the tables contain all the 16 articles



but only the ones that are developed in their corresponding subtheme in the Literature Review.

5.2. Publication Year of the Studies

Table 1

Publication Year of the Studies

Year of Publication	Author(s)	No. of Studies
2015-2017	Afshari & Ketabi (2016a); Afshari & Ketabi (2016b); Aneja (2016); Bøhn & Hansen (2017); Díaz (2015); Levis, Sonsaat & Link (2017); Levis, Sonsaat, Link & Barriuso (2016); Li & Zhang (2016); Pae (2016); Wolff (2015).	10
2018-2021	Adara (2018); Arcaya (2020); Dao (2019); Fauzi & Hashim (2020); Guo, Chen & Sun (2021); Othman & Zahawi (2020).	6

Note. N=16

Table 1 shows the number of studies according to their date of publication. These articles were divided in a period of three years starting from 2015 until the year of writing of this research synthesis. According to Ketabi (2015), In the year 2015, pronunciation has not been really considered for research, yet more articles have started to be developed from that day. Thus, most of these articles are from the year range of 2015 to 2017 (Afshari & Ketabi, 2016a; Afshari & Ketabi, 2016b; Aneja, 2016; Bøhn & Hansen, 2017; Díaz, 2015; Levis, Sonsaat, and Link, 2017; Levis, Sonsaat, Link and Barriuso, 2016; Li & Zhang, 2016; Pae, 2016; Wolff, 2015).

The provided information of these articles shows that the topic of pronunciation in ELT contexts is still a theme of convergence among English learners and researchers, specially based that pronunciation itself has suffered risings and downfalls. (Afshari and



Ketabi, 2016a). Nevertheless, even though the highlight of the importance of pronunciation and the remarkable role it has in the acquisition of English, it has not received the value for a correct inclusion, incorporation, teaching, and development of practices in EFL classrooms. (Afshari and Ketabi, 2016b).

In the same way, the next set of papers based on the year of publication (2018-2021) exemplifies that pronunciation is still being discussed: Adara, 2018; Arcaya, 2020; Dao, 2019; Fauzi & Hashim, 2020; Guo, Chen and Sun, 2021; Othman & Zahawi, 2020. There is an evident decrease of papers that were used, but this is justified by Fauzi and Hashim (2021). These authors stated that since English has now considered as the lingua franca, there is no necessity of discussion among native and nonnative speakers of the language but rather on the capability of users to use the language. The accent and the foreign pronunciation are not key elements to distinguish users of language, especially when they can be understood among them.

However, this same argument is put into contradiction by the results of Fauzi and Hashim (2021), saying that students are still unclear with the different concepts, similarities, and differences that a native and a nonnative speaker of English has, specially towards the pronunciation ability. It is a discrepancy between the assumptions that are acquired by researchers and educators than the ones we can encounter in the students' points of view towards the matter of oral skills.

As a final assumption, the pandemic may have limited empirical and in-field studies that would apport more in the concern of pronunciation perceptions. According to Dao (2019), some of the findings of his article are limited because of the imposition of qualitative studies rather than quantitative studies. This limitation may be addressed to the developing health situation in the world.

5.3. Location of the Studies

Table 2

Continent of the conducted studies

Continent	Author(s)	No. of Studies
North America	Aneja (2016); Levis, Sonsaat & Link (2017) *; Levis, Sonsaat, Link & Barriuso (2016); Wolff (2015).	4
South America	Arcaya (2020)	1
Europe	Bøhn & Hansen (2017); Díaz (2015); Levis, Sonsaat & Link (2017) *	3
Asia	Adara (2018); Afshari & Ketabi (2016a); Afshari & Ketabi (2016b); Dao (2019); Fauzi & Hashim (2020); Guo, Chen & Sun (2021); Levis, Sonsaat & Link (2017) *; Li & Zhang (2016); Pae (2016); Othman & Zahawi (2020).	10

Note. N=16 * Study developed in two continents. Additionally, one of these countries lays on two continents

Table 2 shows the location of the places of study and analysis of the research papers that were used in the Literature Review. According to the table, it can be assumed that the continent that is more focused on the development of pronunciation and, specifically on the perceptions and the adoption of the most accurate model of pronunciation is Asia.

