2022, 1(1), 1-9

Attitudes of In-service ELT Teachers towards Dialects of English

Reyyan Zülal Yöney[a1]

[a]*Kocaeli Health and Technology University, Başiskele/Kocaeli, Turkey*

Abstract
This study aimed to investigate (1) the attitudes of in-service English language teachers (ELT teachers) in Turkey regarding different dialects of English, (2) the dialects ELT teachers prefer to use, and (3) the dialects they teach. Using a quantitative research method, this study utilized a semantic differential scale, multiple response questions and close-ended questions in order to collect data from in-service teachers on their attitudes and preferences towards dialects of English. In light of the findings of this study, it was concluded that the American dialect was viewed more positively than any other dialect included in this study while the Indian dialect received negative evaluations. The American dialect was also the dialect most frequently used and taught by the ELT teachers in this study.
Keywords: English language teaching, dialects, teacher attitudes.

Received Date: February 28, 2022. Acceptance Date: May 31st, 2022.

Journal of Language and Education Review.

1. Introduction

The attitudes of teachers regarding the English language have an impact on the way they perceive language. This perception in turn affects their preferences in using and teaching the language. Inquiring the relation between teacher attitudes towards different dialects of English and their choices on the dialects they speak or teach can provide notable implications into English language teacher education practices as well as material design for language teaching. For the purpose of revealing the relations between these phenomena, this study aims to investigate the attitudes of in-service English language teachers (ELT) in Turkey regarding different dialects of English, the dialects ELT teachers prefer to use, and the dialects they teach. In addition to these, the teachers were also asked which dialects are included in the coursebooks and materials they use in their classrooms. With these aims in mind, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How are dialects of English perceived by in-service language teachers?
2. Which dialect(s) do in-service English language teachers think they speak?
3. Which dialect(s) do in-service English language teachers teach?

2. Literature

Research on teacher attitudes towards World Englishes can provide valuable insights into English language teaching practices in various contexts and how these attitudes contribute to the inclusion or exclusion of different varieties. Teachers' attitudes and perceptions of different varieties of English have been explored in a number of contexts, especially in recent years. The review of literature on relevant research revealed various results in terms of how teachers perceived dialects and the attitudes they had or developed towards different dialects of English across Inner, Outer and Expanding Circle varieties (Kachru's Three Circles of English, 1985).

The review of literature indicated that teachers in some contexts demonstrated positive attitudes towards different varieties of English. One such study by Nguyen (2017) investigated the perceptions of Vietnamese ELT teachers, who participated in localized or overseas Master's level TESOL programs, regarding native speaker model and different varieties of English. This study showed that most teachers who participated in these programs

**ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Reyyan Zülal Yöney, Department of Foreign Languages, Kocaeli Health and Technology University, Başiskele/Kocaeli, Turkey, E-mail address: reyyan.yoney@kocaelisaglik.edu.tr, Tel: +90 (262) 999 80 85. ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8100-7279.*

demonstrated higher awareness and appreciation of varieties of English. In a similar vein, in Wang and Du's (2018) study, English teachers, other subject teachers, and staff members at a Taiwanese university demonstrated positive attitudes towards varieties of English, even though they experienced difficulty in understanding other varieties of English. Such studies like these showed that teacher attitudes on different varieties of English may be positive. However, the literature review also revealed that much research on teacher attitudes towards English varieties demonstrated negative attitudes of teachers.

Research showed that some varieties of English received negative evaluation from teachers due to native speaker ideology. An example study to this was conducted by Çeçen and Serdar Tülüce (2019), which focused on pre-service ELT teachers' attitudes towards Inner, Outer and Expanding circle English speakers. This study indicated that pre-service ELT teachers tended to comply with native-speaker norms when evaluating speakers and viewed Inner circle speakers more positively than Outer and Expanding Circle speakers. Research also showed that negative attitudes towards World Englishes and idealizing native speaker norms may have an impact on teachers' preferences in which variety of English they opt to teach (Coskun, 2011; Boonsuk, 2021) and it may determine the views of teachers on preferred pronunciation (Coskun, 2011).

