

The Relationship among Self-Assessed Oral Competencies, Teaching Styles and
Teaching Approaches of Non-Native EFL Teachers at a State University in Türkiye

The Graduate School of Education

of

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

Fatma Özcan

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in

Teaching English as a Foreign Language

The Department of English Language Teaching

Ankara

August 2023

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

The Relationship among Self-Assessed Oral Competencies, Teaching Styles and
Teaching Approaches of Non-Native EFL Teachers at a State University in Türkiye

Fatma Özcan

July 2023

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Tijen Akşit (Advisor)

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Prof. Dr. Çiğdem Sağın Şimşek, Middle East Technical University (Examining Committee Member)

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aynur Yürekli, İzmir Economy University (Examining Committee Member)

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

Prof. Dr. Orhan Arıkan (Director)

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG SELF-ASSESSED ORAL COMPETENCIES,
TEACHING STYLES AND TEACHING APPROACHES OF NON-NATIVE EFL
TEACHERS AT A STATE UNIVERSITY IN TÜRKİYE

Fatma Özcan

MA in Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Advisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Tijen Akşit

August 2023

This case study investigated self-assessed oral competencies including oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction, teaching styles, and approaches in terms of student and teacher-centeredness of non-native EFL teachers at a state university in Türkiye. It also explored the possible relationships between their self-assessed oral competencies and teaching styles and teaching approaches. Data from the questionnaire responded by 90 teachers and interviews with 11 participating teachers were analyzed. The results revealed that these teachers assessed oral competencies are high, they prefer Personal Model, Facilitator and Expert teaching styles and that their approach to teaching is the Conceptual Change Student-Focused (CCSF). It was also found that teachers' self-assessed oral competency is affected by factors like the area of their BA degrees and whether they speak other languages. Age and years of teaching experience have been identified as the factors which have an impact on their preferred teaching styles and approaches. Finally, oral interaction has been found to have a weak relationship with almost all the teaching styles and the teacher-centered approach, and a moderate relationship with CCSF. Moreover, Personal Model and CCSF showed weak to moderate relationships with all the oral competency areas.

Keywords: EFL teachers' language proficiency, self-assessed oral competencies, teaching styles, teaching approaches in terms of student and teacher-centeredness

ÖZET

Türkiye’deki bir Devlet Üniversitesinde Ana Dili İngilizce olmayan Öğretmenlerin
Öz-değerlendirdikleri Sözel Yeterlikleri, Öğretim Stilleri ve Öğretim Yaklaşımları

Arasındaki İlişki

Fatma Özcan

Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Yüksek Lisans Programı

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Tijen Akşit

Ağustos 2023

Bu vaka çalışması, Türkiye'deki bir devlet üniversitesinde İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğreten ve ana dili İngilizce olmayan öğretim görevlilerinin, sözlü anlama, sözlü üretme ve sözlü etkileşimi kapsayan öz değerlendirdikleri sözel yeterliklerinin, öğretim stilleri ve öğrenci merkezli ve öğretmen merkezli olması yönündeki öğretim yaklaşımlarını incelemiştir. Ayrıca öğretim görevlilerinin öz değerlendirdikleri sözlü yeterliklerinin, öğretim stilleri ve öğretim yaklaşımları ile arasındaki olası ilişkiler araştırılmıştır. 90 öğretim görevlisinden alınan anket verileri ve 11 öğretim görevlisinden alınan mülakat verileri analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar, öğretim görevlilerinin öz değerlendirdikleri yeterliklerinin yüksek olduğunu, tercih ettikleri öğretme stillerinin Rol Model, Kolaylaştırıcı ve Uzmanlık stillerini ile öğretme yaklaşımlarının Kavramsal Değişim Öğrenci Odaklı (CCSF) olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Ayrıca, sözlü yeterliklerin öz değerlendirmesinde lisans mezuniyet alanı ve başka yabancı dil bilmelerinin; öğretim stilleri ve yaklaşımlarında da yaş ve öğretmenlik deneyimleri gibi faktörlerin etkili olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Son olarak, sözlü etkileşimdeki yeterliğin neredeyse tüm öğretim stilleri ve öğretmen-merkezli yaklaşımlarla zayıf ilişkilere ve CCSF ile orta derecede ilişkiye sahip olduğu belirlenmiştir. Dahası, Kişisel Model ve CCSF'nin tüm yeterlik alanlarıyla zayıf ila orta derecede ilişkili olduğu görülmüştür.

Anahtar kelimeler: İngilizce öğretmenlerinin dil yeterlilikleri, sözel yeterliliklerin öz değerlendirmeleri, öğretim stilleri, öğrenci ve öğretmen odaklılık yönünden öğretme yaklaşımları

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While I take pride in my accomplishment, I want to express my deep gratitude to the numerous individuals who played an invaluable role in making it all possible. First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my supervisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Tijen Akşit, whose wisdom and expertise guided me through uncharted territories. Additionally, I am grateful to Prof. Dr. Çiğdem Sağın Şimşek and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aynur Yürekli, the committee members, for their invaluable feedback.

I extend my heartfelt thanks to my role models, Prof. Dr. Belgin Elmas and Prof. Dr. Olcay Sert, whose motivations and inspiration have been instrumental in shaping me. I am also thankful to my current director, Prof. Dr. Ümit Deniz Turan, for providing me with the opportunity to complete this program.

I was fortunate to have the most wonderful and supportive classmates: Sevgi Çayır, Harika Tuncer, Nihan Şahin, Tuğçe Hamamcıoğlu, and Damla Sena Ercazip.

I am equally blessed to have an amazing group of best friends and family members. So, I would like to thank my husband, Furkan Özcan; my parents, Mustafa and Aynur Erdem; my sisters, Tuğçe Uysal and Seval Kaya; my brother, Serhat Uysal and my best friends, Ayşe Nur Sünnetçi and Gül Uzuner. Thank you for facing the adversities with me and celebrating my success even before me. I will always cherish your presence in my life.

On a final note, to my loving husband, Furkan Özcan, your love gives me the luxury to dream the impossible and the joy to witness its realization. I will forever be proud and grateful, knowing that I made the right choices to deserve a life with you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Problem	8
Purpose.....	11
Research Questions	11
Significance.....	12
Definition of Key Terms	13
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	14
English Language Teaching (ELT) in the World.....	14
ELT in Türkiye.....	18
Teaching Style.....	19
Teaching Approaches.....	23
Language Proficiency and Competency.....	26
The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).....	27
Self-assessment	30
EFL Teachers' Language	32

Related Studies.....	33
CHAPTER 3: METHODS	38
Research Design.....	39
Setting and Participants.....	41
Method of Data Collection.....	45
The Questionnaire	47
The Interviews.....	55
The Pilot Study.....	57
Method of Data Analysis	57
The Questionnaire	57
The Interviews.....	61
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	69
Self-Assessed Oral Competency	69
Findings from the Questionnaire.....	69
Findings from the Interviews	79
Comparison of the Data from the Questionnaire and the Interview	90
Teaching Styles	92
Findings from the Questionnaire.....	92
Findings from the Interviews	107
Comparison of the Data from the Questionnaire and the Interview	110
Teaching Approaches.....	110
Findings of the Questionnaire	111
Findings from the Interviews	117

Comparison of the Data from the Questionnaire and the Interview	120
The Relationship between Oral Competency and Teaching Styles; and Teaching Approaches.....	120
The findings from the questionnaire	121
Findings from the Interviews	124
Comparison of the Data from the Pearson Correlation Analysis and the Interviews.....	126
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	128
Discussion of Major Findings	128
EFL Teachers' Self-assessed Oral Competencies.....	129
EFL Teachers' Teaching Styles	134
Teaching Approaches.....	137
Relationship between EFL Teachers' Oral Competency and Their Teaching Styles	140
Relationship between EFL Teachers' Oral Competency and Their Teaching Approaches.....	143
Implications for Practice	144
Implications for Further Research.....	145
Limitations	147
REFERENCES.....	148
Appendix A: Informed Consent Form for the Questionnaire	171
Appendix B: Questionnaire Part 1	173
Appendix C: Questionnaire Part 2.1	177

Appendix D: Questionnaire Part 2.2	180
Appendix E: Questionnaire Part 2.3	183
Appendix F: Informed Consent Form for the Interview	185
Appendix G: Interview Questions.....	186
Appendix H: Priori List for Teaching Styles	191
Appendix I: Priori List for Teaching Approaches.....	192
Appendix J: Emerging Categories for Teaching Styles and Teaching Approaches	193



LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Personal Information	43-44
2	Personal Information	44-45
3	Focus of the Questions	47
4	Distribution of Items for Oral Competency	52
5	Item Numbers of Teaching Style Inventory	53
6	Item Numbers of Approaches to Teaching Inventory.....	54
7	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients of the Questionnaire.....	55
8	Tests Used for Dependent Variables.....	59
9	Statistical Analyses and Assumptions	60
10	Priori List for Oral Competency	61-62
11	Sample of Analysis with the Priori List of Oral..... Comprehension	63
12	Emerging List of Categories for Oral Competency.....	64
13	Emerging Categories and Codes for the Sub-category..... 'Movie' (Sample)	65
14	Sample of Analysis with Emerging Categories for Oral ... Comprehension	66
15	List of Categories Emerged from the Data for the Relationship	67
16	Descriptive Statistics for Oral Competency	70
17	Mann Whitney U Test Results for Oral Competency	71
18	Oral Comprehension Subscale of Oral Competency	72
19	Mann Whitney U Test Results for Oral Comprehension	73
20	Oral Production Subscale of Oral Competency	75
21	Mann Whitney U Test Results for Oral Production	76
22	Oral Interaction Subscale of Oral Competency	77-78
23	Mann Whitney U Test Results for Oral Interaction	79

24	Number of Comments about Oral Comprehension	80-81
25	Number of Comments about Oral Production	84
26	Number of Comments about Oral Interaction	87-88
27	Descriptive Statistics for Teaching Styles Subscales	92
28	Expert Style Subscale of Teaching Styles	93-94
29	T-test Results for Expert Style	94-95
30	ANOVA Results for Expert Style	95
31	Tukey HSD Results for Expert Style	96
32	Formal Authority Style Subscale of Teaching Styles	96-97
33	T-test Results for Formal Authority Style	97-98
34	ANOVA Results for Formal Authority Style	98
35	Tukey HSD Results for Formal Authority Style	99
36	Personal Model Style Subscale of Teaching Styles	99
37	Mann Whitney U Test Results for Personal Model Style ...	100-101
38	Kruskal Wallis Test Results for Personal Model Style	101
39	Pairwise Comparison for Personal Model Style	101
40	Facilitator Style Subscale of Teaching Styles	102
41	T-test Results for Facilitator Style	103
42	ANOVA Results for Facilitator Style	104
43	Tukey HSD Results for Facilitator Style	104
44	Delegator Style Subscale of Teaching Styles	105
45	T-test Results for Delegator Style	106
46	Number of Comments about Teaching Styles	107
47	Descriptive Statistics for Teaching Approaches Subscales..	111
48	CCSF Subscale of Teaching Approaches	112

49	T-test Results for CCSF Teaching Approach	113-114
50	ITTF Subscale of Teaching Approaches	114
51	T-test Results for ITTF Teaching Approach	115-116
52	ANOVA Results for ITTF Teaching Approach	116
53	Tukey HSD Results for ITTF Teaching Approach	117
54	Number of Comments about Teaching Approaches	118
55	Correlation Matrix for Oral Competency and Teaching Styles	121
56	Correlation Matrix for Oral Competency and Teaching Approaches	122-123
57	Number of Comments about the Relationship	124

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The urge to survive in a globalized world and the desire to explore other cultures force people from different parts of the world to learn the lingua franca in order to communicate in different contexts (Crystal, 1997). Hence, the greater interest in learning English, by giving rise to the number of its learners, calls for a proliferation in the number of non-native teachers (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008) teaching English as a foreign language (EFL). Thus, an efficient language education for those students with qualified teachers to achieve the development of students' communication capacities (Şekerci, 2011) has been of the utmost importance in different parts of the world at varying levels of education.

The focus of efficient language instruction has undergone a shift through the years and the importance has been placed on teaching students how to communicate (Chambless, 2012). In order to achieve this goal, ample exposure to meaningful language and sufficient chances to produce meanings in the language should be provided to students (Chambless, 2012). The greater attention on the ability to communicate has brought teachers' English proficiency levels and their teaching skills under scrutiny (Butler, 2004) for some reasons. Firstly, language teachers themselves are expected to attain a high-level of proficiency in the first place (Chambless, 2012) to improve students' communication skills. Secondly, the teaching styles of teachers influencing their decisions and behaviours in the classroom (Grasha, 2002), and their teaching approaches in terms of student and teacher-centeredness should be adjusted to accommodate students' needs for exposure and for creating meanings in the language.

A possible relationship between teachers' English language proficiency and their teaching style is worth studying because the subject knowledge of teachers has been reported to have an impact on the classroom decisions of teachers (Richards et al., 2013). In addition, language proficiency has been listed among the possible determinants of teaching styles along with teachers' personalities, cultures, and backgrounds in teaching (Korthagen, 2004). Similarly, teachers' lack of competency in language might result in the prevention of unpredictability in the classroom, which is generally brought in by student-centered teaching approaches (Littlewood, 2012).

Therefore, the main focus of this study is on the teaching styles, teaching approaches, and self-assessed oral competency of non-native English language teachers at a state university in Türkiye. It aims to explore how the teachers assess themselves in those areas, and to investigate any possible relationship between their self-assessed oral competency and their teaching styles and approaches.

Background

Attempts to improve the quality of English language teaching (ELT) have placed greater importance on the language proficiency of English teachers because by affecting language teaching and learning, target language proficiency plays an important role in the professional expertise of language teachers (Andrews, 2007; Butler, 2004; Richards, 2015). Murdoch (1994) characterizes the high proficiency of language teachers as the most valuable component of non-native teachers' teaching competence. Shin (2008) also depicts good command of language as one of the most essential features of exceptional teachers. Hence, a good level of target language proficiency is a sine qua non for a teacher aspiring to achieve their teaching goals.

Language proficiency is defined as a composition of a wide range of abilities which should be presented in a continuous manner for the definition to be meaningful (Hadley, 2001). Bachman (1990) specifies language proficiency as competency in the use and knowledge of a language. For research and assessment purposes, language proficiency can be seen as language competence related to four skills in addition to language knowledge enabling competencies in those skills (Butler, 2004). The definition for language proficiency offered by the Common European Framework accommodates the knowledge of language systems, and suitable language use in particular social occasions and with particular people (Council of Europe, 2001). The framework specifies language proficiency by bringing together different competencies in the form of language acts listed for different skills which are all further classified according to reference levels. The main grouping consists of reception, production, interaction, and mediation (Council of Europe, 2020). These are divided into different skills like for production, there are two categories: oral production and written production. Then, under these skills, language acts are recorded for different levels of competency. For example, for oral production, one of the language acts at the B2 level is “I can present clear, detailed descriptions on a wide range of subjects related to my field of interest” (Council of Europe, 2020, p.178). Since the framework offers a clear and detailed account of abilities in language, it was found to be favorable for the purposes of this study. As the focus of education is on promoting oral competencies, only the skills related to oral competency as a part of language proficiency, which are oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction, were selected as the focus of the study.

The influences of competencies in the target language on teaching have been explored in terms of different aspects. For instance, the language input needed for

communicative competence development is limited when the teacher does not have a good command of English because, as the main provider of language input (Kim & Elder, 2008), teachers cannot use the language confidently and accurately (Richards et al., 2013). In addition, English language proficiency has an impact on teachers' ability to reach language resources, the competency in adapting the coursebook according to students' needs, and confidence in using authentic materials (Farrell & Richards, 2007). Teachers with lower levels of language proficiency prefer a more prescriptive type of teaching (Tsui, 2003). Hence, it is undeniable that teachers' level of competency in the target language has many implications for their classroom practices.

Developing a sufficient level of English is crucial for EFL teachers and self-assessment of their proficiency can be beneficial for their improvement because this kind of assessment has been associated with autonomy (McMillan & Hearn, 2008). Self-assessment is a self-managed and governed activity in which assessment is carried out internally (Oscarson, 1989). In addition to the benefits to the self-assessors like higher levels of motivation for self-improvement (Butler, 2004), self-assessment presents itself as a good data collection tool for academic studies for several reasons. Firstly, self-assessment has been reported not only as effective and easy but also less time-consuming to conduct (Ross, 2006). Secondly, the results from self-assessment tools demonstrate an acceptably significant statistical correlation with the results from objective assessment tools (Finnie & Meng, 2005). As a result, the data collection tools used in this study are certain parts of the CEFR's self-assessment grid and inventories where teachers provide self-reports on their competency and teaching.

Teachers' oral competencies have come into focus even more because of high number of learners aspiring to master their oral competencies in order to communicate in English. Consequently, the teachers have had to satisfy the requirement of having high levels of oral competencies. Also, in order to face the current demand of the students, teachers have been forced to address the need to adopt their teaching style and approaches. Teaching style has been defined as a collection of decisions made by teachers when managing the classroom and selecting teaching goals and learning tasks (Grasha, 2002). A teaching style is the sum of the ideology, beliefs and actions of a teacher and the style involves the implementation of all those components (Jarvis, 2004). A well-known framework for teaching styles is offered by Grasha which proposes five categories: "Expert, Formal Authority, Personal Model, Facilitator, and Delegator" (2002, p.154). Expert Style is concerned with transmitting knowledge to the students. Formal Authority Style regards themselves as a part of the school with recognized knowledge. The style is mainly associated with providing feedback and constructing rules. Personal Model Type perceives themselves as an idol for students and students are expected to copy the teacher's actions and approaches. Facilitator Style values teacher-student interaction and questions which aim to guide students to informed decisions. Delegator Style is depicted as an intelligent and capable person who is ready to help if needed. A teacher might show evidence of various styles to different degrees, although one style is generally more dominant. The style performed by the teacher will depend on many things including teachers' subject knowledge (Grasha, 1994).

Teaching approaches are also parts of teaching styles and the development of communication skills as the main aim of education require necessary changes in both. Teaching approach is defined broadly as the combination of teachers' motives

and actions (Trigwell & Prosser, 1996). One very common approach practiced in language classrooms is the Communicative approach or Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) which was introduced to language classrooms in the 1980's (Miller & Aldred, 2000) and has been used to improve the communication skills of students ever since. CLT encourages teaching language in its authentic contexts which will contribute to learners' communicative competence (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

Communicative competence, placed at the heart of CLT, is defined as knowing linguistic rules and structures, correct use of language in various contexts, the relationship between utterances in speech, and language strategies by Hymes (1972). The attempts to improve the communicative competence of students affected the positions of teachers in the teaching process by bringing students and their experiences into focus. Students have taken a more active role in their learning process whereas teachers try to organize the classes to provide more opportunities for students to experience using the language (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

There has been suggested one main and common categorization of teaching approaches which is student or teacher-centered teaching. Teacher-centered teaching emphasizes teachers' authority and less place in the decision-making processes about the classroom, whereas in student-centered teaching approach, students are associated with active participants of the classroom practices (Jarvis, 2004). One of the frameworks used for teachers in higher education is the Approaches to Teaching framework, which entails two main distinctions to teaching: the Information Transmission/Teacher-Focused (ITTF) and the Conceptual Change/ Student-Focused (CCSF) (Trigwell & Prosser, 2004). The teachers' level of capability in language can become a factor in their choices regarding their teaching approaches as teachers with

lower proficiency generally implement more predictive activities where the focus is on teachers rather than learners (Tsui, 2003).

Chambless (2012) states that much of the collected knowledge about foreign language learning depends on our principles, approaches, and actions instead of empirical data. For example, although language proficiency levels of teachers shape the achievement of language learning outcomes in the classroom (Kim & Elder, 2008), it is not clear how teachers' language affects what teachers do and how they use the language in the classroom (Canh & Renandya, 2017). Furthermore, what contributes to teachers' continuous improvement in terms of language proficiency and the deterioration of experienced teachers' language proficiency over time have not received much attention (Chambless, 2012).

Problem

Some foreign language teachers learn English as their additional or foreign language themselves and their main goal is to improve the proficiency of their students in the target language. However, teachers might struggle in their own quest to possess higher levels of English, which is stated as necessary if they wish to promote their students' language development (Sullivan, 2011). Some studies have investigated language teachers' self-assessed language proficiency at the elementary level in Japan, Taiwan and Korea (Butler, 2004); at the secondary level in China (Tang, 2007). Also, in Türkiye, Köksal and Ulu (2019) studied pre-service EFL teachers' conceptions of their language proficiency. Chambless (2012) points out the lack of knowledge about experienced teachers' language proficiency and the need for discovering the changes that the proficiency levels of language teachers undergo after graduation. Hence, it is still worth investigating language teachers' self-assessed oral competency as part of their language proficiency.

Language teachers' language competency has been found to have a relationship with different aspects of learning and teaching. There are studies elaborating on the effectiveness of teaching and teachers' general language proficiency (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008; Tsang, 2017; Valmori & De Costa, 2016; Yusuf & Novita, 2020); self-assessed language proficiency and the experience of burnout of teachers (Nayernia & Babayan, 2019); language proficiency of language teachers and their language use in the classroom (Canh & Renandya, 2017). In Türkiye, Şekerci (2011) studied self-assessed proficiency in relation to the self-efficacy beliefs of teachers at the tertiary level and Yılmaz (2011) investigated language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and self-perceived language proficiency at the primary and high school levels. More empirical data on the relationship between target language proficiency, only by focusing on oral competency, and teaching can further support the understanding of the complex relationship between the EFL teachers' proficiency and the nature of teaching.

Teaching style refers to decisions made by teachers in the teaching process including teachers' choice of teaching practices. Teaching style has been studied in relation to personality types of preservice language teachers (Cooper, 2001), the epistemological beliefs of teachers (Soleimani, 2020) and their levels of creativity and burnout (Ghanizadeh & Jahedizadeh, 2016). The relationship of the target language proficiency of teachers with their teaching has also been discovered in previous research. Teachers' form-oriented and communication-oriented teaching practices have been explained in relation to their perceived language proficiency (Zhang, 2019); teachers' teaching practices and language proficiency are studied by Richards et al. (2013). In Türkiye, teaching methods used by teachers at different levels (Okmen & Kılıc, 2016) and teachers' preferences when presenting grammar at

the secondary school level are explored (Çakır & Kafa, 2013). Also, Karabuga (2015) delved into the match between teachers' teaching style and their students' learning styles in language classrooms at a preparatory school in Türkiye. However, teachers' practices in the classroom in terms of teaching styles and approaches should be further studied at the tertiary level in Türkiye because according to the report conducted by the British Council on language education of universities in Türkiye, English in language education is treated as a subject rather than a language of communication (West et al., 2015). According to the report, the treatment of English as a subject reduces teachers' tendencies to design more communicative classes integrating students' activity and interaction with their peers. Because teachers with low levels of language are found to be using more grammar-focused practices (Chacón, 2003), it is important to investigate the relationship of teachers' language competencies with their teaching style and approaches to improve the quality of teaching in language education in Türkiye.

In relation to student and teacher-centeredness of teaching, Gibbs and Coffey (2004) discovered the change in the orientation of teaching as part of a teacher development program. Opdenakker and Van Damme (2006) inquired Dutch speaking teachers' teaching styles in terms of teacher, student, and content-centeredness. Lueddeke (2003) discovered teaching approaches that academics prefer based on the dichotomy of student and teacher-centeredness in the UK. In Türkiye, Altinyelken (2011) looked at primary school teachers' understanding, perception, and teaching practices related to student-centered pedagogy. Also, at tertiary level, academics teaching approaches at education faculty of universities in Türkiye were studied. Regarding teaching approaches in terms of student and teacher-centeredness in Türkiye, adaptation of a culturally sensitive pedagogy instead of disregarding the

student-centered pedagogy was suggested by Altinyelken (2011). For a change to start in teaching, realization, and evaluation of teaching should be achieved by investigating it with further studies (Heimlich & Norland, 2002). Hence, it is important to shed light on the teaching approaches at the tertiary level so that the required change in the focus of the language lessons (West et al., 2015) at universities can be encouraged with the awareness of their preferred approaches.

Purpose

The main focus of this study is the EFL teachers' self-assessed oral competencies in English, their teaching styles, teaching approaches, and the relationship of oral competency with teaching styles and teaching approaches in terms of student and teacher-centeredness.