As a manner of argumentation, Guo, Chen and Sun (2021) expressed their need for applying long-term instructions for the inclusion of NSTs into a national level (China). Similarly, Pae (2016) presented that there are many gaps to cover into the topic of students' perceptions towards the instruction of NST and NNSTs in the country where the study was carried out (Korea) even though there is plenty of information from



the neighbor countries. Moreover, Othman and Zahawi (2020) concluded that Kurdish teachers are more oriented to a native-like pronunciation for them and their pupils as well. Asian countries are very aware to the topic of pronunciation and the subthemes that come with pronunciation in our days.

Unlike the Asian continent, the South American territory is lacking from components to describe pronunciation in some components. One prime example of this is exposed by Araya (2020) that assured that although the great quantity of papers to assess the oral skill, the assessment of pronunciation, and specially a comparison on assessment based on NSTs and NNTs' way of grading is insignificant. Besides, from the papers he mentioned, none of them corresponds to our social context.

5.4. Educational Levels

Table 3

Educational Level of the Conducted Studies

Level	Author(s)	No. of Studies
High/Secondary School	Adara (2018); Bøhn & Hansen (2017); Fauzi & Hashim (2020).	3
University	Arcaya (2020); Dao (2019); Díaz (2015); Guo, Chen & Sun (2021); Levis, Sonsaat & Link (2017); Levis, Sonsaat, Link & Barriuso (2016); Li & Zhang (2016); Othman & Zahawi (2020); Pae (2016). Wolff (2015).	10
Others/Not identified	Afshari & Ketabi (2016a); Afshari & Ketabi (2016b); Aneja (2016);	3

Note. N=16

Table 3 exposes the educational level of the participants. There are two important points to cover in this table. The first one is that since this study evaluates



students' perceptions, these are best obtained from groups of people that already have a critical thinking ability; and also, the capability to answer questions with a critical cognition segment is suitable for grown students. As a result, the majority of these investigations are performed with college students rather than children or students that are in a process of ongoing cognitive development. (Arcaya, 2020; Dao, 2019; Díaz, 2015; Guo, Chen and Sun, 2021; Levis, Sonsaat, and Link, 2017; Levis, Sonsaat, Link and Barriuso, 2016; Li and Zhang, 2016; Othman & Zahawi, 2020; Pae, 2016; Wolff, 2015)

The second point to clarified here is the point of “others/not identified” are papers that are focused on the exposition and the development of arguments from the ideologies contrasted in the Literature Review. Yet, these demonstrate an analysis and a conclusion of the authors, and additionally provide important information about the development of English pronunciation, especially in its tendencies and models of pronunciation.

5.5. Pronunciation Teaching Shifting

Table 4

Perspectives towards Pronunciation Trends

Continent	Author(s)	No. of Studies
Validate Nativeness	Bøhn & Hansen (2017) *; Othman & Zahawi (2020)	1
Validate Intelligibility	Afshari & Ketabi (2016a); Afshari & Ketabi (2016b); Bøhn & Hansen (2017) *	3

Note. N=4 *Document appears in both categories *Not all the documents provide a clear response for the stated issue

Table 4 provides information about the current state of pronunciation teaching to



decide the proper model based on the ideology for guiding its teaching. It tries to provide an answer to the question: “Which principle (Nativeness or Intelligibility) leads the teaching of English pronunciation currently?” Prior the debate of the main points, it is necessary to state that for Intelligibility any English teacher with an acceptable level of intelligibility is a proper model for the subskill, whereas in Nativeness, a native-like pronunciation is required through imitation of “standard” accents, so a NST is the best model in this case.

According to Afshari and Ketabi (216a), the attention of educators should be guided to achieve an intelligible manner of talking rather than an imitation of a native speaker. In his following paper, Afshari and Ketabi (2016b) explained that pronunciation has shifted to the repetition of drilling activities based on repetition to the use of the language for communicative situations with a comprehensible pronunciation. Moreover, educators’ perspectives agree on acquiring the perspectives of Intelligibility as explained by Bøhn and Hansen (2017) in their study. Nevertheless, these authors also mention that there is the need to investigate more about the validity of intelligibility as Nativeness is the traditional way to instruct and evaluate students that is still accepted. However, these articles present different threats to the acceptance of Intelligibility. This threat becomes evident in Othman and Zahawi (2020). In the paper, teachers are the ones who value more pronunciation guided with a native-like focus. This big difference between results that validate either Nativeness or Intelligibility makes the ideologies difficult to trust when deciding for the correct model for pronunciation.