The impact of native speaker ideology revealed itself in research on teachers' attitudes on their own varieties of English as well. For instance, varieties such as China English (Chinglish) were viewed negatively and faced low acceptability from Chinese ELT teachers and students due to underlying factors such as stigma and native speaker ideology (Wang, 2015). In a similar vein, research also showed that the attitudes of non-native ELT teachers towards their own variety of English demonstrate preference for native pronunciation over their own variety (Uygun, 2013; Monfared, 2019) whereas some ELT teachers value both non-native and native varieties (Monfared, 2019). In other cases, ELT teachers from non-inner circle countries were found to show favor towards inner-circle varieties over non-inner circle English varieties (Lim, 2020; Yılmaz, 2020) and view having a non-native accent as a disadvantage (Lim, 2020).

However, studies focusing on Turkish contexts, especially on in-service teachers' attitudes, are limited. Examples that the review revealed are studies by Coskun (2011), Uygun (2013), Çeçen & Serdar Tülüce (2019), Yılmaz (2020). Among these studies, only Yılmaz (2020) investigated the attitudes of in-service teachers. The review of literature also did not reveal a study where a semantic differential scale was designed specifically for teachers to determine their attitudes towards different dialects. This study is noteworthy in that it aims to contribute to the literature on in-service ELT teachers' perceptions of dialects of English and to reveal their preferences regarding dialects.

3. Method

This study adopted a quantitative research methodology for investigating English language teachers' attitudes and use of different dialects of English. An online survey that consisted of a semantic differential scale, multiple response questions and a multiple-choice question was used in order to collect data. For the purpose of determining the attitudes of in-service English language teachers towards different dialects of English, a semantic differential scale was utilized while the dialects ELT teachers prefer to use and teach were investigated through multiple response questions. An additional two-option multiple choice question was utilized to determine the dialects included in the resources ELT teachers used in their classrooms.

The data was collected over the span of five days. Thirty-seven in-service English language teachers across different cities and regions of Turkey participated in this study. The teachers were contacted through social media platforms or through the help of other people. The participants were asked to sign an online informed consent form prior to completing the survey. Since the study solely focused on teachers' attitudes and the dialects they prefer to speak and use, demographic information was not collected from the participants.

The semantic differential scale was developed for this study by the researcher. Six pairs of descriptors were used in the scale. The pairs of adjective descriptors used in the scale were chosen specifically for English language teachers. The adjective pairs for each descriptive were named as follows: Easy to speak - Not easy to speak, Easy to teach - Not easy to teach, Intelligible - Unintelligible, Preferable - Unpreferable, Pleasant-sounding - Not pleasant-sounding, Harmonious - Unharmonious.

The semantic differential scale involved five parts, each part involving a different dialect of English. The five dialects involved in this study are Australian, Indian, British, American and Welsh. For each part, the participants were asked to listen to an audio recording of an excerpt read in one of these dialects. While listening to the audio recording, the participants were asked to mark one of the numbers from 1 to 7 according to the degree of closeness of the given pairs of descriptors on the semantic differential scale. After responding to each pair of adjective descriptors, the participants were allowed to continue to the next part and listen to the same excerpt in another dialect.

For the excerpt that the teachers listened to in this study, a short audio recording was designed for each dialect

through Speakabo, an online platform which allows converting text to speech and adapting the same text to different dialects. The text converted to speech was an excerpt from chapter four of Little Women by Louisa May Alcott. The excerpt is as follows:

"Jo gave her sister an encouraging pat on the shoulder as they parted for the day, each going a different way, each hugging her little warm turnover, and each trying to be cheerful in spite of wintry weather, hard work, and the unsatisfied desires of pleasure-loving youth. When Mr. March lost his property in trying to help an unfortunate friend, the two oldest girls begged to be allowed to do something toward their own support, at least. Believing that they could not begin too early to cultivate energy, industry, and independence, their parents consented, and both fell to work with the hearty good will which in spite of all obstacles is sure to succeed at last."

Following the semantic differential scale, the participants were asked multiple response questions with regards to the dialect(s) of English they think they speak and the dialect(s) of English they teach. An "Other" option was also added to these questions and the teachers were asked to explain which dialects they spoke or taught if they marked this option. Lastly, a Yes/No question was asked on whether the coursebooks/resources they used included dialects other than British, American, and Australian. If their response was "Yes", they were asked to specify which dialects were included.

In order to analyze the data collected from teachers through the online survey, IBM SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) Statistics 28 for Microsoft software was used. All the data collected through the survey was first coded in the software. The data from semantic differential scale was coded as ordinal data, while the data from multiple response questions was coded as nominal data. The nominal data from the multiple response questions was then appointed numerical values.