Research Questions

This study aims to address the following questions:

1. What are non-native EFL teachers' self-assessed oral competencies in relation to oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction?
 - 1.1. Do their oral competencies differ based on gender,
 - age,
 - years of teaching experience,
 - field of the undergraduate degree,
 - field of the graduate degree
 - whether other foreign languages are spoken?
2. What teaching styles do these teachers adopt?
 - 2.1. Do their teaching styles differ based on:
 - gender,
 - age,

- years of teaching experience,
- field of undergraduate degree,
- field of the graduate degree,
- whether other foreign languages are spoken?

3. What teaching approaches do they adopt in terms of student and teacher-centeredness?

3.1. Do their teaching approaches differ based on:

- gender,
- age,
- years of teaching experience,
- field of the undergraduate degree,
- field of the graduate degree,
- whether other foreign languages are spoken?

4. Is there a relationship between

- their self-assessed oral competency in English and their teaching styles?
- their self-assessed oral competency in English and their teaching approaches?

Significance

With further investigation of the relationship among teaching styles, approaches, and self-assessed oral competency of teachers, this study can contribute to the relevant empirical data on language teaching and learning. A possible relationship might explain the impact of teachers' oral competency on teachers' teaching and the results might inspire the relevant settings to invest in professional development practices for in-service teachers to improve their oral competency and

teaching. Moreover, the teachers' comments about their oral competency might benefit others, especially novice teachers, who might struggle with oral competency as teachers.

Definition of Key Terms

Language Proficiency: is the knowledge of language systems and suitable language use in particular social occasions and with particular people (Council of Europe, 2001).

Oral Competency: is a part of language proficiency accommodating oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction (Council of Europe, 2020).

Teaching Style: is perpetual patterns of teachers' act and performance (Grasha, 2002).

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): is approach to teaching which sets its goal as to improve communicative competence (Richards, 2006).

Teaching Approach: is the mixture of one's intentions and actions (Trigwell & Prosser, 1996)

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter offers a review of the literature related to the present study that explores non-native EFL teachers' self-assessed oral competency, their teaching styles, and teaching approaches. The chapter starts with explanations of the current events and trends in English language teaching in the world and in Türkiye. Later on, definitions and information about teaching styles, teaching approaches, language proficiency, and oral competency are provided. Lastly, an account of the relevant empirical studies on self-assessed oral competency of English teachers, teaching styles and teaching practices is included.

English Language Teaching (ELT) in the World

Globalization prompted an increasing need to communicate with people from different parts of the world and English as a lingua franca made international communication possible to achieve different purposes like business and travel (McKay, 2018). English is favored as a foreign language (Şekerci, 2011) and the population of its speakers is growing exponentially comprising almost 1.5 billion people which is around a quarter of the worldwide population (Szmigiera, 2021). The increasing need to attain sufficient communication capabilities in English has resulted in an enormous demand for English teaching globally (Richards, 2006) because millions of people desire to accomplish an excellent command of English. The rapid escalation in the need to learn the English language has also increased the number of non-native English-speaking teachers (NNEST) (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008).

Many countries like New Zealand (Richards et al., 2013), China (Tang, 2007), Taiwan, Korea, and Japan (Butler, 2004) have adopted changes in their educational policies to accommodate the need for communication in English. One of

the decisions has been to include English at earlier levels of education to enable more exposure to the students, which is needed for language development (Chambless, 2012). Moreover, educational policies in the world both in contexts where English is taught as a second language and as a foreign language have transformed the methods used in classrooms into more communication-focused methods since the 1990s (Littlewood, 2007). Although the field has been introduced to different approaches, one whose effectiveness many agreed has been the overarching communicative approach (Swan, 2018). The transformation in the focus of language classrooms implies a shift in teaching styles since the teacher's role in the classroom changes into being the counsellor and the manager of group work (Richards & Rodgers, 2014), and the teaching practices are designed with a more learner-centered approach which posits that the ownership of learning should be assigned to the students (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011).

All these changes call for qualified English teachers who can answer to the needs and alterations in classroom teaching. The constant alterations in the focus of language education necessitate adjustments in the notion of a good and qualified English teacher although one unchanging expectation from language teachers is being proficient in the language they teach (Ayar, 2019). Another desirable trait of good teachers is practicing the modern and current approaches and methods in ELT (Ayar, 2019). Due to the belief that if the aim of language teaching is communication, then the teaching method should also reflect this aim (Alnajami, 2019), qualified language teachers have been expected to implement more communication-focused practices in their classrooms since the 1980s (Miller & Aldred, 2000).

Since language started to be seen as an actual rather than an abstract system long ago (Thornbury, 2017), language teachers have been using more communication-focused activities which can be grouped under Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Çakır & Kafa, 2013), instead of teaching practices where the focus is on explicit grammar teaching like in Grammar Translation Method (GTM). With CLT, the focus and orientation of the language classes, hence teaching approaches to language, have undergone a significant shift.

CLT, first introduced in the 1970s, has its premise on the theory of language as a functional and communicative tool and it has been accepted by curriculum developers, teaching specialists, and governments since its entrance to the field of language education (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). It promotes teaching practices in authentic contexts which improve communicative competence (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Communicative competence defined by Hymes (1972) refers to knowing linguistic rules and structures, the correct use of language in various contexts, the relationship between utterances in speech and language strategies. One of the dimensions of CLT is its quality of learner and experience-centeredness and teachers are encouraged to design curriculums so that students can experience the language in line with their unique needs, goals, and profiles (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011).

Even though CLT was developed more than four decades ago, its effects have surpassed its own era by influencing more recent teaching approaches like Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), Text-Based Instruction (TBI), and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Moreover, although today the tendency is principled eclecticism which suggests using multiple methods tailored to the culture and the teaching context, CLT provides support to numerous

teaching practices. For example, with the responsibility given to the students and the adjustments of teaching to the students' profile, CLT supports the autonomy movement suggesting an active involvement of students. There are paradigm shifts marked by CLT which are commonplace in most teaching contexts. Firstly, students are given choice and responsibility over their own learning while teachers are perceived as co-learners who try to find the best teaching experience for learners. Secondly, the need for alternative assessment is underlined because language is seen much more than structures, a more comprehensive account of competency in the language is needed. Also, the integration of English into other subjects in educational curriculums has been highlighted. Thirdly, language is learned to develop students' thinking skills in certain contexts to express themselves. Moreover, language is seen as a social construct and the meaning-making process of language use is emphasized. Lastly, the diversity and uniqueness of students have been acknowledged and received more attention (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). One thing that all these changes have in common is the focus on the learners with special emphasis on their experiences and needs.

Despite the popularity of CLT and accordingly student-centered classrooms, some factors have been listed as the reasons why teachers fail to implement the required changes in their teaching. Most English as a Foreign Language teachers have received training where the classes are student-centered and the focus on communication, however, in some cases, the actions of those teachers have been limited because of their teaching culture (Ahmad & Rao, 2012; Dogancay-Aktuna, 2006). New approaches are developed by Western countries, and they better correspond to the Western culture so they might not resonate with other cultures where teachers are expected to be the mere authority figures providing the knowledge. Student-centeredness as related to CLT, TBLT, or self-directed language learning, has been reported as

challenging in East Asia (Hu, 2002). In Türkiye, for example, it has been reported that universities tend to teach English as a subject rather than a tool of communication (West et al., 2015) and English classes lack communicative language teaching practices where students' active participation is highlighted.

ELT in Türkiye

As in other countries, the need for internationalization also prompted a considerable focus on ELT in Türkiye (Aydoğan & Akbarov, 2014). In Türkiye, English was recognized as a requirement for a distinguished career long ago and families put great efforts into their children's acquisition of the language (Ahmad, 1993). In 1997, the Turkish Ministry of National Education (MoNE) in partnership with the Turkish Higher Education Council, agreed to make a profound change in the country's ELT policy. As a result of the change, English was decided to be introduced at a younger age to enable longer exposure to the language (Kırkgöz, 2007). The adaptations in 1997 are also significant in that it marks the introduction of the communicative approach into the national curriculum of ELT in Türkiye. The goal of ELT shifted to the improvement of learners' communicative capacity, and the teacher role transformed into being a facilitator while the instruction became more learner-focused (Kırkgöz, 2007).

The teacher education programs have also faced alterations to cater to the needs and the changes in ELT to enhance the quality of teachers in Türkiye (Kırkgöz, 2007). To this end, the input on teaching methods was enhanced while extra time for teaching practice in primary and secondary schools for trainee teachers was added. Moreover, to make up for the deficiency in the number of ELT teachers, distance teacher education program was initiated via a protocol signed between MoNE and the Open Education Faculty of Anadolu University in 2000.

In spite of all the improvements and changes in ELT and teacher education, Kırkgöz (2007) states that the findings of her study show communicative language teaching introduced by MoNE did not seem to have engendered the desired outcome in terms of teachers' classroom actions because teaching practices are mainly carried out in traditional teaching methods. As the primary and secondary education continued to be mainly teacher-centered and memorization-focused, Turkish students naturally expect a similar education at university where they are the receiver of information (Ozkan & Kesen, 2008).

The instruction at the tertiary level seems to have failed to adjust to the contemporary changes in ELT in Türkiye (West et al., 2015). Students were reported to arrive at the tertiary level of education where classroom practices represent the teachers transferring the information in the syllabus and students are expected to digest the input (Aydoğan & Akbarov, 2014). Language education at universities fails to allow much freedom for questioning and criticism, and a more deductive approach to teaching language is being used to provide rules and related examples which are followed by practice. Teachers were reported to fail to implement communicative language teaching which enables interaction between students (West et al., 2015). Hence, the need for training on how to promote interaction among students and foster speaking integration during the lesson is needed so that teachers' capability and competence to design interactive lessons can be improved.

Teaching Style

There is a legion of definitions of what teaching style is in the literature. Dunn and Dunn (1977) conceptualize teaching styles as a composite of eight main factors, which include teaching planning and methods, the grouping of the students, design of classrooms, the environment of teaching, the techniques used for

evaluation, the philosophy of teaching and the characteristic features of the instruction. The teaching style is also defined as a teacher's common perception of and interaction with learners, which can show similarities with various methods of teaching (Fisher & Fisher, 1979). Grasha (2002) describes teaching styles as perpetual patterns of teachers' actions and performances. They are representations of teachers' habits and inclinations in learning and pedagogy, which can be revealed differently in specific contexts (Soleimani, 2020). As an umbrella term including teachers' beliefs, standards, principles, and performance, teaching style blends the application of the teacher's philosophy and justification of those principles about the elements of learning (Jarvis, 2004). In other words, teaching style is a combination of teachers' pedagogical background and their real practice.

Just as there are many definitions suggested, there are many classifications of different teaching styles offered. Fisher and Fisher (1979) list six categories of teaching styles which are student-centered, subject-centered, learning-centered, task-oriented, emotionally calm, and collaborative planner. Ornstein and Miller (1980) proposed two categories for teaching styles, one is expressive style whereas the other is instrumental style. Teachers who perform expressive style are described as mentors who show and utilize emotions when managing the classroom while teachers with instrumental style are more task-oriented and concerned about the students' ability to meet some standards.

Henson and Borthwick (1984) suggest a six-point model representing (1) task-oriented teaching style, which is based on classes organized around tasks (2) cooperative planner, which supports teaching practices decided by students and teachers although teachers are mainly in charge (3) child-centered style, which suggests task designed by the teacher while which task to choose is up to the students

(4) subject-centered style, which places the focus on the instruction and accepts no contribution from the students in the decision making (5) learning-centered which pays equal attention onto subject and learners, and (6) emotionally exciting style in which the teacher is mainly concerned about teaching stimulating classes. Jarvis (1985) utilized three categories for the teaching styles which are (1) controlled didactic style, giving lectures, (2) Socratic style, using question-answer sequences, and (3) facilitator style, giving more responsibility to the learners.

Grasha (2002) constructed one of the most commonly used frameworks with five classes of teaching styles which are “(1) Expert, (2) Formal Authority, (3) Personal Model, (4) Facilitator, and (5) Delegator” (p.154). Expert Style is distinguished by expertise and knowledge. Formal Authority Style is characterized by firm expectations and rules. Personal Model Style suggests teachers acknowledge themselves as an ideal example for students. Facilitator Style is associated with teachers acting as a provider of guidance to students. Delegator Style is defined as a capable and intelligent person who is ready to help in case he is needed.

The teaching style of teachers can have qualities of more than one style and different styles in combination can be adopted by a teacher, which is referred to as clusters by Grasha (2002); however, one style is likely to be more dominant. Each style has its own strengths, so no style is favored over another although overemphasis on some characteristics of different styles might result in undesired consequences. For example, teachers with Expert Style provide fruitful knowledge but overemphasis on the knowledge might be intimidating for students (Grasha, 1996). While teachers with Formal Authority Style set rules and expectations, over attention to the rules might lead their classes to suffer from rigid and strict classroom management. Teachers with the Personal Model Style want to be observed for their

good qualities which are ideally expected to be taken up by students later. However, these teachers might struggle with the feeling of disappointment if their students fail to learn from and copy the teacher as their role model. Teachers with Facilitator Style support students in their process of making knowledgeable decisions, yet their classes might lead to excessive openness in the classroom which some students might find disturbing. Finally, teachers with Delegator Style mainly promote autonomy, however, these teachers might cause a highly demanding learning experience for some students who are not ready or trained to become autonomous.

Depending on the definitions made, it is pointed out that teaching styles have close relationships with many factors. The teaching style can be influenced by teachers' character (Korthagen, 2004; Rachman et al., 2021), their thinking and cognitive styles (Zhang, 2008), their principles (Korthagen, 2004), pedagogical beliefs (Dunn & Dunn, 1977; Korthagen, 2004; Rachman et al., 2021) and needs (Rachman et al., 2021), subject matter (Korthagen, 2004), teaching goals and methods (Bota & Tulbure, 2015; Dunn & Dunn, 1977), teaching planning (Dunn & Dunn, 1977), evaluation techniques (Dunn & Dunn, 1977); the environment of teaching (Dunn & Dunn, 1977), the culture and social factors in their contexts (Korthagen, 2004). Teaching styles, in turn, influence teachers' material use, classroom management, relationship with students, and style of observation of students (Grasha, 1994). They can determine the quality of the teaching environment (Dewaele, 2019; Mak, 2011) and affect the students' state of cognitive abilities and psychology (Kang, 2005).

Some aspects of the base of teachers' beliefs, which are the reasons for teachers' choices and actions, might be unknown to teachers and Bem (1970) calls them zero-order beliefs. Uncovering those foundations can offer opportunities to

understand, evaluate and even change them (Zinn, 1991). Realization of those beliefs can firstly lead to a sensitivity to what and why teachers do. Secondly, it can promote an expanded vision and enable them to consider other alternatives that they can apply. Furthermore, knowledge about one's teaching philosophy can help with the resolution of the inconsistency between educational and total life philosophy. Lastly, it can offer more critical thinking about beliefs, principles, and actions. Information about teaching styles can be used as a starting point for their changes and adaptation, which can eventually improve instruction (Heimlich & Norland, 2002). The ability to adapt teaching styles can benefit teachers to match their teaching to the needs and learning styles of their students, which can lead higher grades and positive learner attitudes.

Teaching Approaches

The style performed might affect the methods and activities chosen in the classroom because teaching style as a concept includes both theoretical beliefs and teaching practices (Jarvis, 2004). Teacher-centeredness and learner-centeredness which are also addressed in the description of teaching style (Soleimani, 2020) attracted more attention in language classrooms after CLT. The former suggests teachers' authority in the class and the inactive role of the students (Jarvis, 2004), whereas the latter attributes a more active role to students by contributing to the classroom practices (Grasha, 2002; Jarvis, 2004). In the teacher-centered approach, teachers transmit knowledge via lectures to student listeners who receive the information passively (Andersen & Andersen, 2017; Crowder, 2015; Peters, 2010; Singh & Garg, 2015). Teachers being the source of knowledge are attributed to greater responsibilities and authority over how teaching is carried out and what knowledge is provided (Singh & Garg, 2015). In contrast, more individualized and

competency-based teaching is performed with student-centered methods (Lee et al., 2016). The decisions in student-centered methods are shaped by students and the responsibility encourages their independence and level of autonomy (Singh & Garg, 2015). The key to student-centered classes is that students make use of real tools with authentic and real-life materials (Tondeur et al., 2017). The benefits of the student-centered approach to teaching have been reported by empirical studies (Aytaç & Kula, 2020; Biggs & Tang, 2011; Cornelius-White, 2007; Michael 2006).

In brief, the orientation of classes in terms of student and teacher-centeredness shapes other factors. The impact of teaching approaches and practices on learning outcomes can be summarized in three steps (Martin et al., 2002). Firstly, the teaching objectives with or without students in the center will affect the way students are taught. Secondly, following the decision about the objectives, teachers' attention, or lack of attention to what students' learning styles are will alter the teaching style. Finally, teachers' beliefs about how students are best motivated to learn will suggest adjustments to the orientation of the class. In essence, as the teaching approach can have a crucial impact on teaching, learning about it can contribute to the knowledge about teaching and learning and how to improve both.

In order to serve the aim of learning about teaching approaches, the Approaches to Teaching Inventory (ATI) was produced (Trigwell & Prosser, 1996), tested with teachers in higher education, and updated to its current form (Trigwell et al., 2005). The inventory was developed based on five approaches to teaching proposed by Prosser et al. (1994): (1) teacher-focused approach accompanied by information transmission, (2) teacher-focused approach enabling concept acquisition of students, (3) teacher-student interaction approach allowing concept acquisition of students, (4) student-focused approach marked by students' development of their

conception, and (5) student-focused approach distinguished with change in students' conceptions. With its foundation on this five-approach structure, the Approaches to Teaching (AT) framework is composed of two main distinctions to teaching: the information transmission/teacher-focused, ITTF, and the conceptual change/ student-focused (CCSF) (Trigwell & Prosser, 2004). Although many more aspects of teaching approaches have been discovered, the dichotomy of teacher and student-centeredness prevails in research because of its effectiveness in describing the roles of teachers and students (Harshman & Stains, 2017).

When it comes to language education, with the focus on promoting communication skills, the participation of learners in interaction has been highlighted by many studies (Gass & Selinker, 2008; Long, 1996; Savignon, 2005; Swain, 1985; Swan, 2018). The belief that language knowledge is built via the active participation of learners (Benson, 2012), requires students to take active roles in more student-centered classes (Crumly, 2014; Nunan, 2013). The new expectation of communication-oriented classrooms has placed demands on teachers to adjust their attitude and approach. Firstly, how teachers perceive their role in the classroom should transform from the disseminator of knowledge into a multi-tasker facilitating learning experiences, managing group work, providing a good model of communication, and analyzing needs. Secondly, how teachers identify language learning should shift from acquiring knowledge to developing competence (Wang, 2007). These adjustments manifested themselves in the roles taken on by the teachers because while students adopt a more active role, teachers become the facilitator of their learning (Drotar, 2019). Moreover, one of the requirements of such classrooms is the teachers' competency in the language. When students are decision makers, students' unpredictable actions in communication require higher language skills of

teachers, who might have little experience in participating in communication themselves (Littlewood, 2012).

Language Proficiency and Competency

Formal linguists and sociolinguists have different stances when it comes to language proficiency. The former conceives competence in a simplistic way by emphasizing the rule-governed structures under the name of linguistic competence (Chomsky, 1965) whereas the latter includes both knowledge of the language and the ability to use it in their definition of communicative competence (Hymes, 1972).

Canale and Swain (1980) expand the notion of communicative competence by accounting for sociolinguistic, strategic, and discourse competencies. Bachman and Palmer (1996) define language proficiency under six interdependent categories comprising organizational, grammatical, textual, pragmatic, functional, and sociolinguistic knowledge.

Attempts for objective measurement have been found difficult as reaching a common definition of proficiency is challenging because of its complex nature (Faez et al., 2021). Sometimes for assessment purposes, language proficiency was viewed as language competence in four skills and related language knowledge in terms of vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation in speech (Butler, 2004). Today, the idea of foreign language proficiency has been influenced by the Common European Framework, which offers not only different competency areas to define language proficiency but also actions to be carried out by learners with specific levels of competency (Council of Europe, 2020). The framework defines competency as a mixture of abilities, knowledge, and features individuals employ and make use of to perform communication acts. Communicative competency is divided into competencies in building blocks of the language, appropriate language use in

different social units, and language use appropriate to specific social interactions (Council of Europe, 2001).

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) is a unifying scheme originally created for the shareholders in education in Europe who take part in language learning and teaching processes. It elaborates in detail on things to be learned to effectively act, perform, and communicate in a language by specifying the skills and knowledge to be attained as well as accounting for the cultural factors affecting the language to be used (Council of Europe, 2001). One of its main aims is to enable clarity, consistency, and integrity of education programs and of teaching and assessment practices, in addition to consistency among different educational contexts (Council of Europe, 2020).

Thanks to the definitions of competencies at various levels, the framework helps classify language proficiency into categories and define what language proficiency entails in specific sections, which qualifies the framework as a common calibrating tool with standardized marking points to evaluate achievement related to specific areas. Thus, the framework not only provides opportunities for educators to design a standard format of evaluation but also serves as a scale for life-long learners to measure their progress when learning a language. With the breakdown of competencies, the descriptors under various sections also help educators to manage complex tasks such as generating objectives of courses for different learner profiles and learning contexts (Council of Europe, 2001).

Its approach is defined as being action-oriented in that learners are seen as active social agents who employ skills, strategies, and competencies both related and unrelated to language to perform in a given context and under context-specific

requirements effectively. Competency is defined as the body of skills, knowledge, and traits individuals draw on to carry out actions. As a sub-category, communicative competency refers to the individual's capacity to achieve acts of communication by making use of linguistic resources and its components comprise linguistic, sociolinguistic, and pragmatic competencies. Linguistic competence includes the extent and characteristics of knowledge related to language systems, their cognitive organization, and accessibility to individuals. Sociolinguistic competence involves limits of social conventions in which language is used as a means whereas pragmatic competence is related to the acts of certain linguistic components in specific interactions (Council of Europe, 2001).

The classification of language proficiency has three main levels A, B, and C which correspond to the basic user, independent user, and proficient user respectively and each level have two subcategories. Level A1 is named as “Breakthrough Level” which is considered to be the lowest level and Level A2 is identified as the “Waystage Level” which defines a more competent learner than the previous level. The independent user category has Level B1 “Threshold Level” and B2 “Vantage Level”. Level C, the highest level, includes two sub-groups: Level C1 “Effective Operational Proficiency Level” and Level C2 “Mastery Level” (Council of Europe, 2001).

The framework has affected teaching and assessment practices both in Europe (Barni, 2015; Figueras, 2012) and around the world (Byram & Parmenter, 2012). In addition to being translated into 40 languages (Figueras, 2012), the framework has been used to align the outcomes and assessment even of language programs other than English (Tono, 2019). Türkiye is one of the countries which implemented the framework in the curriculum design of mainstream education both

at primary (Arikan, 2015) and secondary level (Zorba & Arikan, 2016). Following its membership to the Council of Europe in 1949, Türkiye has been attempting to adopt the regulations of the European Union which also involve policies related to foreign language education (Çelik, 2013; Mirici, 2008; MoNE, 2005). With an intention to pilot the European Language Portfolio (ELP), which is offered as an alternative assessment by the framework, and the curriculum based on the CEFR, 20 schools located in two cities were chosen during the academic year of 2001-2002 (Hişmanoglu, 2013). The teachers in those schools were offered training to get familiarized with the CEFR and ELP. After receiving the approval of the Validation Committee of the Council of Europe and after piloting the curriculum and ELP in many more schools, MoNE decided to implement the curriculum throughout the country in the academic year of 2006-2007 (Demirel, 2005; Şahinkarakaş et al., 2009). At the tertiary level, however, the adaptation process has not been so smooth. Some of the findings of the related studies show the limited number of state universities with the CEFR based curricula and point out the need for in-service training for teachers to design their classes in congruence with the CEFR (Çağatay & Gürocak, 2016).