As a conclusion, Table 4 provides information that strongly suggests a big difference of what is stated in research with actual thoughts. In research, Intelligibility is the accurate trend for teaching English pronunciation nowadays, yet in practice there is still a big presence of Nativeness due to the factor of preference of nativeness principles



or not relevance of Intelligibility. Therefore, an accurate model of English pronunciation according to Intelligibility does not require a native speaking teacher, but that premise is held only in papers as some research results still demonstrate a nativeness preference by teachers, and especially the ones that had the chance to study the target language in a country where it is spoken natively. In these cases, the accurate English model is still a native speaking teacher (NST) rather than any nonnative speaking teacher (NNST).

A distinction here to be made is that not all the documents stated in the previous and following tables and analysis are mentioned as not all of them are regarding to pronunciation models or perceptions. The lack of papers produced the selection of documents that had components of pronunciation, but not all of them included data about the specific addressed issue.

5.6. Accurate Model of Pronunciation according to Studies

Table 5

Native Speaking Teachers vs. Nonnative Speaking Teachers

Year of Publication	Author(s)	No. of Studies
Validate NSTs	Guo, Chen & Sun (2021); Pae (2016) *; Wolff (2015).	3
Validate NNSTs	Afshari & Ketabi (2016a); Afshari & Ketabi (2016b); Aneja (2016); Dao (2019); Pae (2016). *	5

Note. N=7 *Document appears in both categories *Not all the documents provide a clear response for the stated issue

Table 5 attempts to answer which is the most appropriate English model for the teaching of pronunciation? It demonstrates the most suitable pronunciation model



without considering students' perceptions. Students' preferences are covered in the next table; therefore, table 5 and table 6 are closely related but very different according to the model of pronunciation.

As for now, the aim of these articles is to determine the proper model of English pronunciation according to the different research and relevance on pronunciation in the current scenario of English in the globalized world. Wolff (2015); Guo, Chen, and Sun (2021); and Pae (2016) demonstrate that there is relevance of NSTs into the field of pronunciation only based on their status of Native Speakers that are supposed to know in depth the features of the language. These three authors demonstrate the argument of superiority of NSTs in the relevance these instructors are given.

On the other hand, there is a major difference between the documents that validate NNSTs as the models for pronunciation. Aneja (2016); Dao (2019); Pae (2016) established characteristics and arguments that give Nonnative Teachers of English a higher status when teaching pronunciation. Among these features that could be mentioned are the learning experience of a second tongue and the shared cultural background (Aneja, 2016); and the assumption of achievable results similar to the instructors and the practices based on meaningful features. (Dao, 2019). Additionally, Afshari and Ketabi (2016a); and Afshari and Ketabi (2016b) demonstrated in both of their papers that native speakers are losing their relevance in the field of pronunciation teaching due to the new conception of English as a Lingua Franca.

To finish, Table 5 presents the reasons why one model or another is selected. As a summary NSTs are chosen to be models based on their relevance, which is decreasing, whereas NNSTs are selected based on arguments that find their origin in research analysis. Because of this fact, we could say that NNSTs are the most suitable model for



English pronunciation nowadays, but there is still one major point to cover, the preferences of learners.

5.7. Accurate Model of Pronunciation according to Perceptions

Table 6

Native Speaking Teachers vs. Nonnative Speaking Teachers

Year of Publication	Author(s)	No. of Studies
Learners' Preference on NSTs	Adara (2018); Arcaya (2020); Díaz (2015); Dao (2019); Fauzi & Hashim (2020); Levis, Sonsaat & Link (2017); Levis, Sonsaat, Link & Barriuso (2016); Li & Zhang (2016); Pae (2016)	9
Learners' Preference on NNSTs		0

Note. N=9 *Only 9 from the 16 studies report preferences of students regarding pronunciation

Table 6 establishes students' preference towards the two established models of pronunciation based on the question, "What are the students' perceptions about NSTs' teaching pronunciation opposed to NNSTs'?" Table 5 and its analysis demonstrated that, in terms of research, NNSTs are the models that should direct the teaching of the oral subskill. Nevertheless, this current table claims a different statement. Students' point of view agrees that a NST is a better model to teach oral skills like pronunciation. (Adara, 2018; Arcaya, 2020; Díaz, 2015; Dao, 2019; Fauzi & Hashim, 2020; Levis, Sonsaat & Link, 2017; Levis, Sonsaat, Link & Barriuso, 2016; Li & Zhang, 2016; Pae, 2016).