After the data was entered into the software, the reliability of the semantic differential scale responses was determined through Cronbach's Alpha. Following this, descriptive statistics of the semantic differential scale responses were determined in each adjective pair for all the dialects. After the descriptive statistics for the scale were determined, the mean scores for the responses provided for each dialect was also calculated. The data from the multiple responses questions on the dialects teachers use and teach was analyzed for their frequencies.

4. Findings

The reliability of the responses was checked through Cronbach's Alpha in order to see whether the responses provided by the teachers for each of the thirty descriptors in the scale were reliable. The Cronbach's Alpha value for the responses given to the semantic differential scale was found to be .875, which showed that the responses provided to the scale were reliable. After the reliability of the responses was determined, the semantic differential scale responses were analyzed for descriptive statistics of each adjective pair for all the dialects.

The adjective pair that was analyzed first was "Easy to speak-Not easy to speak". This descriptor was tagged as "easiness to speak". The responses given to the adjective descriptors on easiness to speak were analyzed for descriptive statistics to see how teachers evaluated the dialects they listened to in terms of how easy they were to speak. The analysis showed that the highest mean for easiness to speak was determined for American English (Dialect 4). The mean score for this dialect is 6.46 with 7 being the highest possible value. The standard deviation for this dialect was the lowest value with .730, showing that the responses given by all the teachers were close to the mean score.

Figure 1. Descriptive statistics for easiness to speak

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Dialect 1(Australian)-easiness to speak	37	1	7	4,43	1,659
Dialect 2(Indian)-easiness to speak	37	1	7	3,62	1,963
Dialect 3(British)-easiness to speak	37	4	7	5,76	,983
Dialect 4(American)-easiness to speak	37	5	7	6,46	,730
Dialect 5(Welsh)-easiness to speak	37	1	7	4,57	1,519
Valid N (listwise)	37				

The dialect that received the second highest mean score is found to be British English (Dialect 3) with a 5.76 mean score and .983 standard deviation. The standard deviation shows low variance among responses like in the case of American English while there is a .70 difference between the mean scores these two dialects received from teachers. These two dialects were followed by Welsh, Australian and Indian dialects. The mean scores for Welsh and Australian were 4.57 and 4.43 respectively. Each of these dialects had a standard deviation score above 1.5, meaning that the scores given to these two dialects were more scattered along the scale. Though the mean scores and the standard deviation of these two were similar to each other, they were still more than 1 point below British accent in terms of mean score and their standard deviation was higher by more than 0.5. The lowest score and the highest standard deviation were determined to belong to Indian English (Dialect 2). This dialect received a 3.62 mean score, almost 3 points lower than American English's mean score. The standard deviation of the responses was very close to 2 points, showing the responses scattered the most for this dialect.

This analysis indicated that American English was found to be the easiest one to speak among the teachers in the study and British English follows closely behind American English. These two dialects of English appear to be the easiest dialects to speak for Turkish teachers who participated in this study as they provided high values for these and neither of these dialects received a low value from the teachers. Welsh and Australian dialects were evaluated to be less easy to speak by the teachers in this study as both the mean score and the standard deviation indicated. Among the dialects included in this study, Indian English was the one evaluated most negatively in terms of easiness to speak. Both the mean score and standard deviation for this dialect indicated that Turkish teachers found this dialect to be not easy to speak.

Following easiness to speak, the second descriptor to be analyzed for descriptive statistics was easiness to teach. This tag involved the adjective pair of "Easy to teach-Not easy to teach" on the semantic differential scale. This analysis revealed similar patterns to the results of the descriptive statistics of easiness to speak. For easiness to teach, the analysis for descriptive statistics showed that the American dialect received the highest mean score and the lowest standard deviation. This indicated that the ELT teachers in this study found the American dialect to be the easiest to teach among the five dialects involved in this study. The mean score for this dialect was 6.41 out of 7 and the standard deviation was .896, lower than 1 point. After the American dialect, the second highest mean score was once again received by the British dialect with 5.57 out of 7, which is a little lower than its score for easiness to speak. Its standard deviation for easiness to speak is also higher than easiness to speak with a standard deviation of 1.259 points.