Although the framework has been adopted in numerous institutions around the world, there have been some criticisms on how it is used by the institutions without considering the features of specific contexts (Barni, 2015), on how it lacks a theoretical foundation (Hulstijn, 2007) and how the creation of the descriptors lacks scientific scrutiny (Alderson, 2007; Fulcher, 2004). Focus on native speakerism (Barni, 2015; McNamara, 2014) and the lack of attention on multilingualism (Krumm, 2007) are other areas which received criticisms. Some changes have been applied to the first published version of the framework with the aim of addressing

some of the criticisms and keeping up with the evolving nature of communication because of modern improvements in technology and the internet (Deygers, 2021). More detailed categorization of the levels, the restatement of some descriptors, and additional competencies were offered with the additional volumes. One of the most significant updates to the original version is a new competency area offered under the name of “mediation” which is created with an attempt to include communication acts which cannot be covered by reception or production. “In fact, it (mediation) integrates and goes further than the co-construction of meaning by underlining the constant link between the social and individual dimensions in language use and language learning.” (North & Piccardo, 2016, p.4).

Following the changes, the self-assessment grid was updated to include mediation as one of the competency areas. The grid offers opportunities for self-directed learning and self-assessment. Thus, a learner outside formal education with an aim to reach a level can design his own learning by choosing the descriptors of the level as outcomes for his learning and self-assess his progress. Moreover, with the self-assessment scale provided by the framework, not only students in a class can evaluate their progress, but also teachers can self-assess the success of their course and their teaching by investigating the point their students have achieved to reach on the scale (Council of Europe, 2001, 2020).

Self-assessment

Self-assessments, self-reports, or self-estimates are self-conceptions of ability and perceptions about capabilities (Yan & Brown, 2016). They correspond to one of the two fundamental lines of testing, which are assessment via self-report and assessment via examinations (Yan & Carless, 2021). They have gained more

popularity in recent years (Ifenthaler et al., 2022) since the introduction of autonomy in teaching (Patri, 2002), the ELP via the CEFR.

There are some reasons acknowledged why this type of assessment is being implemented. Firstly, assessment in the form of self-report or self-assessment is an internal process and self-directed, which is why a connection to autonomy has been constructed (McMillan & Hearn, 2008). Thus, one can reflect on their performance and the realization of their current level can promote opportunities to take necessary actions to improve the weaknesses (Butler, 2004). Also, recognition and appreciation of the achievements can improve the perception of the capabilities and efficacy (Zimmerman, 2000). Secondly, self-assessments have been reported to be effective and less time-consuming in addition to being easy to conduct (Ross, 2006). Lastly, this kind of assessment shows reliable and consistent results with objective measurements (Finnie & Meng, 2005; Gomes et al., 2019) despite contradicting results by some studies (Runnels, 2013). As a result, it represents itself as a reasonable choice for researchers, teachers, and students.

In addition to the use of self-assessment by language learners, this type of assessment has also been included in teacher evaluation policies. One of the many reasons why many frameworks for the purposes of self-assessed teacher evaluation have been created is that teachers can recognize their competency and identify necessary steps to take for further development (Borg & Edmett, 2018). However, regarding providing accurate results from teacher self-assessment, Borg and Edmett (2018) refer to some issues. Firstly, there is a high potential for teachers' self-assessment not to represent the real self. In some cases, teachers have inflated self-conception because they might see incompetency as a threat to their profession. In some other cases, they might assess their performance poorly because of their high

expectations of themselves (Tichenor & Tichenor, 2005). Secondly, untrusting environments where the purpose of self-assessment is summative and judgmental and lacking a clear focus on development can create unreliable results.

Drawing on self-assessment practices with students and teachers, there are suggestions made to raise the accuracy of self-assessment results. Firstly, the assessors should be trained to raise their capacity to gauge their achievements (Council of Europe, 2001). Secondly, clearly stated descriptors which are based on specific experiences improve the reliability of the results (Council of Europe, 2001). Brown et al., (2014) point out that “can-do” statements produce more accurate results than items stating more abstract constructs. Thirdly, the anonymity of the assessors’ identities (Borg & Edmett, 2018), and a focus on development (Ross, 2006) can help create safe environments to enable reliable assessment.

EFL Teachers’ Language

Freeman et al. (2015) suggest teacher language be categorized not as a general language proficiency but as a specialized subcategory including the skills needed for teaching and preparing lessons. Richards et al. (2013) count language knowledge as part of teachers’ subject knowledge. Richards (2015) enumerates competencies comprising teachers’ language proficiency as the ability to present appropriate language models, provide English use during the class, including explanations on grammar structures and lexical items by giving examples, utilize authentic materials, give corrective feedback to students, choose the proper level of input, practice spontaneous and creative teaching, choose the proper level of input, practice self-correction and self-monitor of teachers’ own language for accuracy.

As a part of teachers’ subject knowledge, language competency is the most valuable component of non-native teachers’ teaching competency (Murdoch, 1994)

since a good command of English is required for target language modeling in terms of grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation (Faez & Karas, 2019; Naserdeen, 2001). Farrell and Richards (2007) state that a poor level of language results in teachers' failure in accessing language resources. Those teachers are more likely to have prescriptive language knowledge (Tsui, 2003) and prefer following the coursebooks closely, and are less likely to use CLT in their classrooms where there is plenty of room for interaction and students' experience and oral work (Richards et al., 2013). Similarly, Richards (2017) points out that low level of language knowledge may suffice for teaching at presentation or practice stages of lessons, however, teachers might struggle with the free production stage where improvisational factors of spontaneous speech become prominent. During the lessons, teachers with low levels of competency are generally too busy with their own language weaknesses to let students experience the language and communicate (Farrell & Richards, 2007).

On the other hand, great command of language enables teachers to adjust materials by evaluating their usefulness for classroom needs (McNamara, 1991) and implement authentic materials (Farrell & Richards, 2007). Those teachers are not only better at providing feedback that is meaningful and adjusted to students' levels by making use of many strategies but also, they are better at spotting students' errors (Scrivener, 2005). These teachers can be more spontaneous and exploit the teaching moments that emerge in the classroom (Kim & Elder, 2008). Teachers' improved language knowledge can elevate their job performance and boost their self-confidence in their work (Eslami & Harper, 2018).

Related Studies

Some studies investigated language teachers' self-assessed language proficiency at the elementary level in Japan, Taiwan, and Korea (Butler, 2004) and at

the secondary level in China (Tang, 2007) and they found that teachers in general assess their language proficiency being low or slightly above average. The impact of teachers' general language proficiency on teachers and teaching was elaborated on in some studies from the point of teaching effectiveness (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008; Tsang, 2017; Valmori & De Costa, 2016; Yusuf & Novita, 2020). The studies concluded that teachers' higher perceptions of general language proficiency have correlations with their beliefs about their ability to teach effectively. There are other studies that looked into teachers' language proficiency in relation to the language use of teachers in classrooms (Canh & Renandya, 2017) and they concluded that while general language proficiency is important for effective teaching, classroom proficiency is almost as crucial for teachers. In addition, according to a study about teachers' language proficiency and their burnout experiences (Nayernia & Babayan, 2019), low levels of language proficiency could result in high levels of burnout. In Türkiye, Köksal and Ulum (2019) examined pre-service EFL teachers' conceptions of their language proficiency, and they found that the pre-service ELT teachers perceived their language proficiency to be inadequate. Also, Arikan (2011) studied prospective teachers' perspectives about their language proficiency and target culture and the study concluded that while the participants found themselves capable in the target language, they felt that they are less knowledgeable about the target culture. Moreover, Yılmaz (2011) explored language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and self-perceived language proficiency at the primary and high school levels. Şekerci (2011) looked into self-assessed proficiency in relation to the self-efficacy beliefs of teachers at the tertiary level. The results of both studies were in line with others conducted around the world as they also found a relationship between high perception of language proficiency and teaching efficacy.

As for teaching styles, some studies mention the effects of teaching styles on student anxiety levels (LaBillois & Lagacé-Séguin, 2007) and the study suggested that different teaching styles could result in differing anxiety levels depending on the students' profiles. Rahimi and Asadollahi (2012) investigated differences in teaching styles across different groups with varying qualities and they concluded that EFL teachers use a variety of teaching styles. Furthermore, teaching style was studied in relation to the personality types of preservice language teachers (Cooper, 2001) and the study found that the teaching styles and teachers' personality types matched. Also, the relationship between the epistemological beliefs of teachers and their teaching styles (Soleimani, 2020) was studied in Iran and the study found that the Facilitator Style was the most popular style preferred by the EFL teachers and their epistemological beliefs informed their choice of teaching styles. In addition, in Iran, the connection among teachers' teaching styles, their level of creativity and burnout (Ghanizadeh & Jahedizadeh, 2016) were studied, and it was finalized that the choice of teaching styles has relationships with teachers' creativity and burnout levels. In Türkiye, Karabuga (2015) explored the consistency of teaching styles of EFL teachers with learning styles of their students at a preparatory school of a university and the study suggested that teachers employ many teaching styles to accommodate different learning styles in classroom.

With regard to student and teacher-centeredness of teaching, Gibbs and Coffey (2004) examined the change in teaching practices of teachers who participated in a teacher development program and the participants underwent positive changes towards a more student-centered teaching. Opdenakker and Van Damme (2006) looked into the teaching styles of Dutch-speaking teachers under three categories: teacher, student, and content-centered teaching and according to the

results, effective teaching could be explained by good classroom management skills and a more learner-centered approach. Lueddeke (2003) explored different scholars' teaching approaches in terms of student and teacher-centeredness in the UK and according to the findings of the study, the academic disciplines, teaching qualifications and years of teaching experiences have an influence on teachers' teaching approach. In Türkiye, Altinyelken (2011) investigated primary school teachers' understanding, perception, and teaching practices of student-centered pedagogy and the study suggested that teachers in Türkiye should improve ways to adopt a student-centered approach that would suit the cultural context. Moreover, Aksoy et al., (2018) studied the teaching approaches regarding teacher and student-centeredness adopted by academics of education faculties in Türkiye and they concluded that the class size and the level of classes being taught informed the choices of teaching approaches the academics made.

Moreover, the relationship among the target language proficiency of teachers, their teaching methods and teaching practices was explored in previous research. For instance, teaching practices and EFL teachers' language proficiency were studied by Richards et al. (2013) and they found that teachers' language proficiency has an impact on their classroom management skills. Also, EFL teachers' choices of form-oriented and communication-oriented teaching practices were questioned in relation to their perceived language proficiency by Zhang (2019) and the study suggested that language proficiency affected teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, which in turn influenced their choice of communication-oriented practices in classroom. In Türkiye, teaching styles were found to be one of the factors determining the teaching success of geography teachers by Artvinli (2010) and according to the findings, the geography teachers adopt a more teacher-centered approach. Moreover, teachers' choices in

terms of teaching methods when presenting grammar at the secondary school level (Çakır & Kafa, 2013) and their study suggested that the participants used traditional teaching methods like Grammar Translation and Total Physical Response which are more teacher centered. Finally, teaching methods preferred by teachers at different levels (Okmen & Kılıc, 2016) were explored and they created a teaching methods scale with five subscales.



CHAPTER 3: METHODS

This chapter presents the methodology of this study, which includes research design, setting and participants, method of data collection, and method of data analysis.

The study aims to find out EFL teachers' self-assessed oral competency, teaching styles and approaches and the relationship between their oral competency and their teaching styles and teaching approaches. In this respect, the following questions are attempted to be answered in this study:

1. What are non-native EFL teachers' self-assessed oral competencies in relation to oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction?

1.1. Do their oral competencies differ based on:

- gender,
- age,
- years of teaching experience,
- field of the undergraduate degree,
- field of the graduate degree
- whether other foreign languages are spoken?

2. What teaching styles do these teachers adopt?

2.1. Do their teaching styles differ based on:

- gender,
- age,
- years of teaching experience,
- field of undergraduate degree,

- field of the graduate degree
 - whether other foreign languages are spoken?
3. What teaching approaches do they adopt in terms of student and teacher-centeredness?

3.1. Do their teaching approaches differ based on:

- gender,
 - age,
 - years of teaching experience,
 - field of the undergraduate degree,
 - field of the graduate degree,
 - whether other foreign languages are spoken?
4. Is there a relationship between
- their self-assessed oral competency in English and their teaching styles?
 - their self-assessed oral competency in English and their teaching approaches?

Research Design

The focus of this exploratory case study is non-native English-speaking EFL teachers' self-assessed oral competency in terms of comprehension, production, and interaction in English, their teaching style, and teaching approach in terms of student and teacher-centeredness. The study aims to discover the relationship of their oral competency in English with their teaching styles and with their teaching approaches. The group of EFL teachers as participants are currently teaching at one of the oldest and largest state universities of Türkiye located in Eskişehir. For the purposes of the study, a case study method was used because case study as a research method offers a better understanding of ideas by studying people in real situations instead of

representing people according to abstract theories and principles (Yin, 2009). Case studies are implemented when situations do not give themselves only to numerical analysis and when they require more than one tool and many sources of data and evidence (Cohen et al., 2017). In light of its characteristics, the case study method answers the needs of this study for numerous reasons. Firstly, self-assessment and self-perception of the teachers about their oral competency and aspects of their teaching, which is inquired via a questionnaire in this study, are to be better explained with the combination of both qualitative and quantitative data as advised when more reliable results from self-assessment tools are intended (Peterson, 2006). Another reason is the complex nature of language proficiency which is the sum of various competencies. The fact that it is hard to assess proficiency either with tests or self-assessment tools (Butler, 2004) highlights the need for it and its components to be studied in its own context by accounting for different factors when understanding it. Lastly, aspects of teaching are dependent on a mixture of various factors since teachers' choices might rely on consideration of different variables (Mladenovici et al., 2021) which cannot give themselves to mere numerical data analysis. Hence, the listed complexities of the focus areas of this research and the resulting need for support from diverse data tools called for a case study method as the method is described as a portrait of the richness of a context or situation (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995).

Since the study necessitates the investigation of the relationship among variables, correlational research design was also utilized. As it is the research design that is generally preferred to examine the connection between constants and in some cases extrapolate possible outcomes from the collected data (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). For this study, the correlational research design was used to delve into the

relationship between the variables, namely the relationship of teachers' oral competency (the independent variable) with their teaching styles (one of the dependent variables) and with their teaching approaches (the other dependent variable).

Setting and Participants

For the selection of the context, purposeful sampling where researchers choose their case according to a criterion for the purpose of the study (Johnson & Christen, 2014) was preferred. The criterion for this study was to choose a language school of a university in Türkiye that can represent the other English language preparatory schools of other universities in the country including their educational system, the profile of their teachers, and students. Thus, this state university was specifically chosen for this study because of the variety in the demographics of the teachers and the students. Those students and teachers come from different cities and different educational backgrounds and the fact that it is a state university promotes its inclusiveness of students from different families in terms of their socioeconomic status. Its reputation and its physical conditions (offices for teachers, technological equipment in the classrooms, a refectory, so on and so forth), academic opportunities (open education faculty, international exchange programs, so on and so forth) appeal to many teachers, which can as well be the reason for the attention from the students. The variety resulting from the aforementioned factors presents the school as a model with a high potential of representativeness of its many counterparts in Türkiye.

This tertiary educational context is one of the oldest and largest state universities in Türkiye. The university's official language of education is Turkish. However, at some of its faculties, the instruction is carried a hundred percent in English, at some faculties it is thirty, and yet in others, it is fully in Turkish. The

students, to study at fully English-mediated faculties, are obliged to pass an English language proficiency exam and if they fail, they are to be accepted to the English language preparatory school. The students, to study at other faculties, can voluntarily enroll in the school. The school employs approximately 180 English language teachers and every year nearly 2000 students for its English education program are accepted.

According to the education and exams regulations document presented on the school's website, general English is taught with an integrated program including four skills (speaking, writing, listening, and reading) and language areas (grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation). At the beginning of the school year, students are placed into their levels in English and the levels range from starter (A1 in the CEFR terms) to intermediate (B2). At the end of the school year, students are expected to pass a final exam, the scores of which determine their level of success in completing the language program in addition to the scores of the midterm exam, the quizzes, the tasks, and class participation. Following the final exams, students who have successfully completed the program are obliged to take a proficiency test. The decision about whether students can continue studying at their departments is made depending on two factors: their results from the proficiency test and their collected scores from the midterm and final exams, quizzes, tasks, and classroom participation. The passing score is reported on the school's website to be 60, which is again reported to be equivalent to a 72 total score from TOEFL IBT. 72 total score is announced by ETS (English Testing Service) as the lowest score for B2 in the CEFR terms (Papageorgiou et al., 2015). All the students including the ones studying at the preparatory program voluntarily and the ones whose faculty courses taught fully in English are supposed to reach the same level of B2 to pass the proficiency exam.

Currently, Turkish national teachers to be recruited to the positions at universities are expected to obtain exam results from YDS (a national standardized language exam) which tests language knowledge and reading comprehension of the test takers; as well as ALES (a national standardized test) which assesses the knowledge of Turkish language and basic mathematics skills of the test takers. Both tests are designed for people who either wish to enroll in universities for their master's and Ph.D. studies or want to work as teachers at universities in Türkiye. In addition to exam results, teachers' GPAs are taken into consideration when applicants are listed for the teaching position. Moreover, a face-to-face interview or a written exam is also a requirement. Their performance in these exams is another factor in the recruitment decision (T. C. Cumhurbaşkanlığı, 2018). With the new regulations imposed in 2018, one other requirement is to hold at least a master's degree with a thesis in a relevant area.

The sampling of the participants for this study was on a voluntary basis. All teachers in the school were approached and 90 teachers voluntarily answered the questionnaire. Their personal information is categorized and summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Personal Information

Characteristics	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Male	28	31.1
Female	62	68.9
Age		
26-30	2	2.2
31-35	24	26.7
36-40	23	25.6
41-45	23	25.6
46-50	12	13.3
51+	6	6.7
Years of Experience		
6-10 years	12	13.3
11-15 years	17	18.9

Characteristics	<i>n</i>	%
16-20 years	31	34.4
21+ years	30	33.3
Undergraduate Fields of Study		
Teaching English as a Foreign Language	67	74.4
English Language and Literature	9	10.0
American Culture and Literature	7	7.8
English Translation and Interpreting	4	4.4
English Linguistics	3	3.3
Master's Degree		
Teaching English as a Foreign Language	35	38.9
Other fields	38	42.2
None	17	18.9
Ph.D. Degree		
Teaching English as a Foreign Language	1	1.1
Other fields	11	12.2
None	78	86.7
At least one other language spoken		
Elementary and higher level	27	30.0
Others	63	70.0

As can be observed in the table, the participants vary in terms of gender, age, years of teaching experience, the undergraduate field of study. They also differ in terms of whether they hold a graduate degree and whether they speak any other foreign languages at the elementary or higher level.

Following the questionnaire, 11 teachers participated in one-to-one interviews voluntarily. Their personal information is demonstrated in Table 2.

Table 2

Personal Information

Characteristics	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Male	5	45.5
Female	6	54.5
Age		
26-30	1	9.1
31-35	6	54.5
36-40	1	9.1
41-45	3	27.3
Years of Experience		
6-10 years	5	45.5
11-15 years	2	18.2
16-20 years	3	27.3

Characteristics	<i>n</i>	%
21+ years	1	9.1
Undergraduate Fields of Study		
Teaching English as a Foreign Language	9	81.8
English Language and Literature	1	9.1
American Culture and Literature	1	9.1
Master's Degree		
Teaching English as a Foreign Language	3	27.3
Other fields	2	18.2
None	6	54.5
Ph.D. Degree		
Teaching English as a Foreign Language	-	-
Other fields	1	9.1
None	10	90.9
At least one other language spoken		
Elementary and higher level	5	45.5
Others	6	54.5

As can be observed in the tables above, the participants of the interview varied in terms of gender, years of teaching experience, and other languages spoken. However, the majority falls in the age range of 31-35, graduated from ELT departments holding no Ph.D. degree.

Method of Data Collection

To collect data, a questionnaire with different parts, a self-report data collection tool as suggested by Johnson and Christensen (2014), was utilized for the non-native English-speaking teachers to reflect on their oral competency in English, teaching styles, and approaches. A questionnaire is selected as the data collection tool for the purpose of learning about the characteristics of a group (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006), so it was used for a similar purpose in this study.

Following the questionnaire, the interview protocol was conducted with some of those teachers who volunteered to provide the researcher with better insights into their oral competency, teaching styles, and teaching approaches. Qualitative interviews, which are often preferred by quantitative researchers to support their data with more in-depth insights, help investigate beliefs, thoughts, knowledge,

motivation, and so on and so forth (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). Also, as interviews enable access to the inner world, they have the potential to offer invaluable information about complex constructs like competency and teaching.

Both the questionnaire and the interview protocol were conducted on a voluntary basis and the data collection process started after receiving the approval of Bilkent University's ethics committee and of the institution where the research was carried out. Following the approvals, the principal of the preparatory school was contacted to send an invitation and the link for the questionnaire to the teachers via an e-mail. The invitation e-mail briefly explained the purpose of the study, gave information about the researcher, and included a google forms link to the questionnaire.

The google forms document led to a message to the participants from the researcher (Appendix A). It informed the participants about the research by providing details about the research institution, the researcher, and the aim of the study. It also notified them about the number of questions and the time to be spent on the questionnaire. Moreover, the informed consent form communicated the confidentiality measures taken by the researcher. The participants were assured of the anonymity of their identity and their institution, the fact that the data would be kept on a computer under a password, and that the data would be shared only for scientific purposes at related conventions. They were also informed that their rights at the workplace would not be affected by the collected data, they could leave anytime and if they were interested in learning about the results, they would be contacted.

An invitation for the interview protocols to be conducted following the questionnaire was attached at the end of the questionnaire. Similar to the

questionnaire, the informed consent of the interviewees was sought at the beginning of the interview protocol, information about the goal of the study was reminded to the teachers, and the anonymity of their identity and their institution was assured.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire (Appendix B) consisted of two parts. The first part was about the demographics of the teachers, the second part was a combination of sets of questions. Part 2.1 (Appendix C) was created based on the CEFR self-assessment grid to delve into teachers' oral competency accompanying oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction in relation to research question 1. Part 2.2 (Appendix D) was an inventory developed by Grasha (2002) and used in this study to learn about teachers' teaching styles to answer research question 2. Part 2.3 (Appendix E) was an inventory created by (Trigwell et al., 2005) to investigate the approaches to teaching at tertiary level education, which was used for research question 3. The focus of the questions asked in the questionnaire can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3

Focus of the Questions

Sections	<i>n</i>
Personal information	8
Oral competency	24
Teaching Styles	40
Teaching Approaches	22
Total	94

As can be seen in Table 3, there were 94 items in total in the questionnaire and it took roughly 20-30 minutes to answer. None of its parts was translated into the participants' first language because translation requires a lot of resources to be spent on the process and even though the process is managed conscientiously, the risk of meaning losses is difficult to avoid (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009). In addition, because the participants were teachers of English and had been recruited on the basis of their

proficiency in English in the first place, the items of the questionnaire were assumed to be comprehended with ease by the teachers. Hence, instead of translation, the questionnaire was piloted to check if the items perform the job that they were created for as advised by Dörnyei and Taguchi (2009).

The first part of the questionnaire was designed to learn some personal information about the participants and consisted of 8 items. The information collected in this part was about the teachers' gender, age, years of teaching experience, the undergraduate field of study, and whether they hold a postgraduate degree. In addition, if they speak other languages and their perceived level of proficiency in that language were inquired. All the questions are multiple-choice questions, and some have "other" option in case there are options not included in the list of options, which can lower the quality of the questionnaire (Anderson & Arsenault, 1998).

Section 2.1 of the questionnaire (Appendix C) was created by the researcher based on the self-assessment grid provided by the Council of Europe as part of the Common European Framework (Council of Europe, 2020). The updated version of the self-assessment grid includes reception, production, interaction, and mediation sections. Under reception, oral comprehension, reading comprehension; under production, oral and written production; under interaction, oral interaction, written and online interaction; under mediation, mediating a text, concepts and communication are listed. For the purposes of this study, the language-related acts about oral competency including oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction sections were included in the questionnaire. The choice of including only the oral competency areas and using the self-assessment grid of the CEFR was made to improve the reliability of the tool in line with suggestions made by the literature.

Firstly, because the focus of self-assessment should be constrained to a more limited area questioned with can-do statements (Council of Europe, 2001; Brown et al., 2014) instead of focusing on the whole language proficiency only the parts related to oral competency were included and the can-do statements of the CEFR's self-assessment grid were used. Also, the CEFR self-assessment grid was chosen because the teachers in this study are familiar with it, which is important as being unfamiliar with the tool can result in less reliable outcomes (Council of Europe, 2001). Lastly, the identity of the participants was kept confidential so that they could feel relaxed and not threatened or judged about their answers to the questions as suggested by Borg and Edmett (2018). This information was explicitly shared with the participants in the consent form before their participation in the study.