The reasons to show a preference are similar between the papers. In most of them, the phenomenon of "catching a cold" is mentioned. As explained by Levis et. all (2017), participants are believed that the exposure to a standard pronunciation would



produce in them an identical manner of speaking. Additionally, most English learners believe that the pronunciation of a Native Speaker is considered the “real” form to speak the language. (Dao, 2019; Fauzi and Hashim, 2020).

Additionally, the preference of students towards a NST generates different effects as the keeping of the traditional conception of pronunciation that has always been compared with Native Speakers or the recorded versions of English books to learn the language. (Dao, 2019; Levis, 2016; Li and Zhang, 2016)

Another remarkable fact to mention is that these papers demonstrate that NNSTs are considered as good instructors for the language except on the oral skills. That means that NSTs and NNSTs are segmented only when referring to communicative skills. Besides pronunciation, there is no difference between a Native and a Nonnative Teacher as their performance depends on different factors.

As an opposition of what was established in Table 5, Table 6 presents that, in terms of preference and even motivation of students, the most appropriate model to teach pronunciation are NSTs with a significant difference. The issue of this result is that the data from research does not match with the preferences that are seen in a real class. It is still unclear to determine the best model to teach pronunciation based on the guidelines of pronunciation nowadays and in the students’ point of view.

In order to determine which one is the best model, there needs to be a discussion between the oral proficiency of students that have participated in lessons with NSTs and NNSTs. Clearly, their overall performance and the degree of difference is a determinant factor as this may supposed which model teachers better. As a result, the next table demonstrates this point.



5.8. Similarities or differences on the teaching of pronunciation

Table 7

Native Speaking Teachers vs. Nonnative Speaking Teachers

Year of Publication	Author(s)	No. of Studies
Significant Difference in favor of NSTs		0
Significant Difference in favor of NNSTs		0
No difference in Students' Performance	Arcaya (2020); Levis, Sonsaat & Link (2017); Levis, Sonsaat, Link & Barriuso (2016); Li & Zhang (2016).	4

Note. N=4

Table 7 presents the information related to the similarities and differences that may be possible to encounter in students' pronunciation performance when taught by either NSTs or NNSTs using the question "How does the influence of a NST affect the students' pronunciation outcomes compared to the results obtained by a NNST?" as a basis. The first thing to mention, not only in here, but in all the development of this study is that there is no recent information with a proper contrast between Native and Nonnative Speaking Teachers in respect to pronunciation teaching, and this is more notorious in our context. (Arcaya, 2020).

Besides that issue that is addressed more in the recommendations of this research synthesis, Levis, Sonsaat, and Link (2017); Levis, Sonsaat, Link and Barriuso (2016); and Li & Zhang (2016) exposed that there is not a significant difference in the learning outcomes between the learners when being taught by different instructors.



Therefore, this last argument proves no validation of either NSTs or NNSTs within the teaching of pronunciation in terms of learners' results

With the previous analysis, some conclusions could be drawn from the different indagating and contrast of the different articles revised in this research synthesis regarding to the correct model to teach pronunciation. These generalizations are stated below. Furthermore, some recommendations are also stated in the next chapter.



CHAPTER VI:

Conclusions and Recommendations

The last chapter of this paper is dedicated to expose the findings, generalizations and possible suggestions and topics for further research in the area. Properly, this entire information is based on the sequential and careful inquiry of the gathered data.

6.1. Conclusions

The aim of this research was to determine through the analysis of several points which is the most appropriate model to the teaching of pronunciation in the context we live nowadays. The arguments to base this election were founded according to the ideology that guides pronunciation teaching nowadays, the differences that Native and Nonnative Speaking Teacher have regarding to oral production, the preferences of learners and disposition to choose one of these models, and finally the possible similarities and differences in the learning outcomes that these instructors produce in their students. Certainly, there is a fulfillment in the gaps that this research tried to cover up, yet it demonstrated that there is more to look up.