Figure 2. Descriptive statistics for easiness to teach

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Dialect 1(Australian)-easiness to teach	37	1	7	3,32	1,684
Dialect 2(Indian)-easiness to teach	37	1	7	3,22	1,946
Dialect 3(British)-easiness to teach	37	2	7	5,57	1,259
Dialect 4(American)-easiness to teach	37	4	7	6,41	,896
Dialect 5(Welsh)-easiness to teach	37	1	7	4,30	1,614
Valid N (listwise)	37				

Following the American and British dialects, the Welsh dialect's mean score was determined to be 4.30. While this is the case, the Indian and Australian dialects received the lowest and second lowest mean scores respectively, showing that these dialects were considered to be the least easy ones to teach among the dialects involved in this study. The Australian dialect received a 3.32 mean score, the Indian dialect received the lowest mean score with 3.22 out of 7. The highest standard deviation also belonged to the Indian dialect with 1.946. These results inferred that, in terms of easiness to teach, the dialect evaluated to be the easiest one to teach was the American dialect while the dialect that received the lowest score for easiness to teach was the Indian dialect. Just like in the case of easiness to speak, the Indian dialect received the lowest score and the highest standard deviation for this descriptor as well.

The adjective pair "Harmonious-Unharmonious" on the semantic differential scale was tagged as harmoniousness. When the ELT teachers in this study were asked to evaluate the dialects in terms of harmoniousness on the semantic differential scale, the American and British dialects received the highest and second highest mean scores respectively with the lowest standard deviations among the five dialects. The American dialect received a score of

6.49 with .804 standard deviation and the British dialect received a mean score of 6.38 with .982 standard deviation.

This displayed that ELT teachers found these dialects to be the most harmonious among the dialects involved. Following these, the Australian and Welsh dialects received mean scores that were very close with the Welsh dialect receiving 4.97 and the Australian dialect receiving 4.43 mean score. Even though they received close mean scores, their standard deviation scores differed from each other as the Australian dialect had a higher standard deviation.

Figure 3. Descriptive statistics for harmoniousness

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Dialect 1(Australian)-harmoniousness	37	1	7	4,43	2,089
Dialect 2(Indian)-harmoniousness	37	1	6	3,14	1,636
Dialect 3(British)-harmoniousness	37	4	7	6,38	,982
Dialect 4(American)-harmoniousness	37	4	7	6,49	,804
Dialect 5(Welsh)-harmoniousness	37	3	7	4,97	1,301
Valid N (listwise)	37				

Like the results from the earlier analyses, the Indian dialect once again received the lowest mean score. This dialect received a mean score of only 3.14 in terms of harmoniousness. While it received the lowest mean score, the highest standard deviation belonged to the Australian dialect in this case, meaning that the scores given to the Australian dialect were more varied than the scores for the Indian dialect. Even though its standard deviation is not the lowest, the mean score it received implied that the Indian dialect was overall evaluated to be the least harmonious dialect in this study.

Figure 4. Descriptive statistics for intelligibility

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Dialect 1(Australian)-intelligibility	37	1	7	4,89	1,646
Dialect 2(Indian)-intelligibility	37	1	7	4,16	1,675
Dialect 3(British)-intelligibility	37	4	7	6,41	,927
Dialect 4(American)-intelligibility	37	5	7	6,59	,686
Dialect 5(Welsh)-intelligibility	37	3	7	5,35	1,060
Valid N (listwise)	37				

Intelligibility was the fourth descriptor to be analyzed for descriptive statistics. This tag was used for the adjective pair “Intelligible-Unintelligible”. The scores for this descriptor once again showed that the American dialect received positive evaluations from the ELT teachers involved in this study. The highest mean score of intelligibility belonged to this dialect with 6.59 out 7 and .686 standard deviation. The British dialect received the second highest mean score with 6.41 and a low standard deviation. This indicated that the American and British dialects were considered the most intelligible among the five dialects involved in this study. Like the results of the previous analyses, the Welsh dialect came third in terms of the mean scores and standard deviations for intelligibility.

The Welsh dialect was followed by the Australian dialect with a 4.89 mean score and 1.646 points of standard deviation. Like in the case of the analyses of the previous descriptors, the Indian dialect received the lowest mean score with 4.16 out of 7 and a high standard deviation with 1.675. This showed that, in terms of intelligibility, the ELT teachers evaluated the Indian dialect to be the least intelligible among the dialects included in this study. It also received varying scores from the teachers as indicated by the high standard deviation. This inferred that while the American dialect received the most positive evaluation in terms of intelligibility, the Indian dialect received a more

negative stance with the lowest mean score.