The grid has statements for six levels which range from A1 (Breakthrough Level, the lowest level) to C2 (Mastery Level, the highest level) and for this study the statements at B2, C1, and C2 levels were included. The reason for including only these levels is that the teachers are expected to get at least 85 from the national language exam (YDS) (T. C. Cumhurbaşkanlığı, 2018). According to the equivalents table announced by ÖSYM (Center for assessment, selection and placement), 85 in YDS corresponds to 102 in TOEFL IBT, which corresponds to C1 in the CEFR. However, while TOEFL tests four skills (reading, speaking, writing, listening), YDS is only paper-based and mainly assesses competency in receptive skills, more specifically in reading rather than language production (Öğrenci Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi, 2021). The questions in YDS examine the knowledge of vocabulary or grammatical structures, the skills related to translation, reading comprehension, detecting odd-one-out structures, dialogue completion, and restatement. Hence, for the purposes of this study and more specifically for the self-

assessment of oral competency, the B2 level was found to be a better fit as the starting point.

The can-do statements provided by the self-assessment grid were itemized and checked with an expert who has a good understating of the CEFR as she had been trained by the CEFR experts who had written the CEFR and its companion volume. At first, the statements were broken into sentences with only one focus on a single construct, as it is advised to have one complete thought in the items of Likert-type scales (Anderson & Arsenault, 1998). For example, the following item under the oral interaction category for the C1 level was broken into two items. “I can use language flexibly and effectively for social and professional purposes.” was turned into “I can use language flexibly and effectively for social purposes.” and “I can use language flexibly and effectively for professional purposes.”. At the end of the process of listing items, the questionnaire consisted of 13 items for oral comprehension, 12 items for oral production, and 20 items for oral interaction, which in total adds up to 46 items.

After the revision and review by the expert in the fields of education and the CEFR, the number of items was reduced to 24 in total by merging some items together or grouping some under the same sentence stem. For example, the following two items from the self-assessment grid under the oral comprehension category for B2 level were merged into one: “I can understand most TV news.” and “I can understand most current affairs programmes.”. The first reason for the action is TV news and current affairs programmes are very similar in content and the language to be comprehended can be very similar. Also, too much reading easily discourages the respondents (Fraenkel et al., 2012), so to reduce the reading load, the items with very closely related content were merged into one as “I can understand most TV news and

current affairs programmes.”. In addition, some items were grouped under the same stem to raise the quality of reading for the respondents because it is important that the items are not too time-consuming but easy to read (Fraenkel et al., 2012). For example, the previously mentioned items “I can use language flexibly and effectively for social purposes.” and “I can use language flexibly and effectively for professional purposes.” use the same sentence stem so they are grouped together as follows:

“I can use language flexibly and effectively

a) for social purposes

b) for professional purposes”

Also, some items were found to be ambiguous, and the ambiguity was eliminated by either adding up some words or when impossible to make them clearer, some items were deleted. For example, one item under oral interaction for C1 Level which is “I can relate my contribution skillfully to others.” was found to be ambiguous, which needs to be avoided to improve the reliability of the items (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009). The revised item was “I can relate my contribution during a conversation skillfully and meaningfully to others’ contribution.” Lastly, the item for interaction in C2 Level which is “If I do have a problem, I can backtrack smoothly that other people are hardly aware of it” was eliminated for two reasons. Firstly, the word choice could create problems for the respondents since “backtrack” could be too technical, which reduces the quality of the items (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009). Secondly, the reason why it was eliminated rather than made clearer is that the next item “If I do have a problem, I can restructure around the difficulty so smoothly that other people are hardly aware of it.” in a way serves the same purpose as the deleted item did.

At the end of the revision, the number of items was reduced to 24. For oral comprehension, there are 6 items: 3 for B2 Level, 2 for C1 Level, and 1 for C2 Level. There are 7 items for oral production but 4 of them have two subcategories and 1 has 3. 2 items are for B2 Level, 2 items are for B1 Level and 3 items are for C2 Level. For oral interaction, there are 11 items but two of the questions have two subcategories. 2 items are for B2 Level, 4 items for C1 and 5 for C2 Level. The distribution of the items is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Distribution of Items for Oral Competency

Oral Competency	Oral Comprehension			Oral Production			Oral Interaction		
Level	B2	C1	C2	B2	C1	C2	B2	C1	C2
<i>n</i>	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	4	5
Total	6			7			11		

As can be seen in the table, the questionnaire had 24 items with three subscales. Five-point Likert scale was preferred which ranges as follows: 1 (never), 2 (seldom), 3 (about half the time), 4 (usually), 5 (always).

Section 2.2 of the questionnaire (Appendix D) is the Teaching Style Inventory (TSI) developed by Grasha (2002). It is a forty-item questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale which ranges as follows: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (somewhat disagree), 3 (neither agree or disagree), 4 (somewhat agree), and 5 (strongly agree). The teaching styles are grouped under five main classes: (1) Expert, (2) Formal Authority, (3) Personal Model, (4) Facilitator, and (5) Delegator. Each teaching style has eight items related to teachers' teaching preferences and the number of items for each teaching style is shown in Table 5.

Table 5*Item Numbers of Teaching Style Inventory*

Teaching Style	Item Numbers
Expert Style	1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26, 31, 36
Formal Authority Style	2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27, 32, 37
Personal Model Style	3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28, 33, 38
Facilitator Style	4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34, 39
Delegator Style	5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40

The reliability coefficient value is reported to be .75 for Expert, 0.80 for Formal Authority, .66 for Personal Model, 0.84 for Facilitator, .70 for Delegator and .85 for the whole scale (Grasha, 2002). The scale was previously translated into Turkish and the reliability coefficient score for the inventory has been reported as .87 and the internal consistency coefficient as .91 (Süral & Sarıtaş, 2010).

Some of the inventory's items were adapted to the context of this study as the inventory was originally created for the use of the teaching of any subject, not necessarily English. For example, item 3 for Personal Model Style, "What I say and do models appropriate ways for students to think about issues in the content." was rewritten as "What I say and do models appropriate ways for students to think about learning English." Since language classes are not delivered in the form of lectures, the word 'content' was specified for reasons of transparency in meaning as 'learning English' which is the overarching content area for language classes. Also, some items were found difficult to understand by the participants in the pilot study, so some words were replaced to make the items much clearer. For instance, item 29 for Facilitator Style, "I solicit student advice about how and what to teach in this course." was changed into "I ask for student advice about how and what to teach in my classes."

The last section, 2.3 is the Approaches to Teaching Inventory (ATI) (Trigwell & Prosser, 1996) (Appendix E). The recent version of the inventory (ATI-R)

(Trigwell et al., 2005) has 22 items with two-factor structures which are Concept Change/ Student-Focused (CCSF) and Information Transmission/ Teacher-Focused (ITTF). It is a five-point Likert-type scale with answers as follows: 1 (only rarely true for me), 2 (sometimes true for me), 3 (about half the time true for me), 4 (frequently true for me), 5 (almost always true for me). 11 of the items are formed to measure teacher-oriented approach and the other 11 are for student-oriented approach (Trigwell et al., 2005). The number of items for each sub-construct is shown in Table 6.

Table 6

Item Numbers of Approaches to Teaching Inventory

Approach to Teaching	Item Numbers
Concept Change/ Student-Focused (CCSF)	3, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21
Information Transmission/ Teacher-Focused (ITTF)	1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 19, 22

The scale has been tested in universities in the UK, the USA, Hong Kong, and Scandinavia with teachers teaching a range of subjects (Cassidy & Ahmad, 2021). The reported Cronbach's alpha values for CCSF are .86 and for ITTF, .83 (Trigwell et al., 2005). For Türkiye, the overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient value is reported as .81, for ITTF as .93, and for CCSF as .87 (Tezci, 2016).

Since the Approaches to Teaching Inventory was created for the use of tertiary level education in general, some items are generic so that they can be inclusive of any tertiary level classes regardless of the field. Thus, some of those items were adapted for the context of the study. For example, in item 7 for CCSF "I encourage students to restructure their existing knowledge in terms of the new way of thinking about the subject that they will develop.", the word 'subject' was replaced with 'the language' since it is what students are trying to develop in language classes.

For each sub-section of section 2, Cronbach's alpha values were calculated since the value reflects the internal reliability of the items (Gardner, 1995). The calculation can produce valuable information about the items as internal reliability of the items shows whether a set of items which are generated for the measurement of the same outcome are able to produce similar results in the context of the study (Taber, 2017). The results for three constructs of the study are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients of the Questionnaire

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha Values
Oral Competency	.97
Oral Comprehension	.86
Oral Production	.95
Oral Interaction	.92
Teaching Styles	.92
Expert	.69
Formal Authority	.74
Personal Model	.80
Facilitator	.76
Delegator	.70
Teaching Approaches	.87
ITTF	.82
CCSF	.84

As can be seen in the table, the results are closer to one which is the highest value to be obtained in the analysis. Although multiple studies in varying fields accept different ranges as desirable according to Taber's analysis (2017), a value higher than .50 is mostly seen as an acceptable result. Hence, the high values showed the scales of the questionnaire have internal reliability, which means the items measuring the same construct agreed with each other in producing similar results in the context of this study.

The Interviews

The semi-structured interviews (Appendix G) with volunteering teachers followed the questionnaire to further explore teachers' oral competency, teaching

styles, and teaching approaches. Semi-structured interviews, in which the topics have a less tight format, were used because they allow customization with the individualized probes following the questions (Roulston & Choi, 2018). The purpose is to collect insightful data which can help interpret the quantitative data collected from the questionnaires and semi-structured interviews can enable a more individualized inquiry and hence more individualized data in the end.

The interview questions were piloted to check their ability to produce meaningful answers to the research questions as recommended (Roulston & Choi, 2018). After the pilot study, follow-up questions were added to questions 6 and 8 which are about the teaching styles and approaches. The follow-up questions were about the factors affecting their choice of the regarded areas and changes in their way of teaching depending on the teaching content. Those follow-up questions were added because they were mentioned by both participants in the pilot study and because they produced insightful details about the matter.

Interviews were conducted face-to-face in English and before the interview, their consent was sought after necessary information about the interview was provided to the participants in the consent letter (Appendix F). Although the interview was conducted in English, as it is advised, to provide participants with a means of articulation that they feel comfortable with (Roulston & Choi, 2018), they were allowed to code-switch between languages.

11 teachers participated in the interview protocol. Each interview roughly lasted 30-40 minutes on average. The sessions were recorded and transcribed later on and the transcriptions produced 73.625 words in total.

The Pilot Study

Before implementing the questionnaire and conducting the interview, the questions were piloted as they offer opportunities to remedy any problems related to the questions and the procedure (Fraenkel et al., 2012). 30 teachers working at similar state universities in Türkiye answered the questions in the questionnaire and provided feedback regarding the clarity of the items and the time spent answering. At the end of the study, it was understood that answering the questionnaire took at least 15 minutes. Also, some items were fine-tuned for clarity according to the participants' feedback.

Two teachers who work at a state university in Türkiye participated in the piloting process of the interviews. Both interviews took between 30-40 minutes. The questions were mostly found to be clear enough. At the end of the pilot, some follow-up questions were added to some of the original interview questions. Minor changes to the questions in the questionnaire and the interview were done as discussed in the previous section.

Method of Data Analysis

The Questionnaire

After the data from the questionnaires were collected, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 22.0) was used for the analysis of the data. Before analyzing the data from the questionnaires, firstly, Cronbach's alpha value was calculated for the questionnaire to see the consistency of scores in the context of the study. Secondly, to understand the oral competency of teachers, their teaching styles, and teaching approaches, in other words, to answer research questions 1, 2, and 3, descriptive statistics procedures were adopted.

In addition, the personal information of the participants was used as categories to present more meaningful data regarding the first three research questions. Hence, the teachers' self-assessed oral competency, teaching styles, and teaching approaches were further analyzed to identify possible significant differences between or among different groups of categorical variables such as (i) gender, (ii) age, (iii) years of teaching experience, (iv) field of the undergraduate degree, (v) field of the graduate degree, (vi) whether other foreign languages are spoken. For five of the categorical variables, independent samples t-tests and Mann Whitney U tests were conducted for each. However, only for the years of teaching experience, One-way ANOVA and Kruskal Wallis tests were used because the answers about the years of teaching experience category produced three main groups for the classification of the participants. In other words, there were three levels in the categorical variable of years of teaching experience.

Thirdly, to examine the statistical relationship between the self-assessed oral competency and the teaching styles; and the teaching approaches in relation to research question 4, Multiple Pearson Correlation analysis was utilized. The self-assessed oral competency operated as the dependent variable whereas the teaching style and teaching approach performed as two separate independent variables.

Underlying assumptions were checked before choosing the right tool to use for the analysis since the cases where assumptions are violated cause a negative effect on Type I and Type II errors (Osborne & Waters, 2002). Firstly, for most of the statistical procedures, the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variances are required to be checked (Hayes & Cai, 2007). One way of checking normality is running descriptive statistics to check kurtosis and skewness (Garson, 2012). Based on descriptive analysis of Kurtosis and skewness, and Shapiro-Wilk

test of normality, which is among the best tests to use when checking the normality (Aslam, 2021), the researcher decided which parametric and non-parametric tests to use as shown in Table 8.

Table 8

Tests Used for Dependent Variables

Dependent variables	Tests used
Oral Competency	Non-parametric tests (Mann Whitney U & Kruskal Wallis)
Oral Comprehension	Non-parametric tests (Mann Whitney U & Kruskal Wallis)
Oral Production	Non-parametric tests (Mann Whitney U & Kruskal Wallis)
Oral Interaction	Non-parametric tests (Mann Whitney U & Kruskal Wallis)
Expert Style	Parametric tests (One-sample T-test & ANOVA)
Formal Authority Style	Parametric tests (One-sample T-test & ANOVA)
Personal Model Style	Non-parametric tests (Mann Whitney U & Kruskal Wallis)
Facilitator Style	Parametric tests (One-sample T-test & ANOVA)
Delegator Style	Parametric tests (One-sample T-test & ANOVA)
ITTF (Information Transmission Teacher-Focused)	Parametric tests (One-sample T-test & ANOVA)
CCSF (Conceptual Change Student-Focused)	Parametric tests (One-sample T-test & ANOVA)

As presented in the table, for five of the dependent variables, non-parametric tests were used because the assumption of normality was not met according to results obtained from the Shapiro-Wilk test. For years of teaching experience categorical variable because that category had three groups while Kruskal Wallis test was used, for the remaining categorical variables because those categories had two groups, Mann Whitney test was used.

As to check homogeneity of variances, the most popular test used is Levene's test (Garson, 2012). When the test produces a p -value higher than .05, it is assumed that the variances have homogeneity. In this study, before the t-test and ANOVA analyses, Levene's test results were checked, and p values were mostly observed to be higher than .05. There were few cases in t-tests where the value was lower than .05, then the second row, which shows the values to be used in such cases, was used. For ANOVA analyses, all the tests which required a post-hoc test met the assumption of equal variances, hence Tukey's post-hoc test was chosen because it can work better when there are equal variances (Ruxton & Beauchamp, 2008).

For Pearson correlation analysis the assumptions to be met are (1) data from a random or representative sample, (2) continuous and normally distributed variables with linear relationship, (3) no relevant outliers (Schober, Boer & Schwarte, 2018). In this study, before the analysis was conducted, normality was checked with Skewness and Kurtosis values. Scatterplots can be used to check non-linearity between variables (Garson, 2012), so they were used to establish linearity between the variables in this study. For outliers, boxplots were used to check outliers because they can work well to detect outliers in data (Sim, Gan & Chang, 2005). At the end of the examinations, it was found that all the assumptions were met to be able to do a Pearson correlation analysis. The analyses used and the assumptions checked are demonstrated in Table 9.

Table 9

Statistical Analyses and Assumptions

Research Question	Analyses	Assumptions
RQ 1, 2, 3	Descriptive Statistics	
RQ 1.1, 2.1, 3.1	Independent Samples T-test, One-way ANOVA	Normality, Equality of Variances
RQ 4. i, 4. ii	Multiple Pearson Correlation Analysis	Normality, Linearity, Outliers

As the table shows, both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze data. Before applying any tests, the necessary assumptions were checked to assure the conditions were met to use them.

The Interviews

For the data collected from the interviews, after the recordings of the sessions were transcribed, content analysis was applied to analyze the data. The data was collected through the questions which are based on a self-assessment grid and inventories. Hence, a deductive approach when analyzing the content was adopted since it is used when there is a theory or model, and its focus starts from general and shifts to specific (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008).

The analysis of the qualitative data was conducted in line with the sequential process suggested by Dey (1993). The process starts with data collected from the participants and then continues by describing the context-dependent meanings that guide the later steps of the process. To illustrate, in the context of this study, the CEFR being one of the frameworks of the study and the participants who work as EFL teachers led the way when making sense of the concepts. Oral competency, hence, referred to EFL teachers' overall capabilities in comprehending oral input, producing oral outcomes, and interacting with others orally in English. Once the meanings are made clear, the classification stage where data would be navigated through the meaning blocks takes place. Table 10 shows a map of concepts provided by the framework which were used as categories in the classification stage.

Table 10

Priori List for Oral Competency

Main Categories of Oral Competency	Sub-category One	Sub-category Two
1. Oral Comprehension	1.1.General Comments	-
	1.2.Announcements	-

Main Categories of Oral Competency	Sub-category One	Sub-category Two
2. Oral Production	1.3.Media	1.3.1. Live Events 1.3.2. Recorded Content 1.3.3. TV 1.3.4. Movie 1.3.5. Radio 1.3.6. Music 1.3.7. Theatre Plays
	1.4.Listening for Different Purposes	1.4.1. Gist 1.4.2. Details 1.4.3. Specific Information 1.4.4. Implications
	1.5.Lectures & Meetings	-
	1.6.Overheard & Informal Talks	-
	2.1.General Comments	-
	2.2.Addressing Audiences	2.2.1. Announcements 2.2.2. Lectures 2.2.3. Meetings 2.2.4. Presentations
	2.3.Experience Sharing	-
	2.4.Putting a Case	-
	2.5.Entertainment	-
	2.6.After Rehearsals & Preparation	-
	2.7.Spontaneous	-
	3.1.General Comments	-
	3.2.Formal Conversations	3.2.1. Negotiation 3.2.2. Interviews 3.2.3. Debates
	3.3.Informal & Casual Talks	-
	3.4.Co-planning	-
	3.5.Transaction of Goods	-
	3.6.Different Interlocutors	3.6.1. Students 3.6.2. Native Speakers 3.6.3. Non-native Speakers
3. Oral Interaction		

As can be seen in the table, the framework of oral competency had already suggested (1) oral comprehension, (2) oral production, and (3) oral interaction as the main categories. In addition, there were further sub-categories produced from the framework, for example, (1) ‘oral comprehension’ is the main category and (1.3) ‘media’ is one sub-category which emphasizes the ability to make sense of oral input in the form of media. ‘Media’, then, is further divided into (1.3.1) ‘live events’,

(1.3.2) ‘recorded content’, (1.3.3) ‘TV’, (1.3.4) ‘movie’, (1.3.5) ‘radio’, (1.3.6) ‘music’, and (1.3.7) ‘theatre plays’. The first round of analysis was carried out with the priori list in Table 10 once codes were assigned to each category and subcategory to ease the data analysis process. A sample of analysis of the responses about oral comprehension with the priori list is shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Sample of Analysis with the Priori List of Oral Comprehension

Responses	Codes
myself as a very competent listener when it comes to oral comprehension.	
public announcements ... even if I do not understand everything, ...	
... when I listen for the main idea or for the details , info, etc.	
... for lectures , I can say because I was familiar with the content ...	
Movies can be sometimes, uh, problematic, especially if I'm not familiar ...	
if it's an overheard conversation , I don't know, it's something less formal ..	

Note. G=General, ANN=Announcements, L_D_PURP_DTL=Listening for Different Purposes (Details), LCTR=Lecture, MED_MVIE=Media (Movie), OVRH=Overheard Conversations.

As shown in the table, the list worked well when classifying data with the codes assigned for each category and subcategory suggested by the framework. For example, (1.4) ‘listening for different purposes’ is a subcategory of (1) oral comprehension and (1.4.2) listening for details was a subcategory of listening for different purposes. Hence, the code assigned, which was ‘L_D_PURP_DTL’, made reference to those subcategories.

Once the first round of analysis was completed, the researcher stated to interpret data and go into detail as suggested (Patton, 2002). When attempting at a more detailed analysis, two main sources directed the process. Firstly, research

questions proposed another criterion added to the categories since research questions should always serve as a compass when analyzing (Maxwell, 2013). Hence, to show participants' perception of their competency, subcategories were added which were: high, challenged, varies, improved, and worsening. The new subcategories were applied to all responses about oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction to answer the research questions. Hence, the second round of analysis was carried out in reference to the research questions.

In addition, the data necessitated further analysis as layers of content are likely to be added to the data derived from the specific context of the study depending on the researcher's interpretation (Babbie, 2010; Kibiswa, 2019). As a result, new subcategories emerged, and they were added depending on the patterns observed in the participants' answers since their answers mentioned reasons, conditions, evidence and study skills and strategies in relation to their perceived oral competencies. Thus, the third round of analysis was carried out with the new addition to the list of subcategories. The emerging categories after the second and third rounds of analysis are shown in Table 12.

Table 12

Emerging List of Categories for Oral Competency

Round of Analysis	Emerging Categories Used
Second Round of Analysis	Perception of Their Oral Competency High Challenged Varies Improved Worsening
Third Round of Analysis	Reason Condition Evidence Study Skills & Strategies

As given in the table, the second round of analysis was carried out with subcategory of ‘the perception of their oral competency’ and the third round of analysis was completed with a list of subcategories which included ‘reason’, ‘condition’, ‘evidence’ and ‘study skills & strategies’. All these subcategories were applied when analyzing the answers related to oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction.

Then, the list used in the third round of analysis was further enhanced based on the commonalities in the participants’ answers and the interpretations by the researcher. In other words, there were frequent answers that were given in relation to the following subcategories: ‘reason’, ‘condition’, ‘evidence’ and ‘study skills & strategies’. For example, ‘unfamiliar accent’ was repeatedly shown as a reason for challenges faced in oral comprehension. Hence, with these further additions, another round of analysis, the fourth round, was completed according to the emerging patterns in the answers.

In the end, all the further sub-categories, each with an assigned code, were applied to all the answers related to oral competencies. One example of the list shows the reasons given for the movie sub-category in Table 13.

Table 13

Emerging Categories and Codes for the Sub-category ‘Movie’ (Sample)

Codes in Third Round	Categories in Fourth Round	Codes in Fourth Round
MED_MVIE_H_REA	Possible to rewind	RWND
MED_MVIE_H_REA	Familiarity with the plot	FMLR_PLOT
MED_MVIE_H_REA	Contextual Clues	CNTX_CL
MED_MVIE_CHL_REA	Unfamiliar Content	UNF_CN
MED_MVIE_CHL_REA	Unfamiliar Accent	UNF_ACC

Note. MED=Media, MVIE=Movie, H=High, CHL=Challenged, REA=Reason

As can be seen in the table, there were some reasons for high competency in oral comprehension in relation to media in the form of movies as well as challenges

faced. One example of coding the data about oral comprehension is given in Table 14.

Table 14

Sample of Analysis with Emerging Categories for Oral Comprehension

 Yes, actually changes, so I have some reasons for that actually, for example, if you remember, the guy, **I watched the TV series “Afterlife” and I couldn't understand anything without subtitles**, not even a sentence, but for that I have my reasons ... for example, **their accent was very different**, so I couldn't understand it. **there was a lot of black humor and I'm not familiar with that...** but it changes... **Last week I watched 2 movies**, for example, The Truman Show and Forrest Gump and **everything was great**, I didn't need any subtitles, I just watched, and I understood everything.