Based on the information gathered, the model to teach English pronunciation is not decanted to one or another kind of speaker. Based on the ideologies that guide pronunciation teaching, Szpyra-Kozłowska (2014) pointed out that English pronunciation nowadays must accomplish the intelligibility principles. However, this is often neglected due to the traditional idea and influence of Nativeness. Recalling these principles, Bøhn and Hansen (2017) establishes that in Nativeness learners must imitate and assimilate a native pronunciation. As a result, in this ideology, a NST is the better model. In contrast, Derwing and Munro (2016) referred Intelligibility as a substitution of Nativeness as there is not a necessary deletion of accent and exact imitation of a native speaker. In this scenario, a NNST is perfectly an acceptable model for the oral



subskill. The discussion to decide which ideology is the most prominent in the English pronunciation teaching, and consequently, which model should be imitated is not trustworthy due to the lack of a clear dominance of either Nativeness or Intelligibility.

According to which model is better without considering the different guidelines that mold the pronunciation teaching, Wolff (2015); Guo, Chen, and Sun (2021); and Pae (2016) demonstrated that the relevance of a NST has a great weight when institutions and even students have the possibility to decide the model of pronunciation. On the other hand, Aneja (2016); Dao (2019); Pae (2016) Afshari and Ketabi (2016a); and Afshari and Ketabi (2016b) claimed many arguments that put NNSTs in a higher level of NSTs. Due to the strong arguments debated by these authors (Experience in learning the language, common background, achievable models, and influence of ELF) explained in the Literature Review and Analysis of the Data; in this case we could say for the first time that a Nonnative Speaking Teacher is the most accurate model of English in our context. However, the amount of data stated in this article may not seem as enough to assure the general objective of this paper, yet it presents a solid argument to justify the aim.

Additionally, a major contradiction of this claim is presented with the students' perspectives towards NSTs and NNSTs. Adara (2018); Arcaya (2020); Díaz (2015); Dao (2019); Fauzi and Hashim (2020); Levis, Sonsaat and Link (2017); Levis, Sonsaat, Link and Barriuso (2016); Li and Zhang (2016); and Pae (2016) all of them determined the preference of NSTs when teaching pronunciation. Taking into account that education is based on students' needs, we cannot ignore the perspectives and preferences of students as it is a major factor that determines motivation, as an example. (Pae, 2016). Thus, students' perspectives decided that the most accurate model of pronunciation for their own purposes and needs are NSTs.



There is now an argument for each one of the models. The last theme for deciding the most proper model of pronunciation is to determine if students' perspectives and outcomes are valid or if they show a better English-speaking proficiency with NNSTs. Nevertheless, Levis, Sonsaat, and Link (2017); Levis, Sonsaat, Link and Barriuso (2016); and Li & Zhang (2016) proposed that there is no significant difference between the students' oral results.

Concluding this statement of data, it is not correct to say which model is better than the other. Instead, both achieve their functions based on the principles that they had been established and a change in the pronunciation instructor to increase students' outcomes is not the solution to the many problems that the teaching of pronunciation has throughout the world, and especially in our country that has a low proficiency in the language according to the EF EPI test. (2020)

Finally, even though the election of the model to follow when teaching pronunciation is still in discussion, the most important finding of this research synthesis is that Nonnative Speaking Teachers' status is being raised. Currently, many institutions offer English courses that use Native Speaking Teachers as a hook. Nevertheless, this research synthesis demonstrated that nowadays the status of a NST is no longer as relevant as it used to be in the past. As Ketabi (2015) highlighted, pronunciation and the different changes it has had are nowadays moving forward to acquire the global scenario of English being the language that is used not only in native-speaking countries, but in all the globalized world we have right now. At this moment, pronunciation is no longer an aspect determined by native speakers, but for the level of interaction achievable with others.



6.2.Recommendations

Arcaya (2020) exposed that the topic of pronunciation teaching and assessment needs to be clarified with more relevant and generalized data. As a result, one of the major recommendations to follow is to maintain a deep analysis and investigation into the area of pronunciation, especially with its current goals and approaches to teach. Additionally, since the social context has a lot of influence into the acceptance of nativeness and intelligibility as ideologies to guide the pronunciation teaching, it is important to develop research about the preferences and results of these trends and models based on our specific context. Among the regions that have developed similar topics, our Latin-American region is the least in providing meaningful information, and that is something to be criticized and changed in the future.