The next descriptor that was analyzed for descriptive statistics was pleasantness of sound, which was the tag used for the adjective pair "Pleasant-sounding - Not pleasant-sounding". The analysis of this descriptor showed that the American dialect also received the highest mean score for pleasantness of sound while the British dialect received a rather close second highest mean score. It was seen that the American dialect received a mean score of 6.49 and the British dialect received 6.46. Their standard deviation scores were also close to each other with .768 and 869 respectively. The Welsh dialect received the third highest mean score with 4.97 for pleasantness of sound and had a standard deviation of 1.258.

Figure 5. Descriptive statistics for pleasantness of sound

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Dialect 1(Australian)-pleasantness of sound	37	1	7	4,46	2,022
Dialect 2(Indian)-pleasantness of sound	37	1	7	3,00	1,683
Dialect 3(British)-pleasantness of sound	37	4	7	6,46	,869
Dialect 4(American)-pleasantness of sound	37	4	7	6,49	,768
Dialect 5(Welsh)-pleasantness of sound	37	2	7	4,97	1,258
Valid N (listwise)	37				

A close mean score to that of the Welsh dialect was received by the Australian dialect, which had a mean score of 4.46 in terms of pleasantness of sound. And the lowest mean score once again belonged to the Indian dialect with the mean score of 3.00. While the Indian dialect received the lowest mean score, it received the second highest standard deviation with 1.683. The highest standard deviation for this descriptor belonged to the Australian dialect with 2.022, indicating that the scores ELT teachers provided for the Australian dialect were more varied than the scores they provided for the Indian dialect.

The analysis of the descriptive statistics of pleasantness of sound showed that ELT teachers considered the American and British dialects to be most pleasant-sounding among the dialects included in this study. The low standard deviation scores they had also indicated that the scores provided by the teachers were not varied. The fact that the Indian dialect received the lowest mean score for this descriptor implied that ELT teachers considered this dialect to be the least pleasant-sounding among the five dialects. Though the Indian dialect received the lowest mean score, the responses provided by the teachers were relatively more consistent than those provided for the Australian dialect.

Figure 6. Descriptive statistics for preferability

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Dialect 1(Australian)-preferability	37	1	7	4,11	1,792
Dialect 2(Indian)-preferability	37	1	7	2,65	1,567
Dialect 3(British)-preferability	37	4	7	6,27	1,097
Dialect 4(American)-preferability	37	4	7	6,57	,765
Dialect 5(Welsh)-preferability	37	2	7	4,78	1,336
Valid N (listwise)	37				

The last descriptor that was analyzed for descriptive statistics and the last component of the semantic differential scale was "Preferable - Unpreferable", which was tagged as preferability. This analysis showed that, in terms of preferability, the American dialect received the highest mean score (6.57) with the lowest standard deviation (.765), showing ELT teachers' preference for this dialect. And, once again, the British dialect followed the American dialect with a close second highest mean score (6.27) and the second lowest standard deviation (1.097). This

suggested that the ELT teachers involved in this study showed preference for the American and British dialects over the other dialect in the study.

The Welsh dialect followed these two dialects with the next highest mean score (4.78) and the next lowest standard deviation (1.336), just like in the case of the earlier analyses. The Australian dialect also received a mean score close to that of the Welsh dialect with 4.11. It also had the highest standard deviation with 1.792. However, the Indian dialect received the lowest mean score, even if its standard deviation was about 0.2 lower than the Australian dialect's standard deviation. The mean score that the Indian dialect received was 2.65, which was not only the lowest mean score for the preferability descriptor but also for all the descriptors on the semantic differential scale. This analysis indicated that while the American and British dialects were favored by the ELT teachers in this study in terms of preferability, the Indian dialect's low mean score implied that ELT teachers did not consider this dialect preferable.

When all the descriptors on the semantic differential scale were evaluated for each dialect all together, it was observed that the American dialect received the highest mean score overall with 6.50. Its standard deviation was determined to be .70929, which was also the lowest standard deviation overall. Contrasting with the results of the American dialect, the Indian dialect's overall mean score was the lowest with 3.2973 and this dialect's overall standard deviation was the highest with 1.46784 when all the descriptors were considered.