Codes in Third Round	Categories in Fourth Round	Codes in Fourth Round
1. MED_TV_CHLNG_EVI		
2. MED_TV_CHLNG_COND	Accent & No Subtitles	ACCNT & N_SUBT
3. MED_TV_CHLNG_COND	Unfamiliar Content & No Subtitles	UNF_CN & N_SBT
4. MED_MVIE_H_EVI		

Note. MED=Media, MVIE=Movie, H=High, CHL=Challenged, EVI=Evidence,

COND=Condition

As can be observed in the table, both the categories derived from the framework and emerged from the research questions as well as the researcher's interpretations were used for the analysis. A similar procedure was followed for the data about teaching styles and teaching approaches inventories. The first round of analysis was done with the priori lists for teaching style (Appendix H) and teaching approaches (Appendix I) provided by the frameworks. Further rounds were conducted with the categories emerged from the data (Appendix J).

Participants were also asked about the relationship between their oral competency and teaching styles, and between their oral competency and teaching approaches. For the data analysis related to this question, a different approach was adopted since there was no framework for the relationships. Hence, there were only categories emerging from the participants' answers, which are shown in Table 15.

Table 15

List of Categories Emerged from the Data for the Relationship

Level of Categories	Categories Emerged
Main category	Oral Competency & Teaching Styles Oral Competency & Teaching Approaches
Sub-categories in First Round	Relationship No relationship Not sure
Sub-categories in Second Round	Reason Evidence

As the table suggests, first the teachers' answers were categorized according to their thoughts about the relationship. Then, reasons or evidence they provide were categorized accordingly. Also, further sub-categories were added depending on the details they give about the relationship.

The final step of data analysis requires measures taken to ensure the trustworthiness of the analysis. Hence, the analysis was peer-checked later on to improve its reliability of the analysis as suggested by Johnson and Christensen (2014). The first meeting was held after the first round of analysis was completed according to the categories and codes suggested by the frameworks. At the end of the meeting, a possible list of additional categories for the second and third round of analyses was agreed on. The second meeting was held after the second and third rounds of analyses were carried out. In order to eliminate discrepancies in the

analyses, some confusing comments were classified together. In the end, it was made sure the codes and categories assigned to the comments matched.



CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

In this chapter, the results of the data analysis are provided with reference to the research questions by accounting for both quantitative and qualitative data. The questionnaire was used to learn about oral competency, teaching style, and teaching approach, and the data collected were analyzed under those sections. In addition, the interview data was used for further investigation of the three constructs, and the results collected from the interviews are shared in the following sections after the presentation of the data from the questionnaire. Lastly, the analysis of the relationship between constructs is explained with the findings from the statistical analysis and from the interviews.

Self-Assessed Oral Competency

The first research question delves into the EFL teachers' self-assessed oral competencies in relation to oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction. To answer this question, the teachers' answers to the questionnaire were analyzed along with the interview data collected from the participants. The numerical data collected from the questionnaire was further investigated to pinpoint any significant differences among the teachers regarding the following categories: (i) gender, (ii) age, (iii) years of teaching experience, (iv) field of the undergraduate degree, (v) field of the graduate degree, (vi) whether other foreign languages are spoken.

Findings from the Questionnaire

For oral competency, the can-do descriptions from the CEFR self-assessment grid were itemized. The range of answers for each item in this section is as follows: 5

(always), 4 (usually), 3 (about half the time), 2 (seldom), and 1 (never). There are 24 items for the overall oral competency which include 6 items for oral comprehension, 7 items for oral production, and 11 items for oral interaction subscales. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the mean and standard deviation scores for the items. Firstly, the mean and standard deviation scores were calculated for the overall oral competency and then they were calculated for the items of the three subscales which are oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction. The results are presented in Table 16.

Table 16

Descriptive Statistics for Oral Competency (N=90)

Construct	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Oral Competency	4.35	0.44
Oral Comprehension	4.38	0.49
Oral Production	4.37	0.48
Oral Interaction	4.30	0.47

The results of the descriptive analysis indicated that overall teachers perceive their oral competence to be high with a mean of 4.35 ($SD = 0.44$) out of 5. The low score of standard deviation demonstrated there was an agreement among the teachers in terms of their self-assessment of oral competence. From the subscales of oral competency, the oral comprehension subscale had the highest mean of 4.38 ($SD = 0.49$), whereas oral production was a close second with a mean of 4.37 ($SD = 0.48$). The oral interaction subscale received the lowest mean score of 4.30 ($SD = 0.47$). The results represented that when it comes to understanding and producing utterances, the participants assessed their performance to be better than their performance during their engagement in a reciprocal action either as a speaker or listener.

The results were further analysed to see if there is a statistically significant difference among different groups of participants. For this purpose, as the normality

assumption for oral competency was not met, non-parametric tests were used to see possible significant differences among groups. The Mann Whitney U test results are presented in Table 17.

Table 17

Mann Whitney U Test Results for Oral Competency

Groups	<i>n</i>	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender					
Male	28	52.29	1464.00	678.000	.098
Female	62	42.44	2631.00		
Age					
26-40	49	45.88	2248.00	986.000	.881
41+	41	45.05	1847.00		
Undergraduate Field of Study					
ELT	67	42.19	2826.50	548.500	.040
Others	23	55.15	1268.50		
Field of master's degree					
ELT	35	32.59	1140.50	510.500	.088
None	38	41.07	1560.50		
Other languages spoken					
At least 1 ^a	27	54.26	1465.00	614.000	.037
Others	63	41.75	2630.00		

^a The category reflects teachers who speak at least one other foreign language at elementary or higher levels.

As presented in the table, the results showed significant differences in the groups of two categorical variables which are undergraduate field of study and whether at least another foreign language is spoken at elementary or higher levels. The teacher who graduated from the ELT department ($M = 4.30$, $SD = 0.45$) rated their oral competency significantly lower than the ones graduated from other departments ($M = 4.52$, $SD = 0.36$); ($U = 678.000$, $p = .040$). In addition, the teachers who know at least another foreign language at elementary or higher levels ($M = 4.49$, $SD = 0.45$) rated their oral competency higher than the ones who do not speak another

foreign language at least at elementary level ($M = 4.29$, $SD = 0.43$); ($U = 614.000$, $p = .037$).

A Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to check if there are any significant differences among three groups of the years of teaching experience. The results, however, suggested the three different experience groups did not rate their oral competency significantly different from each other ($\chi^2(2) = .839$, $p = .657$).

The first subscale of oral competency was the oral comprehension subscale with six items that describe three levels of competency based on the CEFR. The first three items were listed at B2 Level, the next two items were at C1 Level, and the last item was at C2 Level. For each item, the mean and standard deviation scores are presented in Table 18.

Table 18

Oral Comprehension Subscale of Oral Competency (N=90)

Item Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. I can understand extended talk and lectures and follow even complex lines of argument provided the topic is reasonably familiar. (B2)	4.60	0.54
2. I can understand most TV news and current affairs programs. (B2)	4.44	0.62
3. I can understand the majority of films in standard language. (B2)	4.58	0.60
4. I can understand extended talk even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signalled explicitly. (C1)	4.17	0.69
5. I can understand television programmes and films without too much effort. (C1)	4.39	0.65
6. I have no difficulty in understanding any kind of oral language live or broadcast even when delivered at fast natural speed, provided time to get familiar with the accent. (C2)	4.11	0.69

The mean scores displayed in the table ranged from 4.11 ($SD = 0.69$) to 4.60 ($SD = 0.54$) out of 5, which suggested that the teachers assessed their comprehension to be more than average. For the items in B2 level, the teachers assessed their level of comprehension as higher when they are to understand complex arguments related to familiar topics ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.54$), films when they are in the standard language ($M = 4.58$, $SD = 0.60$), TV shows, and current affairs programs in general ($M = 4.44$,

$SD = 0.62$). For the items in C1 Level, the mean scores were lower. However, the answers to the first question in C1 Level demonstrated that the teachers could understand the films and programmes without too much struggle ($M = 4.39$, $SD = 0.65$), which showed higher results than when they are to understand less structured talks with the ideas lacking clear relationships ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 0.69$). The scores for the last item generated for C2 Level suggested that teachers perceived their comprehension level to be comparatively lower when the content is delivered at a faster speed with an accent that requires time to get used to ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 0.69$).

Further analysis was conducted to see the differences among the groups. As the normality of the data was not met, Mann Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis tests were used. The Mann Whitney U test results are shown in Table 19.

Table 19

Mann Whitney U Test Results for Oral Comprehension

Groups	<i>n</i>	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender					
Male	28	53.48	1494.50	664.000	.049
Female	62	42.44	2597.50		
Age					
26-40	49	47.96	2350.00	884.000	.324
41+	41	42.56	1745.00		
Undergraduate Field of Study					
ELT	67	42.72	2862.50	584.500	.035
Others	23	53.59	1232.50		
Field of master's degree					
ELT	35	32.03	1121.00	491.000	.052
None	38	41.58	1580.00		
Other languages spoken					
At least 1 ^a	27	54.74	1478.00	601.000	.027
Others	63	41.54	2617.00		

^a The category reflects teachers who speak at least one other foreign language at elementary or higher levels.

As can be seen in the table, age, gender, or field of master's degree did not play a role when it comes to oral comprehension. However, the teachers with a BA degree in ELT ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.50$) showed significantly lower scores in the comprehension subscale than the ones who graduated from other departments ($M = 4.54$, $SD = 0.41$); ($U = 584.500$, $p = .035$). This might mean that the teachers with BA degrees related to teaching found themselves less competent in making sense of oral input. Also, the ones who spoke at least another foreign language at elementary or higher levels ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 0.43$) showed a significant difference from the others, which meant the former had significantly higher scores than the latter ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 0.49$) in comprehension subscale ($U = 601.000$, $p = .027$). This showed that the teachers who can speak another language at a certain level perceived their performance in oral comprehension better than the one who do not speak other languages.

For the other categorical variable, namely years of experience, a Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted. The results, however, suggested no statistically significant difference among the means of the groups ($\chi^2(2) = .983$, $p = .612$).

The second subscale of the oral competency was oral production with seven items but five of the items had sub-categories giving details about the conditions related to the actions. The first two items were iterated for B2 Level, the third item with three sub-categories was for C1 Level, and the last four items were for C2 Level. For each item, the mean and standard deviation scores are displayed in Table 20.

Table 20*Oral Production Subscale of Oral Competency (N=90)*

Item Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
7. I can present clear and detailed descriptions on a wide range of subjects related to my field of interest. (B2)	4.50	0.55
8. I can explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various opinions. (B2)	4.56	0.58
9. I can present clear descriptions of complex subjects... (C1)		
a) integrating sub-themes.	4.30	0.61
b) developing particular points.	4.24	0.66
c) rounding off with an appropriate conclusion.	4.33	0.67
10. I can present a clear argument... (C2)		
a) in a style appropriate to the context.	4.24	0.69
b) with an effective logical structure that helps the recipient notice and remember significant points.	4.39	0.67
11. I can present a smoothly flowing argument... (C2)		
a) in a style appropriate to the context.	4.24	0.68
b) with an effective logical structure that helps the recipient notice and remember significant points.	4.43	0.60
12. I can present a clear description... (C2)		
a) in a style appropriate to the context.	4.40	0.60
b) with an effective logical structure that helps the recipient notice and remember significant points.	4.43	0.58
13. I can present a smoothly flowing description... (C2)		
a) in a style appropriate to the context.	4.36	0.59
b) with an effective logical structure that helps the recipient notice and remember significant points.	4.41	0.60

As the findings suggested, teachers scored their oral production higher than average in all three levels. The highest mean scores fell into the group of items stated for B2 Level. The answers indicated that teachers could produce speech related to their interest ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 0.55$) by explaining the advantages and disadvantages related to the subject, which had the highest mean score ($M = 4.56$, $SD = 0.58$). The results mean that teachers feel most competent when talking about familiar topics and when they have to expand on the negative and positive sides of subjects. The item in C1 Level about presenting their opinions clearly about difficult subjects with supporting ideas received the lowest score with a mean of 4.24 ($SD = 0.66$), which showed teachers struggle more when they need to support their ideas about complex

subjects with clarity. The other lowest scores landed on two items in C2 Level with the same mean of 4.24, which are about giving clear ($SD = 0.69$) and smoothly flowing arguments ($SD = 0.68$) both in an appropriate style. This result showed that teachers felt their performance is poorer when defending their stance about a topic in a way that is accurate to the context.

The results were investigated across different categories of the participants to see if there was any statistically significant difference among the participants' oral production scores. T-test analysis was used to calculate the difference as shown in Table 21.

Table 21

Mann Whitney U Test Results for Oral Production

Groups	<i>n</i>	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender					
Male	28	52.79	1478.00	664.000	.074
Female	62	42.21	2617.00		
Age					
26-40	49	43.96	2155.00	930.000	.544
41+	41	47.32	1940.00		
Undergraduate Field of Study					
ELT	67	42.11	2821.50	543.500	.035
Others	23	55.37	1273.50		
Field of master's degree					
ELT	35	33.86	1185.00	555.000	.222
None	38	39.89	1516.00		
Other languages spoken					
At least 1 ^a	27	52.74	1424.00	655.000	.084
Others	63	42.40	2671.00		

^a The category reflects teachers who speak at least one other foreign language at elementary or higher levels.

As can be seen in the table, gender or age categories did not result in significant statistical differences and the variable categories related to language and master's degree did not show any difference, either. However, oral production mean

scores showed a statistically significant difference between the two groups related to the undergraduate field of study ($U = 543.500$, $p = .035$). The ones who had BA degrees in ELT ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 0.50$) seem to perceive their ability to produce oral output lower than the ones who have BA degrees in other departments ($M = 4.56$, $SD = 0.39$).

For the years of experience category, a Kruskal-Wallis test was used to identify any possible differences among the groups when it comes to oral production. According to the results, no statistically significant difference was observed in oral production among the groups related to years of experience ($\chi^2(2) = .357$, $p = .836$).

The last sub-scale of oral competency was oral interaction with 11 items. The first two items were specified for B2 Level but one of them had two sub-categories defining some details about the conditions. The next four items were listed for C1 Level with one of them including two sub-categories. The last five items were described for C2 Level. The mean and standard deviation scores for each item are provided in Table 22.

Table 22

Oral Interaction Subscale of Oral Competency (N=90)

Item Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
14. I can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with users of the target language quite possible. (B2)	4.24	0.66
15. I can take an active part in discussion in familiar contexts... (B2)		
a) accounting for my views.	4.44	0.62
b) sustaining my views.	4.24	0.69
16. I can express myself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. (C1)	4.34	0.58
17. I can use language flexibly and effectively... (C1)		
a) for social purposes.	4.52	0.59
b) for professional purposes.	4.42	0.65
18. I can formulate ideas and opinions with precision. (C1)	4.29	0.64
19. I can relate my contribution during a conversation skilfully and meaningfully to others' contributions. (C1)	4.41	0.60
20. I can take part effortlessly in any conversation and any discussion. (C2)	4.11	0.71

Item Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
21. I have a good familiarity with idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms. (C2)	3.91	0.83
22. I can express myself fluently. (C2)	4.40	0.63
23. I can express small/subtle differences in meaning between similar words or phrases precisely. (C2)	4.22	0.65
24. If I do have a problem expressing myself in a conversation, I can restructure sentences causing me difficulty smoothly without people realizing. (C2)	4.36	0.61

Overall, all the items received scores higher than the average. The mean scores of the answers ranged from 3.91($SD= 0.83$) to 4.52 ($SD= 0.59$). Contrary to expectations, the items in C1 Level received higher mean scores than B2. The highest mean score belonged to an item in C1 Level about interacting in English for social purposes with a mean of 4.52 ($SD =0.58$), which meant in social context teachers felt more comfortable interacting with people in English. The items in C2 Level in general received comparatively lower scores. The item about idiomatic expressions had the lowest mean of 3.91 ($SD =0.83$), which indicated low levels of familiarity with idioms and colloquial expressions. The next two lowest mean scores were about teachers' effortless aims to participate in any kind of conversation and discussion ($M =4.11$, $SD =0.71$), and their precision in capturing the changes in meaning ($M =4.22$, $SD =0.65$). These results show that teachers felt the kind of conversations differed their competence in interactions and they did not have excellence at articulating subtle differences in meanings when interacting with others.

Inferential statistics was used for further analysis of the mean differences according to categorical variables. T-test was used for some categorical variables. The results are presented in Table 23.

Table 23*Mann Whitney U Test Results for Oral Interaction*

Groups	<i>n</i>	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender					
Male	28	51.04	1429.00	713.000	.176
Female	62	43.00	2666.00		
Age					
26-40	49	44.83	2196.50	971.500	.789
41+	41	46.30	1898.50		
Undergraduate Field of Study					
ELT	67	42.90	2874.00	596.000	.106
Others	23	53.09	1221.00		
Field of master's degree					
ELT	35	33.93	1187.50	557.500	.234
None	38	39.83	1513.50		
Other languages spoken					
At least 1 ^a	27	53.06	1432.50	646.500	.072
Others	63	42.26	2662.05		

^a The category reflects teachers who speak at least one other foreign language at elementary or higher levels.

As revealed in the table, the differences in the mean scores of oral production did not show any statistically significant results in the related categories. To investigate the role of years of experience, a Kruskal Wallis test analysis was used. The results did not show a significant difference among the groups ($\chi^2(2) = .569$, $p = .752$). This means years of experience did not seem to make a significant difference between any of the groups in their perceived oral interaction competency.

Findings from the Interviews

11 participants who volunteered to participate in the interviews following their contribution to the questionnaire were first asked to comment on whether they realized anything about their oral competency, teaching style, and teaching approaches while answering the questionnaire. Three participants said that they realized inconsistencies between their beliefs and their teaching practice. Participant

7 said, "... in terms of teaching style I see that my teaching style doesn't reflect what I want, so I teach in a way that I normally do not like or do not prefer." In addition, two talked about a possible change they would consider making in their teaching after answering the questionnaire. Participant 10 commented that "I haven't thought about giving opportunities to my students to maybe teach something in the class or design something in the class. So, maybe in the future, I can try them."

In addition, three participants touched upon their realization about their oral competency. Participants 7 and 11 became more aware of the challenges they have regarding oral competency whereas Participant 2 realized he obtained a quite high level of oral competency. Moreover, two participants talked about the relationship between themselves as non-native speakers of English and how they teach speaking in their classroom. Participant 2 said:

I definitely thought about the strategies I use. How much importance I give to speaking parts, and also my own speaking like my own speaking skills and my own oral competency. 'Am I a good model for my students?

Oral Comprehension

For the oral comprehension subscale, the participants were asked about their competency in understanding various types of listening texts and sources in diverse contexts. The number of comments that focused on the main areas covered and how competent the participants found themselves in these areas are listed in Table 24.

Table 24

Number of Comments about Oral Comprehension

Construct	Total		High		Challenged		Varies		Worsening	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
General Comments	34	22.4	18	11.8	13	8.6	2	1.3	1	0.7
Media	60	39.5	25	16.5	35	23.0	-	-	-	-
Announcements	27	17.8	11	7.2	16	10.5	-	-	-	-

Construct	Total		High		Challenged		Varies		Worsening	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Listening for Different Purposes	22	14.5	17	11.2	5	3.3	-	-	-	-
Lectures & Meetings	7	4.6	7	4.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Overheard & Informal Talks	2	1.3	-	-	2	1.3	-	-	-	-
Total Number	152	100	78	51.3	71	46.7	2	1.3	1	0.7

As can be seen in the table, the majority of the comments showed high competency in regard to oral comprehension. Participant 8 said, "... the songs I listen to are in English, the media, any kind of media or radio or TV that I watch or listen to is in English, so it's an everyday thing for me ...". Similarly, Participant 3 said, "I would see myself quite good at comprehending oral input because I usually watch things in English in my private life or listen to English programs or podcasts all the time. ..."

In addition to participants' ideas about their performance, some mentioned conditions that result in high or poor competency. Participant 6 said, "... if it is spoken in a standard way that I'm used to... the accents that I've heard while I was learning the language or maybe from course books that I'm teaching ... then I have no problem." Aside from the accent, Participant 10 commented on unfamiliar content and vocabulary hindering comprehension, "... sometimes I can't understand some types of accents, ... if I'm watching something about a specific job, if I don't know the jargon of the things that they are talking about, I may have problems about understanding them." Participant 1 separated the media into two according to the conditions affecting his performance, "... I can divide into two; live that you can't actually stop... (and) if it is recorded and you have the chance to pause it. You can maybe read the transcript ... that's easier for you to understand."

The media as an overarching category had seven sub-categories which were live, recorded, TV, movie, radio, music, and theatre plays. As for the media in the form of radio, most of the comments indicated challenges. Nine comments out of 11 about radio indicated the challenges experienced when listening to the radio. As Participant 5 said, "... when I don't see anything, when I only hear, when it's on the radio, it takes more attention for me...", most comments pointed out reasons for the difficulty to understand the radio programmes. The most common reasons were fewer contextual clues, cultural content or colloquial language used in radio shows, inability to rewind them, and multitasking when listening. Similarly, theatre plays were found challenging as 12 comments out of 19 about theatre plays addressed difficulties when in the live audience of such plays. Participant 9 said, "... when I was in London, we went to watch some plays at the theatre, and well, it was in Old English, so I know the story and everything, but I didn't understand most of what they were saying." As reasons for their challenge, participants mentioned unfamiliarity with the language and cultural content in the plays, lack of exposure to the experience, and inability to replay live shows.

In the case of announcements, although they have similarities to media, the comments regarding announcements were categorized as different from the media because the decision when to listen to them is not made by the listeners. Most of the comments in the regarding category stated challenges when understanding announcements. For example, Participant 6 said, "... if I'm not familiar with place names, ... some people's names, if I'm not familiar with these names, then I don't feel very confident, so I might probably miss (some information)." Two participants mentioned negative emotions impeding their comprehension of announcements like Participant 1 said "... my anxiety level goes higher, and I get just shaky a bit. I have

to understand everything...” Participant 5 mentioned adult life deterring comprehension of announcements:

... we are all adults ... if it takes my attention if I am going to use it in my daily life, ... if this person is my boss or something, I hear the announcement easily in five seconds... when there is cognitive load, when I am overloaded and when I am tired,... angry with my son or something, then it's hard to concentrate on what is said...

The participants' comments about formal contexts such as meetings or lectures indicated high competency. As for the reasons, they touched upon familiarity with such contexts and formal language used in such occurrences. Participant 11, for example, talked about her competency in listening to lectures about various topics provided that she has enough details:

... at university, we had lectures in English, and everything was OK. I want to talk about the duration, so you listen to different lectures about different subjects, psychology, etc., ...you don't know anything about the topic, but in time with those examples, details, etc., things become clear to me.

All in all, no matter if they experience challenges, the participants believed they show a good understanding of the tasks at hand when listening. 16 answers commented on strategies used for better comprehension, for example, about listening for different purposes, Participant 3 said,

... if I'm listening for specific information, I'm looking for this word that, ... I pay special attention to this word ... But if it's for the main idea, ...I try to make a global sense of all the things ... but for specific information, I listen deliberately for some pieces of information.

Oral Production

For the oral production subscale, the participants were asked questions about their performance when it comes to oral production. They were also given prompts to consider their performance in different contexts and for various purposes in the cases where they have time to get prepared before speaking or they have to make a spontaneous speech. Their answers categorized according to varied conditions are presented in Table 25.

Table 25

Number of Comments about Oral Production

Construct	Total Number		High		Challenged		Varies		Worsening		Improved	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
General Comments	26	19.3	12	8.9	13	9.6	1	0.7	-	-	-	-
Addressing Audiences	44	32.6	30	22.2	13	9.6	1	0.7	-	-	-	-
Experience Sharing	18	13.3	10	7.4	5	3.7	-	-	2	1.5	1	0.7
Putting a case For	20	14.8	10	7.4	10	7.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Entertainment After Preparation & Rehearsals	2	1.5	1	0.7	1	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spontaneous	14	10.4	11	8.2	2	1.5	1	0.7	-	-	-	-
Total Number	135	100	81	60.0	47	34.8	5	3.7	2	1.5	1	0.7

As can be seen from the total number of comments in the ‘high’ column, the participants perceived their capacity in oral production as high in general no matter what the functions or the settings of their act are. However, when first asked about their perceived weaknesses and strengths in oral production, participants mentioned some challenges they face. The most addressed obstacles were negative emotions and the need to speak spontaneously. Participant 4 said, “...if I had to do that spontaneously, it would be a little difficult in terms of finding the exact words to

convey the exact meaning...because I'm not a native speaker and, of course, there are stress factors as well...” Speaking of strengths, participants commonly showed practice as the reason for their high performance in special settings and for particular purposes. Participant 3 said, “I am much better at classroom language because this is what I produce most, right? So, like giving instructions to the students in English... or speaking with my students in the English teaching context.”