As a final claim, this document has proved that there is no necessity if achieving a native-like pronunciation when communicating in English; therefore, this idea should be spread through the different institutions, courses, and instructors that still believe that English is not a matter of change. Languages, and the manners of talking are always changing, and we, as educators, should change our vision of those changes as well.



References

- Adara, R. A. (2018). STUDENTS' MOTIVATION AND PREFERENCES TOWARD NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE ENGLISH-SPEAKING TEACHERS. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 1–21. doi: [10.24127/pj.v7i1.1329](https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v7i1.1329)
- Afshari, S., & Ketabi, S. (2016a). Changing paradigms in teaching English pronunciation: A historical overview. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 5(5). doi: [10.5861/ijrsl.2016.1423](https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2016.1423)
- Afshari, S., & Ketabi, S. (2016b). Current trends and future directions in teaching English pronunciation. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 5. doi: [10.5861/ijrsl.2016.1437](https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2016.1437)
- Alemi, M., & Tavakoli, E. (2016, January 28). *Audio Lingual Method*. Retrieved at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/293731529_Audio_Lingual_Method
- Aneja, G. A. (2016). Rethinking Nativeness: Toward a Dynamic Paradigm of (Non)Native Speakering. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 13(4), 351–379. doi: [10.1080/15427587.2016.1185373](https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2016.1185373)
- Arcaya, M. (2020). Differences Between Native English-Speaking Teachers and Their Non-Native Counterparts When Evaluating Pronunciation. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 22(1), 29–41. doi: [10.15446/profile.v22n1.78800](https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v22n1.78800)
- Archer, G. (2017). *Pronunciation models in regional environments: A comparison and assessment of RP and SSE*. 79. Retrieved from: <http://theses.gla.ac.uk/30983/>



- Bøhn, H., & Hansen, T. (2017). Assessing Pronunciation in an EFL Context: Teachers' Orientations towards Nativeness and Intelligibility. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 14(1), 54–68. doi: [10.1080/15434303.2016.1256407](https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2016.1256407)
- Bodorík, M. (2017). Teaching English pronunciation by non-native teachers as seen by Slovak teachers. *Journal of Language and Cultural Education*, 5(3), 157–174. doi: [10.1515/jolace-2017-0034](https://doi.org/10.1515/jolace-2017-0034)
- Boyle, J. (1997). Native-speaker Teachers of English in Hong Kong. *Language and Education*, 11(3), 163–181. doi: [10.1080/09500789708666726](https://doi.org/10.1080/09500789708666726)
- Brown, E. (2013). *Native and Non-native English-Speaking ESL/EFL Teachers in Sweden: A Study on Students' Attitudes and Perceptions towards the Teaching Behavior of Native and Non- native English-Speaking Teachers*. 36. Retrieved at: <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:624579/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dao, D. (2019). *Learner perception of L2 pronunciation instruction*. 47, 44–52. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330114527_Learner_perception_of_L2_pronunciation_instruction
- Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2015). *Pronunciation Fundamentals: Evidence-based Perspectives for L2 Teaching and Research*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Díaz, N. R. (2015). Students' Preferences Regarding Native and Non-native Teachers of English at a University in the French Brittany. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 173, 93–97. doi: [10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.036](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.036)
- EF (2020). EPI 2020– Ecuador. Retrieved August 4, 2021, from <https://www.ef.com.ec/eipi/regions/latin-america/ecuador/>