Figure 7. Mean score for each dialect

Report

	D1(Australian) Mean Score	D2(Indian) Mean Score	D3(British) Mean Score	D4(American) Mean Score	D5(Welsh) Mean Score
Mean	4,2748	3,2973	6,1396	6,5000	4,8243
N	37	37	37	37	37
Std. Deviation	1,43114	1,46783	,84575	,70929	1,01982

Following the descriptive statistics of the semantic differential scale, frequencies of which dialects were preferred to be spoken and which dialects were preferred to be taught by in-service ELT teachers were determined through multiple response questions. In multiple response questions, the teachers could mark one or more dialects. The options of these questions were comprised of British English, American English, Australian English, and "Other". If they marked the "Other" option, they were asked to specify. The frequencies of the responses to the multiple response question for determining which dialects ELT teachers thought they speak indicated that the American dialect was the dialect that most of the ELT teachers stated that they speak (Figure 8). Twenty-seven ELT teachers stated that they speak the American dialect, which is 73% of the cases.

Figure 8. Frequencies of which dialects teachers speak

$speaks_dialect Frequencies

		Responses		
		N	Percent	Percent of Cases
$speaks_dialect[a]	speaks British dialect	14	31,1%	37,8%
	speaks American dialect	27	60,0%	73,0%
	speaks Australian dialect	1	2,2%	2,7%
	speaks other dialect	3	6,7%	8,1%
Total		45	100,0%	121,6%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

After the American dialect, the British dialect was the second most frequently-chosen dialect to be marked for the dialects spoken with fourteen teachers indicating that they speak this dialect. This constituted 37.8% of the cases. One teacher implied that they speak the Australian dialect. While three teachers also marked the "Other" option, two of these reported "American English with a slight Turkish accent" and "Something between English and American full of Turkish secondary school teacher elementi (speed based)" as the other dialects they speak. The third teacher that marked the "other" option stated the Indian dialect along with the British dialect as the dialects they speak. One teacher wrote "American" to the "Other" option even though they did not mark that option, so this response was not evaluated. None of the teachers indicated to speak any other dialect.

Figure 9. Frequencies of which dialects teachers teach

$teaches_dialect Frequencies

		Responses		
		N	Percent	Percent of Cases
$teaches_dialect[a]	teaches British dialect	18	39,1%	48,6%
	teaches American dialect	28	60,9%	75,7%
Total		46	100,0%	124,3%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

The multiple response question regarding which dialects ELT teachers teach had the same options as the multiple response question on the dialects they speak. The frequencies of the responses to the multiple response question for determining which dialects were taught by ELT teachers showed that the American dialect was also the dialect most frequently marked option (Figure 9). This dialect made up 75.7% percent of the cases. The second frequent response was the British dialect with 48.6% of all the cases. None of the teachers indicated to teach Australian or any other dialects in their lessons.

Following this, there was a Yes/No question on whether the coursebooks and resources used by the teachers included a dialect other than American, British, and Australian. If the teachers marked the "Yes" option, they were asked to specify which dialects were included. The results from this question revealed that thirty teachers marked the "No" option, indicating that there were no dialects included in their resources other than these three varieties. Four of the teachers who marked the "Yes" option also stated British and American dialects to be included in their resources, which means that no other dialect was in fact included in their resources even though they initially marked the "Yes" option. Two teachers did not indicate which dialect was included in their resources, even though they marked the "Yes" option. Only one teacher who marked this option indicated a different dialect, stating that the Scottish dialect was included in their coursebooks and/or resources. The responses to this question implied that for the majority of the ELT teachers in this study, the materials and coursebooks they use do not include any variety other than the three inner circle varieties indicated in the question. No outer circle or expanding-circle varieties of English were expressed to be included in their resources by the teachers.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

This study investigated in-service ELT teachers' perceptions of five dialects of English, the dialects that English teachers think they speak, and the dialects that they teach in their classrooms. The results from the data analysis both provided answers for these issues and implications for language teaching and language teacher education.

For all the descriptive statistics, the American dialect received the highest mean score while the Indian dialect received the lowest mean score for each descriptor. The frequencies of the responses provided to the multiple response questions aligned with the results of the semantic differential scale responses. The American dialect was determined to be the most frequent dialect to be chosen for the dialects spoken and taught by the ELT teachers while the British dialect was the second most frequent for both the dialects spoken and taught. This shows that the American dialect was evaluated more positively than all the other dialects and the most frequently spoken and taught dialect was determined to be this dialect as well. These findings aligned with Yılmaz's (2020) study, which concluded that American English was favored the most among the teachers that participated in the study.