The ‘addressing audiences’ category had four subcategories depending on different characteristics of the audiences, which are announcements, lectures, meetings, and presentations. Although most of the participants commented on speaking to a group of people in general, some specifically brought up the subcategories as they indicate different contexts. For the general category of addressing audiences, participants listed some reasons resulting in good or poor performance: familiarity with the content and the audience, the number of people in the audience, negative emotions, and whether they can get prepared before the act. Participant 1 said, “... the bigger the crowd, the higher the stress. ... That's why you plan, but not always you can plan if it's something urgent and just unprompted.” Also, participant 11 talked about the familiarity of the audience, “I'm an instructor, so if I'm in the classroom with my own students, it's OK. I feel comfortable ... if I don't know the people very well or at all, then I can get nervous, and it affects my performance.” From the subcategories, announcements received the greatest number of comments. 18 answers mentioned announcements and 11 of them reported high performance in the related act. Participant 10 said, “I'm more comfortable about this one because generally, these announcements are more formal, so you have some structure that you can use.”

Participants also talked about their oral production when sharing personal experiences and most of their remarks signaled a high level of performance in the related area. Participant 7 said, "...if I'm talking about personal experiences, yes, I feel more relaxed and more fluent because I'm just focusing on the message that I'm trying to give ...not the target language." Participant 4 brought up the type of experience as a factor affecting her performance: "...when it's about a cultural thing or let's say about Turkish politics or if it's a joke ..., I really have difficulty explaining myself. ... I would definitely tell it better in Turkish." In addition, Participant 6 pointed out the negative change in his ability over time:

I'm not good at this ...because I've stopped reading books. ... in the past I was to use a variety of adjectives may be verbs to describe (experiences). ... as a teacher of English, I've been constrained by the language that I'm teaching, so I tend to use the language that I'm teaching... I would say that my production is similar to that of a B1 plus level student.

Another area that attracted a high number of answers was about putting a case. Participants' answers fell into two equal parts which are high and challenged. They discussed content, personality, interpersonal relationships, anxiety, and time to get prepared as affecting factors. Participant 2 said,

I think that depends on many factors, the familiarity of the topic, the person you're discussing with... it can be your superior, like your boss or a student. Your attitude is going to change. It can be something difficult to talk about like a sensitive matter like politics maybe or I don't know, human rights, women's rights... but all in all, I again feel pretty confident.

Moreover, Participant 7 referred to her personal preferences affecting her performance: "... not so good, but I think it's not just about the language so in (my) mother tongue, as well... I don't feel so comfortable to tell something in a debate..."

Finally, in 18 of the comments about high performance in oral production, participants acknowledged some strategies they use when dealing with the task at hand. For example, Participant 5 talked about how to manage the task of giving presentations at international conferences:

... I feel comfortable, I always make some jokes before I start, and I ask if people know about Türkiye... I have eye contact with people, and I understand, they ask me questions... I suddenly stop and talk about something else, something about private life or something that makes them laugh...

Oral Interaction

Oral interaction as an act encompasses oral comprehension and oral production, so some of the answers had similarities with the ones given earlier. However, oral interaction had interpersonal exchanges at heart and questions were asked about different conversational acts, contexts, and interlocutors. The number of comments made in the related categories is presented in Table 26.

Table 26

Number of Comments about Oral Interaction

Construct	Total Number		High		Challenged		Varies		Improved	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
General Comments	29	16.8	18	10.4	7	4.1	4	2.3	-	-
Formal Contexts	41	23.7	17	9.8	23	13.3	1	0.6	-	-
Informal/Casual Contexts	19	11.0	9	5.2	8	4.6	2	1.2	-	-
Co-planning	17	9.8	6	3.5	9	5.2	2	1.2	-	-
Transaction of Goods	20	11.6	11	6.4	7	4.1	-	-	2	1.2

Construct	Total Number		High		Challenged		Varies		Improved	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
With Different Interlocutors	47	27.2	26	15.0	21	28.8	-	-	-	-
Total Number	173	100	87	50.3	75	43.4	9	5.2	2	1.2

As can be seen in the table, the answers indicating high performance in oral interaction outweigh the answers in the challenged section. In general, the other person's contribution to the conversation stood out as the reason for high competency in oral interaction. Participant 6 said, "I could be better at oral interaction because you have a chance to negotiate meaning here, so you have a chance to ask further questions... to think about what you're going to say when you are listening ...". However, the participants also raised the issue of different partners changing their performance, as Participant 11 said, "...when we have interaction, it's sometimes easier, but of course, it depends on who I talk to, so sometimes it's difficult to understand because of their pace, maybe accent, country, etc." Other factors mentioned included mood and the topic of the conversations as Participant 4 pointed out, "...if I'm too tired and if I'm stressed, and if the topic suddenly becomes something irrelevant to what was decided to be discussed beforehand, I might feel a little challenged..."

Formal contexts including negotiation, interview, and debate as conversation acts attracted the highest number of comments. One reason highlighted by multiple participants was the familiarity with the subject of the formal conversations as Participant 10 said, "... generally, in formal conversations you are talking about your profession, so I feel more comfortable about talking..." Moreover, the predictability of the language used in formal contexts was also mentioned by the participants as Participant 4 said, "In a formal case, it's still fine because it is kind of rehearsed, you know what to expect. You know what questions they might pose and what questions

you might have to answer.” Speaking of the challenges mentioned, the participants listed the interlocutor, the subject of the talk, and negative feelings. Participant 2 said,

... the person is affecting your life, can affect your happiness in your job...

So, you have to be more careful, your manners matter, your attitude matters, your words, you have to choose them more carefully.... For me, so I can say if the others are nine out of 10, formal conversation, I would say 7 out of 10.

On the other hand, casual talks were found to be easier for the same reasons: the partner, the topic of conversation, and the carefree state of mind. For example, Participant 11 said, “I’m better because you can express yourself as you wish... you don’t have to use some specific words, ... you are surrounded by the people you know...” However, several comments brought up some difficulties embedded in casual or informal conversations like unfamiliarity with the partner, the number of people in the group, and the cultural elements in the conversations. Participant 3 said, “Casual conversations, sometimes, surprisingly, more difficult... if the topic is politics or culture or humor...” Participant 6 emphasized the size of the group causing difficulty in relation to his personal preferences: “... if there are more than three or four people, ... this is also related to personality, it gets difficult for me to interrupt or maybe take the floor and say something about the topic for an extended period of time.”

As for different interlocutors, there were three groups which included students, native speakers, and non-native speakers. Out of 13 comments about the students, 11 of them stated high competency in interacting with them while only two mentioned challenges because of the responsibility brought by their teacher status. For example, Participant 2 said, “This is our job, interacting with students. I feel

relaxed... but as a teacher, it is your responsibility to be very precise when you're giving information... in a way that your student really understands...” When participants compared their performance in interaction with native and non-native speakers, the language being used was shown as the common factor altering their performance with both types of interlocutors. For example, Participant 7 said, “Sometimes, I really have difficulty understanding them (native speakers) because of their accents.” Similarly, Participant 5 pointed out the cultural elements affecting the conversation with native speakers saying: “... if they use idioms or slang words... I don't understand... they make jokes, and I don't get it... even if I laugh, they are not satisfied because I didn't laugh at the right time, so sometimes it's hard...” Similarly, cultural elements of the language being used were also shown as the determinant of the poor conversation with non-native speakers, as Participant 8 said “... these people, nonnative speakers, are from other countries, they could totally have a different cultural understanding of the whole thing... so I try to watch what I'm saying.”

All in all, no matter if they found their performance as high or challenged, participants specified strategies to be used when carrying out different conversations. One of the 16 comments about strategies was mentioned by Participant 3 about the conversations with the purpose of co-planning: “I would try to use probably the negotiation expressions. My manners, of course, would change, I would try to be more negotiable. I'm focusing on this goal or plan, what we're trying to do.”

Comparison of the Data from the Questionnaire and the Interview

The questionnaire findings produced a high mean score for oral competency ($M = 4.35$, $SD = 0.44$), which showed that participants found their oral performance high (Table 16). In the questionnaire, there were 460 comments about oral

competency encompassing oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction. In line with the results from the questionnaire, there were relatively more comments in the interviews mentioning high performance (240) than the ones specifying challenges (193) (Table 24, Table 25, Table 26).

Oral Comprehension

Among the subscales, the highest mean score belonged to the oral comprehension subscale with a mean of 4.48 ($SD = 0.49$) (Table 16, Table 18). Similar to the questionnaire findings, most of the comments in the interviews displayed high competency (78), however, they were also almost equal number of comments made mentioning challenges (71) (Table 24).

Oral Production

Oral production as a subscale received a high mean score of 4.37 ($SD = 0.48$) according to the questionnaire results showing that participants perceived their capacity in oral production to be good (Table 16, Table 20). A similar result was observed in the analysis of the data coming from the interview as out of 135 remarks 81 indicated high performance while 47 acknowledged challenges (Table 25).

Oral Interaction

Oral interaction as a subscale received a high mean score of 4.30 ($SD = 0.47$) suggesting participants assessing their own competency in oral interaction to be relatively good (Table 16, Table 22). Similar results were obtained in the findings of the interview as 87 out of 173 comments in total about oral interaction indicated high performance (Table 26). On the other hand, although oral interaction subscale received the lowest mean score in the questionnaire compared to the other subscales, in the interviews, oral interaction had the highest number of comments indicating high performance.

Teaching Styles

The second research question in this study was about the teaching styles that the participants prefer. To answer this research question, quantitative data from the questionnaire and qualitative data from the interviews were used. Inferential statistics was also used to check differences in different categorical variables which were (i) gender, (ii) age, (iii) years of teaching experience, (iv) field of the undergraduate degree, (v) field of the graduate degree, (vi) whether other foreign languages are spoken. It should be noted that some of the items reflected decisions that cannot be made by the teachers themselves but the institution, which was pointed out by the participants of the questionnaire via e-mails sent to the researcher and the teachers who participated in the interviews.

Findings from the Questionnaire

For teaching styles, Grasha's Teaching Style Inventory was used (2002) to collect data. The range of answers for each item was as follows: 5 (strongly agree), 4 (somewhat agree), 3 (neither agree or disagree), 2 (somewhat disagree), and 1 (strongly disagree). There were 40 items in the inventory and five subscales which were Expert, Formal Authority, Personal Model, Facilitator, and Delegator. For each subscale, there were eight items. The descriptive statistics were utilized to calculate the means and standard deviations of each subscale and summarized in Table 27.

Table 27

Descriptive Statistics for Teaching Styles Subscales (N=90)

Construct	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Expert Style	3.73	0.49
Formal Authority Style	3.60	0.53
Personal Model Style	4.01	0.46
Facilitator Style	3.91	0.49
Delegator Style	3.57	0.50

The findings of the descriptive statics showed that the teaching style which received the highest mean is the Personal Model Style ($M = 4.01$, $SD = 0.46$) suggesting that most of the teachers share their perspective on learning English with their students and advise them to do accordingly. The second highest score belonged to the Facilitator Style ($M = 3.91$, $SD = 0.49$) which indicated that most teachers reinforce students' ability to behave responsibly according to their own goals. The Expert Style had a mean score of 3.73 ($SD = 0.49$) which indicated that teachers also saw themselves as the source of knowledge and valued the transmission of their knowledge to some extent. The teaching styles which had the lowest two mean scores were the Formal Authority Style ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 0.53$) which typifies teachers setting high standards for students and ensuring students achieve them, and the Delegator Style ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 0.50$) which represents teachers giving high levels of freedom to the students in the classroom.

The first subscale of teaching style was Expert Style with eight items. The mean and standard deviation scores are summarized in Table 28.

Table 28

Expert Style Subscale of Teaching Styles (N=90)

Item Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Facts, concepts, and principles are the most important things that students should acquire.	3.52	0.81
6. Sharing my knowledge and expertise with students is very important to me.,	4.51	0.69
11. What I have to say about a topic is important for students to acquire a broader perspective on learning languages.	4.02	0.75
16. I want students to end the semester well prepared for their future studies.	4.53	0.66
21. Lecturing is a significant part of how I teach each of the class sessions.	3.22	1.14
26. My expertise is typically used to resolve disagreements about content issues.	3.60	0.82
31. Students might describe me as “storehouse of knowledge” who dispenses the facts, principles and concepts they need.	3.31	0.84

Item Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
36. There is more material in this semester than I have time available to cover it.	3.12	1.22

According to the findings, most of the teachers stated that they wish to prepare their students for their future studies ($M = 4.53$, $SD = 0.66$) and they also valued the practice of sharing their knowledge with their students ($M = 4.51$, $SD = .69$). However, the mean score was lower when it comes to lecturing being a significant part of the teachers' teaching style ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 1.14$). The lowest mean score was received for the item related to teachers' feelings about having less time for the course materials to be covered ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 1.22$), which meant they found the time they had for the course delivery enough. It should also be pointed out that these two items had higher standard deviation scores indicating that teachers had less agreement on their answers regarding the items.

The results were further analyzed across different groups to see the significant mean differences. The results are presented in Table 29.

Table 29

T-test Results for Expert Style

Groups	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> (88)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Gender						
Male	28	3.80	0.43	0.884	.379	0.201
Female	62	3.70	0.52			
Age						
26-40	49	3.55	0.46	-4.089	<.001	0.053
41+	41	3.95	0.45			
Undergraduate Field of Study						
ELT	67	3.72	0.49	-0.218	.828	0.053
Others	23	3.75	0.51			
Field of master's degree						
ELT	35	3.69	0.51	0.940	.350	0.220
None	38	3.80	0.49			

Groups	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> (88)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Other languages spoken						
At least 1 ^a	27	3.67	0.41	0.802	.425	0.184
Others	63	3.76	0.53			

^a The category reflects teachers who speak at least one other foreign language at elementary or higher levels.

As can be observed in the table, the only variable that showed difference among its groups was age ($t = -4.089$, $p < .001$). The group of teachers aged 40 and more ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 0.45$) resulted in higher mean scores when it comes to Expert Style than the younger group ($M = 3.55$, $SD = 0.46$), which meant the older teachers preferred to be the storehouse of information more than the younger group.

Further analysis was carried out for the grouping variable related to years of experience. The ANOVA analysis results are shown in Table 30.

Table 30

ANOVA Results for Expert Style

Years of Experience	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i> (2,87)	η^2
0-15	29	3.58	0.42	9.436***	.178
16-20	31	3.66	0.52		
21+	30	4.01	0.41		

*** $p < .001$.

As the results suggested, a significant statistical difference was found at least between two groups ($F_{2,87} = 9.44$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .178$). To find out more about the difference among the groups, Tukey HSD as a post-hoc test was conducted. The results of the post-hoc test are demonstrated in Table 31.

Table 31*Tukey HSD Results for Expert Style*

Dependent Variable	Years of Experience	Years of Experience	Mean Difference	Standard Error	<i>p</i>
Expert Style	0-15	16-20	-0.140	0.117	.458
		21+	-0.495	0.118	<.001
	16-20	0-15	0.140	0.117	.458
		21+	-0.355	0.116	.008
	21+	0-15	0.495	0.118	<.001
		16-20	0.355	0.116	.008

As revealed in the table, the group with the most teaching experience ($M = 4.01$, $SD = 0.41$) showed a difference from the other two groups with 0-15 years of teaching experience ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 0.42$), and the group with 16-20 years of teaching experience ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 0.52$). However, the group with the least teaching experience did not show a significant difference from the group with 16-20 years of teaching experience. The results suggested that the teachers who have taught more than 21 years preferred to share their knowledge in their classes more than the other with fewer years of experience.

The second subscale of teaching style was the Formal Authority Style with eight items. The mean and standard deviation scores are provided in Table 32.

Table 32*Formal Authority Style Subscale of Teaching Styles (N=90)*

Item Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
2. I set high standards for students in my classes.	3.52	0.97
7. I give students negative feedback when their performance is unsatisfactory.	2.82	1.08
12. Students would describe my standards and expectations as somewhat strict and rigid.	3.04	1.08
17. It is my responsibility to define what students must learn and how they should learn it.	3.42	0.95
22. I provide very clear guidelines for how I want tasks completed in my classes.	4.37	0.68
27. My classes have very specific goals and objectives that I want to accomplish.	3.86	0.84

Item Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
32. My expectations for what I want students to do in this class are clearly defined at the beginning of the semester.	4.16	0.73
37. My standards and expectations help students develop the discipline they need to learn.	3.60	0.78

As the findings suggested, the majority of the teachers demonstrated that they provide clear instructions for the classroom tasks with the highest mean score of 4.27 ($SD = 0.64$) and as the lowest standard deviation score suggested, there was a high level of agreement among the teachers related to the item. This result shows that teachers felt strongly about giving clear guidelines to their students. Also, the item about teachers sharing their expectations with their students received a high mean score of 4.16 ($SD = 0.73$), which indicates that teachers preferred communicating their expectations to their students. The lowest mean score and the highest standard deviation score belonged to item 7 regarding providing negative feedback to the students ($M = 2.82$, $SD = 1.08$), which means teachers do not often share their negative opinions about students' performances. The next lowest score belonged to the item about if their students would describe their teaching as strict and rigid ($M = 3.04$, $SD = 1.08$), and it showed that teachers think their students do not often perceive the teaching of the lesson to be strict, which might mean that teachers are willing to be flexible in their teaching.

Further analysis was carried out to see the differences among the groups regarding Formal Authority Style. The t-test results are shared in Table 33.

Table 33

T-test Results for Formal Authority Style

Groups	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> (88)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Gender						
Male	28	3.71	0.52	1.281	.204	0.292
Female	62	3.55	0.54			

Groups	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> (88)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Age						
26-40	49	3.44	0.51	-3.158	.002	0.138
41+	41	3.78	0.51			
Undergraduate Field of Study						
ELT	67	3.62	0.54	0.573	.568	0.138
Others	23	3.54	0.54			
Field of master's degree						
ELT	35	3.54	0.43	0.474	.637	0.111
None	38	3.60	0.61			
Other languages spoken						
At least 1 ^a	27	3.52	0.44	0.878	.382	0.202
Others	63	3.63	0.57			

^a The category reflects teachers who speak at least one other foreign language at elementary or higher levels.

As can be seen in the table, the only categorical variable that resulted in a significant difference is the age variable. The teachers who are 26-40 had lower mean scores ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 0.51$) than the ones who are older ($M = 3.78$, $SD = 0.50$) ($t = -3.158$, $p = .002$). This shows that older teachers prefer teaching according to expected standards more than the younger teachers.

ANOVA analysis was then conducted for the years of experience categorical variable. The results are demonstrated in Table 34.

Table 34

ANOVA Results for Formal Authority Style

Years of Experience	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i> (2,87)	η^2
0-15	29	3.44	0.50	3.524***	.184
16-20	31	3.56	0.54		
21+	30	3.79	0.51		

*** $p < .001$.

The results showed a significant difference between at least two of the groups ($F_{2,87} = 3.52$, $p = .034$, $\eta^2 = .184$). Hence, further analysis was required to pinpoint

the difference between two specific groups. The results of the post hoc test are presented in Table 35.

Table 35

Tukey HSD Results for Formal Authority Style

Dependent Variable	Years of Experience	Years of Experience	Mean Difference	Standard Error	<i>p</i>
Formal Authority Style	0-15	16-20	-0.121	0.134	.641
		21+	-0.352	0.135	.029
	16-20	0-15	0.121	0.134	.641
		21+	-0.231	0.133	.196
	21+	0-15	0.352	0.135	.029
		16-20	0.231	0.133	.196

As the table shows, a significant difference was found between the group with the least years of experience ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 0.50$) and the ones with the most years of experience ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.51$), which suggests that the teachers who have more than 21 years of experience adopted a teaching model which agrees with the standards more often than the newest teachers in the participant group.

The third subscale was the Personal Model Style with eight items. The mean and standard deviation scores of each item are presented in Table 36.

Table 36

Personal Model Style Subscale of Teaching Styles (N=90)

Item Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
3. What I say and do models appropriate ways for students to think about learning English.	4.36	0.55
8. Students are encouraged to imitate the example I provide.	4.00	0.70
13. I typically show students how and what to do in order to master course content.	4.16	0.65
18. Examples from my personal experiences often are used to illustrate points about the material.	4.14	0.76
23. I often show students how they can use various principles and concepts.	4.02	0.64
28. Students receive frequent verbal and/or written comments on their performance.	4.31	0.74
33. Eventually, many students begin to think like me about learning English.	3.19	0.92
38. Students might describe me as a “coach” who works closely with someone to correct problems in how they think and behave.	3.93	0.68

As the findings suggest, the highest mean score belonged to item 3 regarding teachers providing a model for learning English with what they say and do ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 0.55$). The teachers also indicated they provide their students with feedback on their performance ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 0.74$). However, item 33 with the lowest mean of 3.19 ($SD = 0.92$) showed that the teachers agree less on the fact that the students will start thinking like them about learning English. Also, their mean scores were relatively lower when it comes to teachers acting on the problems in the way students act and think ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 0.68$). The results showed that although teachers thought that setting an example for the students was important, they felt reluctant to impose their ways of thinking on the students.

Further analysis was carried out for the categorical variables to find the mean differences among the groups. The Mann Whitney U test results for the Personal Model Style are presented in Table 37.

Table 37

Mann Whitney U Test Results for Personal Model Style

Groups	<i>n</i>	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender					
Male	28	46.70	1307.50	834.500	.748
Female	62	44.96	2787.50		
Age					
26-40	49	41.06	2012.00	787.000	.053
41+	41	50.80	2083.00		
Undergraduate Field of Study					
ELT	67	46.51	3116.00	596.000	.106
Others	23	42.57	979.00		
Field of master's degree					
ELT	35	37.06	1297.00	663.000	.982
None	38	36.95	1404.00		

Groups	<i>n</i>	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>
Other languages spoken					
At least 1 ^a	27	41.17	1111.50	733.500	.258
Others	63	47.36	2983.50		

^aThe category reflects teachers who speak at least one other foreign language at elementary or higher levels.

As can be observed in the table, the categorical variables did not result in change in terms of how frequently different groups choose to adopt a Personal Model teaching style. The teachers' answers were further analyzed to see possible difference in three groups of teaching experience. To determine if there are significant differences, a Kruskal-Wallis test was used. The results are shown in Table 38.

Table 38

Kruskal Wallis Test Results for Personal Model Style

Years of Experience	<i>n</i>	Mean Rank	$\chi^2(2)$	<i>p</i>
0-15	29	32.95	12.729	.002
16-20	31	46.02		
21+	30	57.10		

According to the results, there was a significant difference between at least two of the groups ($\chi^2 = 12.729$, $p < .001$). Hence, a post hoc test was conducted (Table 39).

Table 39

Pairwise Comparison for Personal Model Style

Dependent Variable	Years of Experience	Years of Experience	Mean Difference	Standard Error	<i>p</i>
Personal Model Style	0-15	16-20	-0.207	6.721	.156
		21+	-0.436	6.774	<.001
	16-20	0-15	0.207	6.721	.156
		21+	-0.229	6.662	.289
	21+	0-15	0.436	6.774	<.001
		16-20	0.229	6.662	.289

As can be seen in the pairwise comparison of the data, there was a significant difference between the groups with the most years of experience ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 0.47$) and the group with the least years of experience ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 0.42$). The results showed that the teachers who have been in the profession for more than 21 years preferred being a role model for students more than the ones with up to 15 years of teaching experience.

The fourth subscale was the Facilitator Style with eight items. The mean and standard deviation scores are listed in Table 40.

Table 40

Facilitator Style Subscale of Teaching Styles (N=90)

Item Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
4. My teaching goals and methods address a variety of student learning styles.	4.08	0.71
9. I spend time consulting with students on how to improve their work on individual and/or group tasks.	4.18	0.71
14. Small group discussions are employed to help students develop their ability to think critically.	4.31	0.77
19. I guide students' work on course projects by asking questions, exploring options, and suggesting alternative ways to do things.	4.21	0.59
24. Course activities encourage students to take initiative and responsibility for their learning.	3.97	0.85
29. I ask for student advice about how and what to teach in my classes.	3.28	0.98
34. Students can make choices among activities in order to complete course requirements.	3.02	0.98
39. I give students a lot of personal support and encouragement to do well in my classes.	4.23	0.67

According to the results, item 39 about teachers providing assistance and incentives to the students had the highest mean score ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 0.67$). Also, most teachers agreed on the fact that they utilize small group discussions to promote critical thinking ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 0.77$). However, their answers on giving choices to the students regarding activities had the lowest mean of 3.02 ($SD = 0.98$). Similarly, they stated they mostly do not seek advice from their students in class-related

decisions ($M = 3.28$, $SD = 0.98$). The results suggest that although teachers start a conversation about the class content and let students be active, they do not provide much freedom to make choices about the classroom activities.