- Fauzi, N., Hashim, H. (2020). Apple vs. Mangosteen: A Qualitative Study of Students' Perception towards Native and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research*, 7(2), 218–228. doi: [10.20448/journal.509.2020.72.218.228](https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509.2020.72.218.228)
- Guo, X. (Grace), Chen, G., & Sun, Y. (2021). An ethical analysis of native-speaking English teachers' identity construction in a mainland China university. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 42(3), 247–261. doi: [10.1080/01434632.2019.1684502](https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1684502)
- Jingxia, L. (2016). Chinese College Students' Views on Native English and Non-native English in EFL Classrooms. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(4). doi: [10.7575/aiac.all.v.7n.4p.84](https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.7n.4p.84)
- Ketabi, S., Saeb, F. (2015). Pronunciation Teaching: Past and Present. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 4(5). doi: [10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.5p.182](https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.5p.182)
- Kaharuddin, A. (2018). THE COMMUNICATIVE GRAMMAR TRANSLATION METHOD: A PRACTICAL METHOD TO TEACH COMMUNICATION SKILLS OF ENGLISH. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, 4(2), 232–254. doi: [10.24252/Eternal.V42.2018.A8](https://doi.org/10.24252/Eternal.V42.2018.A8)
- Levis, J. M. (2005). Changing Contexts and Shifting Paradigms in Pronunciation Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 369. doi: [10.2307/3588485](https://doi.org/10.2307/3588485)
- Levis, J. M., Sonsaat, S., Link, S., & Barriuso, T. A. (2016). Native and Nonnative Teachers of L2 Pronunciation: Effects on Learner Performance. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(4), 894–931. doi: [10.1002/tesq.272](https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.272)



- Levis, J., Sonsaat, S., & Link, S. (2017). Chapter 10. Students' beliefs about native vs. non-native pronunciation teachers: Professional Challenges and Teacher Education. In *Native and Non-Native Teachers in English Language Classrooms*. doi: [10.1515/9781501504143-011](https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501504143-011)
- Li, Y., & Zhang, G. (2016). Native or Non-native-speaking Teaching for L2 Pronunciation Teaching? —An Investigation on Their Teaching Effect and Students' Preferences. *English Language Teaching*, 9(12), 89. doi: [10.5539/elt.v9n12p89](https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n12p89)
- Martínez, J. & Robinson, I. (2014). Native or non-native? The nativeness factor from the EFL student teachers' perspective. In J. de Dios Martínez Agudo (Ed.), *English as a foreign language teacher education*. doi: [10.1163/9789401210485_014](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401210485_014)
- Martínez, J. (2017). Native and Non-Native Teachers in English Language Classrooms. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319315701_Native_and_Non-Native_Teachers_in_English_Language_Classrooms
- Murphy, J. M. (2014). Intelligible, comprehensible, non-native models in ESL/EFL pronunciation teaching. *System*, 42, 258–269. doi: [10.1016/j.system.2013.12.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.007)
- Norris, John & Ortega, Lourdes. (2002). Effectiveness of L2 Instruction: A Research Synthesis and Quantitative Meta-analysis. *Language Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00136>
- Othman, D., & Zahawi, Q. (2020). Nativeness and Intelligibility: Investigating Kurdish EFL Teachers' Orientations. *The Second International Scientific Conference on Education Issues and Challenges in the Light of Cognitive Developments and*



Accelerated Technology 2020. Presented at the second International Scientific Conference on Education Issues and Challenges in the Light of Cognitive Developments and Accelerated Technology 2020. doi: [10.31972/iscs20.009](https://doi.org/10.31972/iscs20.009)

Pae, I. (2017). Effects of the differences between native and non-native English-speaking teachers on students' attitudes and motivation toward learning English. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 37(2), 163–178. doi:

[10.1080/02188791.2016.1235012](https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2016.1235012)

Scott, J. (2015). A Dictionary of Sociology. In *A Dictionary of Sociology*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from

<https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780199683581.001.0001/acref-9780199683581>

Szpyra-Kozłowska, J. (2014). Pronunciation in EFL Instruction: A Research-Based Approach. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 9. B1-B3. Retrieved from: <https://books.google.com.ec/books?id=pktHBQAAQBAJ>

Thir, V. (2016). Rethinking pronunciation teaching in teacher education from an ELF perspective. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 25. 1-28. Retrieved from:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308536469_Rethinking_pronunciation_teaching_in_teacher_education_from_an ELF_perspective/citation/download

Walkinshaw, I., & Oanh, D. (2012). Native- and Non-Native Speaking English Teachers in Vietnam: Weighing the Benefits. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 16. Retrieved at:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282729609_Native--_and_Non--_Native_Speaking_English_Teachers_in_Vietnam_Weighing_the_Benefits

Wolff, D. (2015). All in the same boat? - Native and non-native English speaking teachers' emerging selves in a U.S. MATESOL program. *Undefined*. Retrieved



from: [/paper/All-in-the-same-boat-native-and-non-native-English-Wolff/73dc7ecd834199e2e082adaa2d3078952b4b24bc](#)