In contrast, the Indian dialect received the most negative evaluation with the lowest scores for each descriptor. Apart from the low scores that the Indian dialect received from the teachers, the high standard deviation of the results also implied that teachers' responses varied, meaning that there was not a common perception among the ELT teachers in terms of the evaluation of this dialect on the semantic differential scale. Moreover, this dialect was only indicated by one teacher in this study to be spoken while it was not taught by any of the teachers. Even though the Australian and Welsh dialects received more positive evaluations than the Indian dialect on the semantic differential scale, these dialects were not indicated to be spoken or taught by any of the teachers either.

The dialects which received the highest scores on the semantic differential scale are also the dialects used and taught by the teachers. In terms of the dialects spoken, the American dialect was by far the most frequently chosen option by the teachers. This dialect was chosen almost two times more than the British dialect. The same pattern was observed for the dialects that the teachers taught. The American dialect was the most frequent dialect with most of the teachers expressing to teach this dialect. The frequency of the British dialect for this multiple response question on dialects taught was similar to the prior question on the dialects spoken. The question on whether any dialect other

than the American, Australian, and British dialects were included in teachers' resources and coursebooks did not reveal any other frequently used dialect and showed that these dialects were frequently included in the resources teachers used.

There may be several reasons why the American dialect is viewed more positively than others and preferred more often than any other dialect. One possible reason may be the similarities between Turkish and American English phonetic systems. Another possibility is that the relationship between these two countries may have promoted a wider use of this dialect.

Considering these, it can be implied that there is a correlation between positive attitudes and dialect preferences. There may also be a relation between dialects adopted in materials and attitudes and preferences. However, the nature of this relation requires elaborate inquiry to uncover the interaction and connection between these three elements. The impact these phenomena have on each other was not determined as this study did not aim to uncover the impact relation of these phenomena. In order to uncover the intrigue relationship between teacher attitudes towards dialects, teachers' preferences of dialects, and the dialects adopted in materials, further inquiry is needed.

Attitudes of teachers influence their perceptions of language and their preference in using and teaching a language. The correlation between teachers' attitudes and their preferences in language use and teaching practices in this study also indicated this relation. For this reason, exposing pre-service English language teachers to different dialects of English, especially non-inner circle varieties, during pre-service teacher education can enable pre-service teachers to both develop an understanding of World Englishes. To develop pre-service teachers' perspectives on dialects of English and provide appropriate exposure, pre-service teacher education requires more diversity in terms of the varieties included in courses and materials. That said, as a limitation of this study, the dialects included in this study were limited to five, the majority of which were inner-circle varieties. In order to explore ELT teachers' attitudes towards non-native dialects in more depth, a wider number of non-inner circle varieties may be included in following studies.

References

Boonsuk, Y. (2021). Which English should we stand for? Voices from lecturers in Thai multicultural universities. *RELC Journal, 0*(0), 1-15.

Coskun, A. (2011). Future English teachers' attitudes towards EIL pronunciation. *Journal of English as an International Language, 6*(2), 46-68.

Çeçen, S., & Serdar Tülüce, H. (2019). An investigation of pre-service EFL teachers' attitudes towards speakers from three circles of English. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 15*(1), 123-139.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quirk & H. Widdowson (Eds.*), English in the World: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-36). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lim, S. (2020). A critical analysis of Cambodian teachers' cognition about World Englishes and English language teaching. *Asian Englishes, 22*(1), 85-100.

Monfared, A. (2019). Ownership of English in the Outer and Expanding Circles: teachers' attitudes toward pronunciation in ESL/EFL teaching contexts. contexts. *Asian Englishes, 21*(2), 207-222.

Nguyen, M. X. N. C. (2017). TESOL teachers' engagement with the native speaker model: how does teacher education impact on their beliefs?. *RELC Journal, 48*(1), 83–98.

Uygun, D. (2013). Attitudes of Turkish prospective EFL teachers towards varieties of English. In Y. Bayyurt, & S. Akcan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth international conference of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 190-197). İstanbul, Turkey: Boğaziçi University Publications.

Wang, C., & Du, P. C. (2018). Attitudes toward English diversity of teachers and staffs who help promote internationalization at a Taiwanese university. *English Teaching & Learning, 42*, 95-116.

Wang, W. (2015). Teaching English as an international language in China: Investigating university teachers' and students' attitudes towards China English. *System, 53*, 60-72.

Yılmaz, İ. (2020). *Pre-service and in-service English language teachers' attitudes towards English dialects and dialect self- awareness* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.