Further analyses were conducted to spot the differences among groups. For this purpose, a t-test analysis was conducted (Table 41).

Table 41

T-test Results for Facilitator Style

Groups	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> (88)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Gender						
Male	28	3.94	0.506	0.362	.718	0.082
Female	62	3.90	0.482			
Age						
26-40	49	3.79	0.44	-2.734	.008	0.246
41+	41	4.06	0.51			
Undergraduate Field of Study						
ELT	67	3.94	0.46	1.016	.312	0.246
Others	23	3.82	0.56			
Field of master's degree						
ELT	35	3.81	0.45	1.325	.189	0.310
None	38	3.96	0.53			
Other languages spoken						
At least 1 ^a	27	3.82	0.52	1.093	.277	0.251
Others	63	3.95	0.47			

^a The category reflects teachers who speak at least one other foreign language at elementary or higher levels.

As can be seen in the table, the age category showed a significant difference. The younger group ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.44$) had significantly lower mean scores than the older group ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.50$) ($t = -2.734$, $p = .008$). The result suggests that the older teachers prefer guiding students when they become more independent in class more than the younger ones.

ANOVA analysis was utilized for the grouping variable of years of teaching experience. The results are summarized in Table 42.

Table 42*ANOVA Results for Facilitator Style*

Years of Experience	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i> (2,87)	η^2
0-15	29	3.75	0.44	3.196***	.068
16-20	31	3.92	0.45		
21+	30	4.06	0.53		

*** $p < .001$.

According to the results, a significant difference was detected between at least two of the groups ($F_{2,87} = 3.20$, $p = .046$, $\eta^2 = .068$). Hence, a further post hoc test was used to investigate the differences among the groups (Table 43).

Table 43*Tukey HSD Results for Facilitator Style*

Dependent Variable	Years of Experience	Years of Experience	Mean Difference	Standard Error	<i>p</i>
Facilitator Style	0-15	16-20	-0.173	0.123	.338
		21+	-0.313	0.124	.035
	16-20	0-15	0.174	0.123	.338
		21+	-0.139	0.122	.492
	21+	0-15	0.313	0.124	.035
		16-20	0.139	0.122	.492

As can be seen in the table, there was found to be a significant difference between the groups with the least years of teaching experience ($M = 3.75$, $SD = 0.44$) and the most years of teaching experience ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.53$). This suggest that the most experienced teachers preferred promoting independence by giving freedom to students more than the ones who have relatively fewer years of teaching experience.

The last subscale of teaching style was the Delegator Style with eight items.

The mean and standard deviation scores are summarized in Table 44.

Table 44*Delegator Style Subscale of Teaching Styles (N=90)*

Item Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
5. Students typically work on course tasks alone with little supervision from me.	2.93	0.97
10. Activities in my classes encourage students to develop their own ideas about content issues.	4.21	0.70
15. Students design one of more self-directed learning experiences.	3.38	0.87
20. Developing the ability of students to think and work independently is an important goal.	4.58	0.69
25. Students take responsibility for teaching part of the class sessions.	2.86	1.13
30. Students set their own pace for completing independent and/or group tasks.	3.28	0.98
35. My approach to teaching is similar to a manager of a work group who delegates tasks and responsibilities to subordinates.	3.22	0.90
40. I assume the role of a resource person who is available to students whenever they need help.	4.08	0.69

According to the findings, the majority of the teachers agreed on the importance of improving the skills related to working and thinking independently ($M = 4.58$, $SD = 0.69$). Moreover, teachers' answers showed that they reinforce their students' attempts to create their own ideas ($M = 4.21$, $SD = 0.70$). However, items regarding teachers not interfering with students' work had fewer mean scores. For example, item 5 suggesting limited supervision from the teacher had a mean score of 2.93 ($SD = 0.97$), and item 25 stating students taking part in the teaching process had the lowest mean of 2.86 ($SD = 1.13$). Hence, although teachers felt positive about encouraging students to act and think independently, they were not as willing to letting students become more dominant than the teachers.

For a more detailed description of the group, the differences in teaching styles among categories were calculated using the T-test and ANOVA. The t-test results for the Delegator Style are presented in Table 45.

Table 45*T-test Results for Delegator Style*

Groups	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> (88)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Gender						
Male	28	3.58	0.45	0.173	.863	0.039
Female	62	3.56	0.53			
Age						
26-40	49	3.46	0.43	-2.222	.029	0.033
41+	41	3.70	0.56			
Undergraduate Field of Study						
ELT	67	3.57	0.51	0.136	.892	0.033
Others	23	3.55	0.50			
Field of master's degree						
ELT	35	3.50	0.56	0.478	.634	0.112
None	38	3.56	0.50			
Other languages spoken						
At least 1 ^a	27	3.53	0.44	0.480	.633	0.110
Others	63	3.58	0.53			

^a The category reflects teachers who speak at least one other foreign language at elementary or higher levels.

As can be seen in the table the only category that resulted in a significant change between its groups is age. According to the table, the older group had significantly higher mean scores than the younger ones ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 0.42$) ($t = -2.222$, $p = .029$), which meant the older teachers felt more comfortable when students taking more control of their own learning than the younger ones.

Further analysis was conducted to spot the differences that might be observed among the groups with different years of teaching experience. However, there was no statistically significant difference observed in the groups with different years of teaching experience ($F_{2,87} = 2.51$, $p = .087$, $\eta^2 = .055$). Hence, further post-hoc tests were not used for this data group.

Findings from the Interviews

Interview participants' answers to the questions regarding their teaching styles varied in terms of the style they adopt, and some made links to the focus of the lesson in relation to the style adopted. The number of comments made about each teaching style is presented in Table 46. Their preferred teaching styles when teaching receptive skills (i.e., listening and reading), productive skills (i.e., speaking and writing), and language systems (i.e., grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation) are also specified in the table.

Table 46

Number of Comments about Teaching Styles

Construct	Total Number		Receptive Skills		Productive Skills		Language Systems	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Expert	26	18.3	2	1.4	1	0.7	7	4.9
Formal Authority	14	9.9	1	0.7	-	-	3	2.1
Personal Model	21	14.8	-	-	5	3.5	-	-
Facilitator	48	33.8	4	2.8	11	7.8	4	2.8
Delegator	17	12.0	2	1.4	2	1.4	-	-
Eclectic	16	11.3	1	0.7	1	0.7	-	-
Total Number	142	100	10	7.0	20	14.1	14	9.9

The comments about Facilitator Style received the greatest number of comments. Most participants stated that they adopt this style while some mentioned they would have wanted to adopt it but could not due to various reasons. Participant 3 was among the ones who chose this style,

Facilitator, yes, this is what I want to be. This is what I'm trying to be in a class. I want them to act independently. I show them a lot of sites that they can go and work on their own. I can give them a lot of clues about what they can do when they are alone independently to learn English. Uhm, like today,

for example, I made them prepare their own speaking questions from the book for the to prepare for the speaking exam.

Similarly, Participant 4 expressed his joy when teaching in Facilitator Style, “I like making things more interesting. I like people to be involved in learning. I believe they can learn well if they collaborate or if they interact with each other... so I will call myself more of a facilitator.” The choice of Facilitator Style also stood out when teaching productive skills like speaking and writing. Participant 7 mentioned a shift in her teaching from Expert of Formal Authority Style to Facilitator when teaching those skills, “For receptive skills, maybe, same, an Expert and a Formal Authority...I would like them to produce something for writing... or for speaking, a Facilitator type or a Delegator Style maybe. I will change my style from time to time.” In addition, Participant 1 stated that he believes he should be a facilitator but sometimes he acts against his beliefs, “I know that students should be more in the front, in the lesson. They should use the language. They should be given more freedom to practice, to produce... but I don't do that sometimes.” Similarly, Participant 9 talked about decisions taken by the school affecting her teaching style, “As long as the school practices allow, I try to do my best to provide my students with some opportunities to choose from...”

Another style with a high number of comments was Expert. Participant 6 explained his reasons for the choice as follows:

I like to show that I possess the expertise and knowledge... they like to see the teacher that looks confident and that shows that he or she knows things and ready to transmit this information... in my experience, things go smoothly, once the students establish this trust relationship with their teachers and things get easier... in terms of classroom management as well.

Although teachers adopt Expert Style, four out of 27 comments also pointed out their dissatisfaction about this choice as Participant 10 said, “Expert style because I have to be... it's always my dream that I will give some materials... They will see the rules... have their practice part. They don't need me... but they always look at me to find the answer.” Furthermore, Expert Style was the most popular for teaching language systems, like grammar and vocabulary. Participant 4 stated that when teaching grammar, her teaching style shifts to Expert Style although she generally prefers Facilitator Style, “... only with grammar I would say it changes a little bit because students still have this embedded habit or thoughts about grammar, learning, and teaching... only with grammar, they like being given the input and then producing something.” As can be observed in the comments, for Expert Style, there were two common factors determining their choice: students’ expectations and level.

According to participants’ answers, all the styles took part in their teaching to some extent, which can be observed both from the number of comments that fell into the ‘Eclectic’ category and from the distribution of comments among different styles. As participant 11 said: “I can't say that I have a specific teaching style... I'm the expert in the classroom. I just give the rules and help them and sometimes I just observe the students and sometimes I'm the guide.” Eclectic Style was also associated with being a good teacher, as Participant 1 said, “It's a combination... because a good teacher should be able to switch between the styles... this student needs more guidance... so I should be approaching this student with this style... one needs more guidance or more freedom. You adapt yourself.” In general, the main categories raised for the cause of the choices were students, teachers themselves, the institution, and the focus of the class. For example, Participant 2 said, “... level of the student, level of the class, characteristics of the students, yeah, every classroom

has a different aura... even my mood that day affects the style of teaching.” Also, among the characteristics of the teachers affecting the teaching style, teaching experience was mentioned several times, as Participant 5 said, “... in my first years I was young... I was a very stiff teacher. I wasn't listening (to students) ... sometimes I wouldn't be understanding... in years, I become like a soft, nice and understanding teacher.”

Lastly, teachers also commented on some practices which were not included in the items of the questionnaire like using Turkish when teaching English. Four participants, for example, mentioned they now see using students' first language as beneficial to use when teaching. Based on their experience and observations over the years, the teachers seem to believe students need Turkish input or instructions at times. Participant 2, for example, said “I tend to use more Turkish when I'm teaching grammar... in my first years of teaching, I never used Turkish in classroom... I always saw that some students never said anything, even if they didn't understand what I was explaining.”

Comparison of the Data from the Questionnaire and the Interview

According to the data from the questionnaire, the styles with the highest mean scores were Personal Model ($M = 4.01$, $SD = 0.46$), Facilitator ($M = 3.91$, $SD = 0.49$), and Expert ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 0.49$) (Table 27). The answers from the interview were in line with the findings of the questionnaire as Facilitator (48), Expert (26), and Personal Model (21) were found to be popular although in a different order (Table 46).

Teaching Approaches

The third research question of this study investigated the teaching approaches adopted by teachers in terms of the focus of the class sessions. The data collected

from the questionnaire and the interviews served as the source of information. The answers of the questionnaire were further analyzed to spot differences in different categories based on (i) gender, (ii) age, (iii) years of teaching experience, (iv) field of the undergraduate degree, (v) field of the graduate degree, (vi) whether other foreign languages are spoken. It should be noted that as was the case for Teaching Styles, some of the items regarding teaching approaches were related to the practices imposed by the decisions at the institution, which was highlighted in the comments in the interviews and also in the e-mails received from the participants of the questionnaire.

Findings of the Questionnaire

With regard to teaching approaches, the Approaches to Teaching Inventory (Trigwell et al., 2005) was applied. The items are the 5-point-Likert style with the following answers: 1 (only rarely true for me), 2 (sometimes true for me), 3 (about half the time true for me), 4 (frequently true for me), 5 (almost always true for me). There were 22 items in the inventory and two subscales that are conceptual change/student-focused (CCSF) and information transmission/teacher-focused (ITTF). For each subscale, there were 11 items. The descriptive statistics was used to calculate the means and standard deviations of each subscale and summarized in Table 47.

Table 47

Descriptive Statistics for Teaching Approaches Subscales (N=90)

Construct	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
CCSF	3.79	0.56
ITTF	3.65	0.53

As the table suggested, the mean scores for both subscales were over the average. While the Information Transmission/ Teacher-Focused approach had the

lowest mean score of 3.79 ($SD = 0.56$), the highest mean score belonged to the Conceptual Change/Student-Focused approach with a mean of 3.79 ($SD = 0.56$). The results indicated that a high number of teachers value students' agency over their learning by bringing them into the focus of the classroom whereas comparatively fewer teachers attach high values to their own actions and delivery of knowledge.

The first subscale of approaches to teaching was Conceptual Change/Student-Focused (CCSF). The mean scores and standard deviation scores for each item are presented in Table 48.

Table 48

CCSF Subscale of Teaching Approaches (N=90)

Item Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
3. In my interactions with students in my classes, I try to develop a conversation with them about the topics we are studying.	3.76	0.90
5. I set aside some teaching time so that the students can discuss, among themselves, key concepts and ideas in my classes.	3.98	0.75
7. I encourage students to restructure their existing knowledge in terms of the new way of thinking about the language that they will develop.	3.92	0.80
8. In teaching sessions for my classes, I deliberately provoke debate and discussion.	3.92	0.80
13. I make available opportunities for students in my classes to discuss their changing understanding of the language.	3.26	0.96
14. It is better for students in my classes to generate their own notes rather than copy mine.	3.56	0.96
15. A lot of teaching time in my classes should be used to question students' ideas.	3.58	1.07
17. I see teaching as helping students develop new ways of thinking in my classes.	3.78	0.98
18. In teaching language, it is important for me to monitor students' changed understanding of the language.	3.92	0.77
20. Teaching in my classes should help students question their own understanding of the language.	3.74	1.03
21. Teaching language should include helping students find their own learning resources.	4.27	0.75

According to the findings, teachers' answers to item 21 with the highest mean score of 4.27 ($SD = 0.57$) indicated that the majority of the teachers guide their students when finding their own learning materials. The second highest mean of 3.98

($SD = 0.75$) belonged to item 5 suggesting that teachers mostly spare some classroom time for discussion about the classroom content. However, their mean scores were lower for the items 14 and 15, which means fewer teachers think students should generate their own notes rather than copying the teachers' ($M = 3.56$, $SD = 0.96$) and that a great deal of time should be spent to challenge students' opinions ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 1.07$). Lastly, the lowest mean score belonged to the item regarding the necessity of making opportunities to discuss students' changing understanding of the language ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.96$). The results suggest that although teachers give importance to helping students find their own study materials and share their ideas about the content, they pay less attention on students' changing concepts and freedom when preparing their own notes.

Further analysis was conducted to understand the mean differences among various groups. T-test and ANOVA were used for different categories after ensuring that the assumptions were met. The test results are presented in Table 49.

Table 49

T-test Results for CCSF Teaching Approach

Groups	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> (88)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Gender						
Male	28	3.80	0.58	0.112	.911	0.026
Female	62	3.79	0.55			
Age						
26-40	49	3.69	0.56	-1.833	.070	0.044
41+	41	3.90	0.53			
Undergraduate Field of Study						
ELT	67	3.80	0.55	0.181	.857	0.044
Others	23	3.77	0.58			
Field of master's degree						
ELT	35	3.84	0.50	-0.352	.726	0.083
None	38	3.79	0.52			

Groups	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> (88)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Other languages spoken						
At least 1 ^a	27	3.64	0.63	1.724	.088	0.397
Others	63	3.85	0.51			

^a The category reflects teachers who speak at least one other foreign language at elementary or higher levels.

As can be seen in the table, no categories showed any significant difference when it comes to the Conceptual Change/Student-Focused teaching approach. Further analysis was conducted using ANOVA, however, according to the results, there was no significant difference between any of the groups.

The second subscale of approaches to teaching was Information Transmission/Teacher-Focused (ITTF). The mean and standard deviation scores of the relevant items are listed in Table 50.

Table 50

ITTF Subscale of Teaching Approaches (N=90)

Item Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. In my classes, students should focus their study on what I provide them.	3.70	0.85
2. It is important that my classes should be completely described in terms of specific objectives that relate to formal assessment items.	3.68	0.83
4. It is important to present a lot of facts to students so that they know what they have to learn for my classes.	3.62	0.91
6. In my classes I concentrate on covering the information that might be available from key texts and readings.	3.86	0.77
9. I structure my teaching to help students to pass the formal assessment items.	3.58	0.87
10. I think an important reason for running teaching sessions in my classes is to give students a good set of notes.	3.10	1.10
11. In my classes, I provide students with the information they will need to pass the formal assessments.	4.00	0.79
12. I should know the answers to any questions that students may put to me during my classes.	3.62	1.01
16. In my classes my teaching focuses on the good presentation of information to students.	3.56	1.01
19. My teaching language focuses on delivering what I know to students.	3.53	0.93
22. I present material to enable students to build up an information base in the language.	3.86	0.86

According to the findings, the mean score was the highest regarding provision of information in the classroom that will be needed to pass the formal exams ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.79$). The following two highest mean scores indicated teachers focus on the information given in key texts and readings ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 0.77$), and then bringing in materials for students to develop a knowledge base in the language ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 0.86$). However, the mean score was the lowest for the item suggesting one of the purposes of teaching as giving students a set of notes ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 1.10$). The findings suggest that teachers try to promote development of a knowledge base by often focusing on input coming from reading texts in order to prepare students for formal assessment. However, they do not see providing students with a set of study notes as one of the approaches they employ.

The mean scores were further analyzed to investigate the significant differences among groups. T-test results are shown in Table 51.

Table 51

T-test Results for ITTF Teaching Approach

Groups	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> (88)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Gender						
Male	28	3.65	0.54	0.046	.963	0.011
Female	62	3.64	0.54			
Age						
26-40	49	3.45	0.49	-4.150	< .001	0.013
41+	41	3.88	0.50			
Undergraduate Field of Study						
ELT	67	3.65	0.55	0.053	.958	0.013
Others	23	3.64	0.50			
Field of master's degree						
ELT	35	3.62	0.57	0.358	.721	0.084
None	38	3.66	0.49			

Groups	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> (88)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Other languages spoken						
At least 1 ^a	27	3.59	0.43	0.613	.542	0.141
Others	63	3.67	0.57			

^a The category reflects teachers who speak at least one other foreign language at elementary or higher levels.

As the results suggest that the only variable that showed a significant difference is age. The younger group ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 0.48$) had significantly lower mean scores compared to the older group ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 0.50$) ($t = -4.150$, $p < .001$), which means that the older teachers prefer a teaching approach where they share their expertise and knowledge with students more than the younger ones.

Further analysis was conducted to see the difference in the groups with different years of teaching experience using ANOVA. The results are presented in Table 52.

Table 52

ANOVA Results for ITTF Teaching Approach

Years of Experience	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i> (2,87)	η^2
0-15	29	3.51	0.39	5.514***	.113
16-20	31	3.53	0.60		
21+	30	3.90	0.50		

*** $p < .001$.

As the results suggest, there was found to be a significant mean difference between at least two of the groups ($F_{2,87} = 5.51$, $p = .006$, $\eta^2 = .113$). Hence, a post-hoc test was conducted to see the specific groups with significant differences (Table 53).

Table 53*Tukey HSD Results for ITTF Teaching Approach*

Dependent Variable	Years of Experience	Years of Experience	Mean Difference	Standard Error	<i>p</i>
ITTF Teaching Approach	0-15	16-20	-0.023	0.131	.983
		21+	-0.389	0.132	.012
	16-20	0-15	0.023	0.131	.983
		21+	-0.366	0.130	.017
	21+	0-15	0.389	0.132	.012
		16-20	0.366	0.130	.017

As can be observed in the table, the group with 0-15 years of teaching experience ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 0.39$) had significantly lower scores than the group with 21 and more years of teaching experience ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 0.50$). Similarly, the group with 16-20 years of teaching experience ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 0.60$) had significantly lower mean scores than the group with 21 or more years of teaching experience ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 0.50$). The results showed that the teachers with less than 21 years of teaching experience do not prefer being the transmitter of knowledge as much as the ones with more than 21 years of teaching experience.

Findings from the Interviews

After their contribution to the questionnaire, 11 participants answered questions about their approaches to teaching. The number of comments given about the approaches is presented in Table 58. The approaches they adopt when teaching receptive skills (i.e., reading and listening), productive skills (i.e., speaking and writing), and language systems (i.e., grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation) are also specified in Table 54.

Table 54*Number of Comments about Teaching Approaches*

Construct	Total Number		Receptive Skills		Productive Skills		Language Systems	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
CCSF (Conceptual Change Student-Focused)	25	39.1	4	6.3	6	9.4	1	1.6
ITTF (Information Transmission Teacher-Focused)	26	40.6	1	1.6	1	1.6	5	7.8
Combination	13	20.3	1	1.6	1	1.6	2	3.1
Total Number	64	100	6	9.4	8	12.5	8	12.5

As can be seen in the table, Conceptual Change Student-Focused and Information Transmission Teacher-Focused approaches had almost equal number of comments. Even when participants talked about the approach they adopt, they commented that the other one also has a place in their teaching. For example, Participant 6 said, “I feel closer to student-focused conceptual change, but I cannot discard the other one...It's also part of my teaching approach... 75 to 80% student-focused and 20,25% teacher-focused.” Participant 9 expressed that she had both of them equally because of the responsibilities brought by the teaching context:

I'm again between two because we have a syllabus to follow... we have to follow schools' practices... I want to spend more time on an activity as I see my students are involved in it... I know there will be a quiz to be administered on the last day of that week, I just stop them... so in that sense, we have great competence in planning which is about information transmission teacher focused. But... I am trying to do it, conceptual change student-focused way...

In addition, as the table indicates, CCSF was more popular when it comes to teaching skills including receptive and productive ones. Participant 11 talked about how she tries to challenge her students when teaching receptive skills: “I do that, for example,

let's say we have a reading text in our book... they just focus on the questions in the book... instead, I ask them other questions, then they have to focus on the text better...” Participant 7 said even though she prefers ITTF most of the time, she changes her approach when she teaches skills: “... the student-focused one with the skills... we have lots of debates so I just ask them which topic to discuss...no limitation, they can share their ideas how they like... no formal rules... no grading... the message is important...”

On the other hand, ITTF was more popular when it comes to teaching language systems even for the ones who generally prefer CCSF. Participant 2 explained the reasons for the change: “90% student focused. Grammar wise, I tend to just transmit the information. With grammar when students don't understand, they avoid asking questions for some reason.” Four of the comments pointed out that although they adopt a more teacher-focused approach, they do not feel satisfied with their choice as Participant 5 said, “Our teaching approaches have to be, unfortunately, one way directed teaching because we have a syllabus to complete... a book that doesn't let us be free... I am not happy with my teaching approach because that is not me.”

Speaking of the reasons affecting their choice, participants referred to the characteristics of students and teachers as well as the nature of lessons and authorities in the educational context. Participant 6 summarized the determinants as ... the level of students, the motivation level of students, the expectations of students. Sometimes the topic, like the grammar topics... sometimes it takes like half an hour to transmit, to teach students a grammatical structure if I try to do it in a student-focused way. But if I switch to the teacher-focused approach for just five minutes, then things are going to be easier...

Participants also brought up the features of teachers affecting their approach. Among those features, teachers' character was mentioned by some participants for different choices. While Participant 4 said, "More students focused... the other one is just the presenter mode... I'm not that kind of person. My character is not suitable for that" while Participant 7 said, "... teacher focused... it's also about my personality because in my private life as well... I just want to control anything, so I just want to be responsible for everything." Finally, participants also stated that the choice was made by the decision makers as Participant 5 said, "...somebody out there is affecting, and that is called authority... I don't want to know who, but that person affects me so badly that I feel unhappy."

Comparison of the Data from the Questionnaire and the Interview

The questionnaire revealed that the Conceptual Change Student-Focused approach with a mean score of 3.79 ($SD = 0.56$) and Information Transmission Teacher-Focused approach ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 0.53$) had mean scores very close to each other (Table 47). Similar results were obtained from the analysis of the interviews as 26 of the comments were about ITTF and 25 of them were about CCSF. However, it should also be noted that four of the comments about ITTF specified participants' dissatisfaction with the approach they were forced to adopt (Table 54).

The Relationship between Oral Competency and Teaching Styles; and Teaching Approaches

The fourth question of this study was about the relationship between oral competency and teaching styles as well as between oral competency and teaching approaches. For the investigation of the relationships, both quantitative data from the questionnaire and the qualitative data from the interviews were used.

The findings from the questionnaire

In order to find out about the relationships, Pearson Correlation analysis was conducted. The results are interpreted according to the labels in the literature (Dancey & Reidy, 2007; Schober, Boer & Schwarte, 2018). For example, the range values up to ± 0.39 is labelled as weak by researchers in social sciences. The range of ± 0.4 to ± 0.7 is interpreted as moderate or strong, so the results in that range were defined accordingly. The results are demonstrated in Table 55.

Table 55

Correlation Matrix for Oral Competency and Teaching Styles (N =90)

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4
1. Oral Competency	4.35	0.44	-	-	-	-
2. Oral Comprehension	4.38	0.49	-	-	-	-
3. Oral Production	4.37	0.48	-	-	-	-
4. Oral Interaction	4.30	0.47	-	-	-	-
5. Expert	3.73	0.49	.01	.02	.09	.17
6. Formal Authority	3.60	0.53	.20	.07	.21*	.28**
7. Personal Model	4.01	0.46	.34**	.26*	.32**	.36**
8. Facilitator	3.91	0.49	.21*	.14	.20	.25*
9. Delegator	3.57	0.50	.24*	.09	.26*	.32**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

As indicated in the table, although there were some significant relationships between oral competency including its components and the teaching styles, they have weak to moderate positive correlations. However, Expert Style was the only teaching style that failed to show a correlation with any of the variables; with oral competency ($r(88) = .01, p = .353$), with oral comprehension ($r(88) = .02, p = .877$), with oral production ($r(88) = .01, p = .398$), with oral interaction ($r(88) = .17, p = .108$). This result show that when oral competency level went up or down, the probability of the choice of Expert Style of teaching did not show any difference. On the other hand, the Personal Model Style showed weak positive correlations with oral competency ($r(88) = .34, p = .001$), oral comprehension ($r(88) = .26, p = .015$), oral production

($r(88) = .32, p = .002$), and oral interaction ($r(88) = .36, p < .001$). This finding suggests that when teachers have high competency in oral competency and its subscales, the tendency to choose a Personal Model Style of teaching also increases. Additionally, when their oral competency decreases, their tendency to prefer Personal Model Style also declines. According to the table, among the subscales of oral competency, oral interaction is the one which shows correlations with the teaching styles the most. It has weak positive correlations with Personal Model Style ($r(88) = .36, p < .001$) and Delegator Style ($r(88) = .32, p = .002$), while it shows weaker positive correlations with Formal Authority Style ($r(88) = .28, p = .007$) and Facilitator Style ($r(88) = .25, p = .017$). On the contrary, as stated before, oral interaction does not have a correlation with Expert Style ($r(88) = .17, p = .108$). The results suggest that when the teachers' competency in oral interaction increases, they show weak inclinations to choose Personal Style and Delegator Style while they show weaker inclinations to adopt Formal Authority and Facilitator Style. The opposite direction is also correct for their level of oral interaction and their tendency of choices, which means if they have low level of competency in interaction, they also chose the four teaching styles less often. However, their choice of Expert Style does not show any difference according to low levels or high proficiency levels in oral interaction.

Pearson Correlation was also carried out to investigate the relationship between oral competency and teaching approaches. The results are shown in Table 56.

Table 56

Correlation Matrix for Oral Competency and Teaching Approaches (N =90)

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4
1. Oral Competency	4.35	0.44	-	-	-	-

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4
2. Oral Comprehension	4.38	0.49	-	-	-	-
3. Oral Production	4.37	0.48	-	-	-	-
4. Oral Interaction	4.30	0.47	-	-	-	-
5. ITTF	3.79	0.56	.18	.02	.21*	.27*
6. CCSF	3.65	0.53	.34**	.22*	.31**	.43**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

As can be seen in the table, although correlations between the variables were observed, they were in the range of weak to moderate. However, the relationship between CCSF and oral competency along with its constructs stood out since it showed positive correlations with all of them. CCSF had a moderate positive correlation with oral interaction ($r(88) = .43, p < .001$), and weak positive correlations with oral competency ($r(88) = .34, p < .001$), oral production ($r(88) = .31, p = .003$), and oral comprehension ($r(88) = .22, p = .036$). The results suggest that the teachers who adopt a student-focused teaching approach also have high levels of oral competency. Also, when they adopt a student-focused approach, the likelihood for them to have high competency levels is the strongest in the case of oral interaction, less strong in the case of oral competency and oral production and the least strong in the case of oral comprehension. The opposite combination is also applicable, which means when they have lower levels of oral competencies, they also have less tendency to adopt a student-focused approach. On the other hand, ITTF shows weak positive correlations with oral production ($r(88) = .21, p = .044$) and oral interaction ($r(88) = .27, p = .011$). The results suggest that when teachers have higher levels of competency in oral production and oral interaction, there is a likelihood that they adopt a teacher-focused teaching approach. In addition, when they have lower performance in oral production and interaction, they also have less tendency to adopt a teacher-focused approach.

Findings from the Interviews

In addition to participants' comments about their oral competency, teaching styles, and approaches, they were also asked to comment on their opinions about any possible relationship between their oral competency and their teaching styles; and their teaching approaches. The number of comments received is presented in Table 57.

Table 57

Number of Comments about the Relationship

Construct	Total Number		Yes		No		Unsure	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Between Oral Competency and Teaching Styles	13	54.2	10	41.7	1	4.2	2	8.3
Between Oral Competency and Teaching Approaches	11	45.8	7	29.2	3	12.5	1	4.2
Total Number	24	100	17	70.8	4	16.7	3	12.5

As can be seen in the table in terms of the relationship between oral competency and teaching styles, more comments addressed a possible relationship. Four participants stated that high levels of competency in the language enable them to be more confident and hence more capable in teaching the way they choose to teach. For example, Participant 8 who chooses Facilitator as his dominant teaching style said, "I think oral competency is a milestone in teaching... it's also a very crucial requirement. If you're not orally competent, you wouldn't exert self-confidence in the class... students need to believe that you are really good at what you're teaching..." However, these comments did not make a link between their level of oral competency and the type of teaching style they choose. Two of the participants stated how they managed to develop a high level of oral competency as non-native speakers of English affects their decisions about how to teach their students. Although teachers do not mention it directly, their personal experiences

having an impact on their teaching are among the prominent qualities of Personal Model Style. For example, Participant 3 said, "... since I'm a very independent learner myself, maybe it affects my teaching style. I also want them to be independent and learn for themselves. This can also affect it." Only one participant (Participant 6) referred to the relationship between the oral interaction subscale and his choice of teaching style:

... oral interaction is something that I prefer... maybe that's why I could choose a Personal Model or a Facilitator type model... I feel more confident in that role... I'm not really great in giving presentations... the Expert Style also is something that I use, but I wouldn't prefer...

Speaking of the relationship between oral competency and teaching approaches, there were fewer answers about a possible relationship. Although the comments were vague in terms of addressing a clear relationship between the constructs, there were again three mentions of the effect of their capability in language on their teaching performance in line with how they choose to teach. For example, Participant 4 who prefers a student-focused approach said. "I am orally competent, so I could easily get students to understand whatever I asked them to do. No matter what their level of English might be, I could communicate well my messages to even absolute beginners." Similarly, Participant 8 mentioned how his oral competency promotes his ability to start a conversation with students, which is one of the characteristics of the student-focused approach: "... I'm good enough in English... I always try to be the silly teacher with funny jokes... so that they can relax... my oral competency would be to not just teach in the class, but also to make students' day..." In addition, Participant 6 again made direct links between his competency in interaction and his choice of the student-focused approach: "...

because I like interaction and I don't like being at the center... I want to hear ideas... help students find out what they need... or what they can do, or and maybe understand the structure by themselves..." However, there were also three participants stating that there is no relationship because their choices are dependent on personal preferences and students, as Participant 2 pointed out, "I think there is no relation here... it's you. You just choose one method. If you're good at it (teaching), you'll be good at it in both of them, if you're bad, you'll be bad in both of them."

Comparison of the Data from the Pearson Correlation Analysis and the Interviews

According to the questionnaire results, the only teaching style which showed relationship with all the competency areas was Personal Model Style. It showed weak positive relationships with oral competency, oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction (Table 55). In the interviews, however, only two participants talked about high oral competency in general and their teaching practices which indicated Personal Model Style (Table 57). Although the number of comments was low, they stood out since they were the only comments addressing a relationship between a teaching style they choose and their oral competency. Also, Facilitator Style had a weak correlation with the oral interaction subscale according to statistical analysis (Table 55), which was mentioned by a participant who talked about how his high performance in interaction turns Facilitator Style into the right choice for him (Table 57).

According to Pearson Correlation Analysis of the relationship between oral competency and teaching approaches, CCSF was the only approach which had a relationship with all the oral competency areas. It showed a moderate positive correlation with oral interaction, weak positive correlations with oral competency,

with oral production, and with oral comprehension (Table 56). In the interviews, three comments mentioned a link between their oral competency and their choice of CCSF (Table 57). Also, the only pair among all the constructs in the study that showed a moderate positive relationship was oral interaction and CCSF (Table 56). In the interviews, there was one comment which made a direct connection between the choice of CCSF and high competency in oral interaction (Table 57).



CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

This study explored the oral competency, teaching styles, and teaching approaches of non-native EFL teachers working at a state university in Türkiye. It further investigated the relationship between their oral competency and their teaching styles and teaching approaches. In this regard, this chapter starts with the discussion of the major findings in comparison to the related literature. It proceeds with implications for practice and further research. Finally, the chapter concludes with the limitations of the study.

Discussion of Major Findings

The current study intended to identify the teachers' self-assessed oral competency, and their choices regarding teaching styles and teaching approaches. The first construct of the study, the oral competency of EFL teachers, as the main focus has not been investigated by many studies in the same way as in this study. However, there have been some studies that focused on EFL teachers' language proficiency in general, the results of which will be used in comparison to the findings of this study. In contrast, teaching styles, as the second construct, have been the topic of focus in many studies locally and globally by implementing the same inventory, the Teaching Style Inventory (Grasha, 2002) although the teachers participating in those studies varied in the subject they teach and the educational level they work at. Hence, the findings of the current research will be explained with reference to the previous research by also clarifying any differences in their contexts. Similar to teaching styles, teaching approaches as the third construct has been studied by previous research utilizing the same tool of data collection, Approaches to Teaching Inventory (Trigwell et al., 2005). Although most of those studies focused on tertiary

level education, there were fewer which accommodated EFL teachers as their participants. Thus, the results of the previous studies were looked at closely in order to help navigate the findings of this study in the related literature. Finally, the main emphasis was given to the relationship between oral competencies and teaching style as well as between oral competencies and teaching approaches in the current study. Although these relationships were not elaborated on in studies before in the exact same way as in this study, many called attention to the relationship between EFL teachers' language proficiency and their teaching, which lead the way when making sense of the findings of this study in relation to the previous knowledge.

EFL Teachers' Self-assessed Oral Competencies

The EFL teachers who participated in this study perceived themselves as most capable of understanding oral input, followed by producing oral output, and finally engaging in oral interaction in a social context. Moreover, the teachers with a BA degree in the ELT department found their performance in overall oral competency and more specifically in oral comprehension and oral production to be less satisfactory. Also, the teachers who speak other languages found their ability in overall oral competency and more specifically in oral comprehension to be higher. These results both contradict and agree with some of the findings of the previous research. However, it should be noted that while the current study focused on only oral competencies of teachers, the other relevant studies in the literature focused on overall language proficiency. As the previous studies also included parts related to oral competency as part of the overall language proficiency, the related results have been used to compare the findings.

To begin with, the teachers in this study found their performance in making sense of oral input, producing output, and interacting in English unlike some teachers

in various parts of the world teaching at different levels of education (Butler, 2004; Tang, 2007). The difference between the EFL teachers in the current study and the other conducted in Japan, Korea, Taiwan (Butler, 2004), and China (Tang, 2007) could be related to different teaching contexts. To illustrate, while the teachers in the current study worked at the tertiary level, the others worked at elementary and secondary schools. The language the participants in this study teach might be more challenging and require more command of English from the teachers, hence, they might feel more competent in the language.

Moreover, the requirements expected from the participants of this study could be another determining factor in beliefs of high oral competencies. For instance, a study in Hong Kong (Tsang, 2017) showed that despite being secondary school teachers, EFL teachers perceive their language proficiency to be high because of the expectations of high proficiency from the teachers to be recruited for their teaching jobs at secondary schools in Hong Kong. Similarly, since the teachers in Türkiye to work at universities need to prove their competence in the language with written exams and interviews, it might be expected that the ones recruited were already found to be competent in English. In fact, a similar study conducted with EFL teachers at universities in Türkiye (Şekerci, 2011) showed that those teachers also rated their competencies to be high. Hence, employment in a position after proving good performance in English could result in the high perception of oral competencies in both studies.

A closer examination of the results for the oral competencies showed that the participants of the current study rated their performance to be highest in oral comprehension and almost as high in oral production. Previous research produced differing results regarding EFL teachers' strengths in oral comprehension and

production. Some found that teachers feel stronger in receptive skills (Butler, 2004) and in listening (Tang, 2007), which could be because those teachers teach at elementary and secondary schools. When compared to the context of the current study conducted with EFL teachers at universities, elementary and secondary schools might not require teachers to carry out lessons in English. On the other hand, some studies showed that EFL teachers at high schools in Iran (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008) and teachers at primary and high schools in Türkiye perceive their performance to be higher in speaking than listening. The difference between those studies and the current study could result from comparatively less emphasis given to listening practices in the class at primary and high schools. In comparison, classes at universities might spend more time on speaking and listening since mastery of those skills is required to pass the exams in many preparatory schools. Hence, teachers in this study are inclined to expose their students and themselves to listening and speaking practices so that students can pass the exams, which might result in more developed skills in oral comprehension and production.

A closer review of oral competency areas also revealed both similarities and differences to previous research. For instance, Iranian teachers in Eslami and Fatahi's study (2008) feel their listening skills to be the least proficient when they watched the news or movies without subtitles. On the other hand, the participants in this study rated their related competency higher in comprehending media sources in general. However, it should be noted that the results from the interviews and the questionnaire drew attention to speed and accents as identifying factors of their performance in this study. Thus, on the condition that the input includes fast speech and different accents, it might be deduced that comprehending such texts without subtitles could cause unsatisfactory results for the participants of this study, too.

Regarding oral interaction at which the participants of the current study found themselves to be least competent, similar results were observed in previous research. For instance, Eslami and Fatahi's study (2008) showed that Iranian teachers assessed their performance as the poorest when using strategies to keep a conversation going. Although their research did not have a subscale of oral interaction, the statement may be considered as part of competency in oral interaction. Hence, it might be said that the result received for that item resonates with the results of the current study because the participants in this study perceived their performance to be the poorest in oral interaction. However, it should be noted that one item will hardly suffice for 11 items that belonged to the oral interaction subscale in this study. One other area included as part of competence in oral interaction is idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms. In line with previous studies in Iran (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008) and in Türkiye (Yılmaz, 2011), the teachers in this study perceived their oral interaction competency as the poorest in relation to colloquialisms and idiomatic expressions. Possible reasons why teachers in both studies and the current study struggle to understand language heavy in idiomatic expressions could be the inability to use the language to communicate with foreigners. Limited exposure to oral interaction with natives and non-natives which is likely to bring up unknown cultural content and expressions could cause low levels of competency since the teachers in both contexts resided in countries where languages other than English were spoken as the first language.

Finally, in the current study, a BA degree in the department of ELT was a factor for lower level in oral competency, oral comprehension, and oral production. This could be resulting from limited chance to learn about the target culture in the ELT departments, which was previously highlighted in another study with

prospective teachers about their perception of target language and culture (Arikan, 2011). In comparison to students studying in the departments such as English Language and Literature and American Culture and Literature, the ELT department students have less exposure to literary texts that are high in cultural elements but rather the focus in these departments is more on pedagogical knowledge, which could result in ELT graduates' low perceptions of oral comprehension. Placing less emphasis on cultural input in the ELT department might be the reason why those teachers perceive themselves as less capable in oral competency in English as well as oral comprehension and production. Another reason could be less importance given to enhancing learners' knowledge of the language in the ELT department. Güngör (2020) points out that the department's failure to promote ELT prospective teachers' speaking abilities in spite of its success in improving their pedagogical skills in teaching. Because of over emphasis on pedagogical knowledge, the students in the ELT departments could find themselves focusing on how to develop oral competencies of students before they could find chances to improve themselves in the related areas. Unless teachers find opportunities to improve their skills in English later in their careers, their beliefs about their abilities in their oral competency when they were students in their departments could prevail when they become a teacher. On the other hand, the teachers with a BA degree in ELT are likely to have higher awareness of advanced levels of English that can be achieved by language learners, and they may have higher expectations for their own performances as they themselves are highly experienced language learners. Hence, excessive focus on achieving the desired levels of English could result in harsh judgements about their own oral competency abilities.

One other factor in different levels of oral competency and oral comprehension was whether additional languages were spoken by the teachers at least at the elementary level. The reason why they perceive their oral performance as higher specifically when understanding oral input could be because of the improved language awareness resulting from learning other languages (Milambiling, 2011). This language awareness when coupled with teachers' knowledge of how languages work could bestow an improved perception of their oral performance on them.

EFL Teachers' Teaching Styles

As for the findings from the questionnaire about the teaching styles, the most frequently preferred styles were respectively Personal Model, Facilitator, and Expert. In the interviews, although a different order was observed, these three styles were again among the styles which received the highest number of comments in the following order: Facilitator, Expert, and Personal Model. The resulting difference between the findings of the questionnaire and the interviews could be the outcome of the contradiction between the teachers' beliefs and their practices. Also, the groups of age and years of teaching experience differed significantly in their choice of most of the teaching styles.

Teachers of the current study preferred to be a facilitator enabling effective learning experiences similar to other EFL teachers in different contexts (Ghanizadeh & Jahedizadeh, 2016; Soleimani, 2020). The reason why teachers in different contexts preferred Facilitator Style could be related to the nature of language teaching. As the outcome of language teaching has been seen as students' production (Chambless, 2012), more teachers might believe teachers should be in the role of facilitator. In fact, such logic was observed in the number of comments in the interviews about teachers' choice when teaching productive skills because even the

teachers who preferred other styles said they would choose a Facilitator Style when teaching productive skills.

The participants also preferred to be an expert sharing their knowledge with the students very similar to the teachers in Soleimani's study (2020) in Iran and in Karabuga's study (2015) in Türkiye. The reason why being in an expert role is preferable to all those teachers could result from the culture. In some Eastern cultures, it is still expected teachers to be a figure who would deliver their expertise to students (Ahmad & Rao, 2012; Dogancay-Aktuna, 2006), which could prompt the teachers' choices accordingly.

Interestingly, despite cultural similarities, Personal Model Style was the latest on the most preferred list of the teachers in Soleimani's study in Iran (2008) whereas it was one of the most popular styles in the current study and in Karabuga's study in Türkiye (2015). The reason why being a teacher who shares personal experiences as a role model for the students is preferred in the current context could be related to the need to motivate students. In fact, in the interviews, motivation levels of students were shown as a factor in teachers' choices while the study in Iran depicted students who studied at private institutions as highly motivated. Hence, the teachers in this study might choose to adopt a teaching style like Personal Model Style which highlights personal similarities between themselves and the students to motivate students' attempts to become as good learners of the language as their teacher.

The teaching context and its aspects can be shown as a reason why one of the least preferred styles in this study is Delegator Style which gives high levels of freedom and responsibilities to students. As the comments in the interviews suggested, the educational context in the current study was constrained by the decisions and rules of the regulations of the school and the university. Hence, even

though the teachers wanted to let students have more freedom and responsibility, they themselves might have lacked the freedom to make changes in the decisions about their lessons. In comparison, teachers at private institutions in Iran (Ghanizadeh & Jahedizadeh, 2016) were able to adopt Delegator Style as they were less restricted by authorities' decisions. Also, the resulting less formal relationship between teachers and students was mentioned among the reasons why those teachers were better at sharing their responsibilities with their students, unlike the current study. In the current study, participants in the interviews highlighted institutions' choices shaping their teaching in classrooms. Hence, having to meet the expectations placed by the authorities, the teachers in the current study might feel the need to refrain from adopting Delegator Style regardless of their preferences.

Another style which was among the least favored ones by the participants in the current study was Formal Authority Style which emphasizes the importance of teaching according to the standards and principles. However, Karabuga's study (2015) showed that it was one of the most popular for the EFL teachers in her study in Türkiye. More interestingly, in that study, Facilitator Style was not preferred by many teachers, unlike the findings of other research (Ghanizadeh & Jahedizadeh, 2016; Soleimani, 2020). Karabuga established a link between students' prior experiences as well as their resultant expectations from teachers and teachers' choices of teaching. In contrast to Karabuga's study, most of the teachers in the current study preferred Facilitator Style and the difference in the findings could be because of the change in the needs, experiences, and expectations of the students in time. Also, in the same year as Karabuga's study, a report about language education in Türkiye was published (West et al., 2015) and both studies agree on the traditional way language was taught at universities. The studies, reports and the changing needs

of students to use the language for communication might have caused awareness of a change in the way language should be taught and, hence, the inclusion of Facilitator as a teaching style in Türkiye and in the current study. However, it should be noted that teachers in the current study also adopt Expert Style in their classrooms and all the comments about the reasons for their choices showed students and educational context as the factors. Thus, it might be deduced that although educational context and students were subject to change, some qualities remained unchanged.

Lastly, similar to the findings of this study about age and experience, there are others who also found that age and years of teaching experience were factors in the teaching style of EFL teachers (Rahimi & Asadollahi, 2012). As expected, in the current study, age and experience indicated more frequent use of all the teaching styles. One of the reasons for the more frequent use of almost all the styles by the old and experienced teachers in this study could be their knowledge base leading to confidence in making proper decisions for different teaching contexts (Hagger & McIntyre, 2000). In addition, teachers with more experience have improved classroom management skills including ability to overcome emotional complexities of classes, which not only enables them to have more time to achieve the lesson outcomes but also leads to positive attitudes towards teaching and students (Dewaele, Gkonou & Mercer, 2018). Hence, the experienced teachers are likely to listen to their students and have enough time to adopt the proper teaching styles accordingly considering they waste less time on classroom management issues.

Teaching Approaches

As for the results in relation to teaching approaches, the Conceptual Change/Student-Focused approach was more frequently preferred by the teachers in this study than Information Transmission/Teacher-Focused approach while the

findings from the questionnaire and the interviews showed that although it was less popular, ITTF was also used by the teachers. Also, it was found that ITTF is preferred by old and experienced teachers more than the young ones.

A student-focused approach is found more popular among the participants of the current study, which is expected from teachers in soft disciplines. According to Lueddeke's study (2003) with academics in UK, teachers teaching in so-called hard disciplines like medicine or engineering apply a more teacher-focused approach whereas teachers performing in soft disciplines adopt a more student-focused approach in their teaching. Since teaching languages falls into the softer domains, the result of the current study supports the suggestion by Lueddeke.

On the other hand, the current study had somewhat contradicting findings with another study conducted with academics with different titles working at the education faculty of different universities in Türkiye (Aksoy et al., 2018). They concluded that the academics teaching undergraduate level classes preferred a more teacher-centered approach whereas they chose a more student-centered approach in graduate level classes. The reason for their tendency to use a more teacher-centered approach in undergraduate classes was explained in relation to students' expectations, their low levels of self-regulation and teachers' limited freedom when making choices about the classes. However, in the current study, teachers who taught at the undergraduate level preferred a more student-centered approach although the two approaches were very close to each other. Nevertheless, it should be acknowledged that all the teachers in the current study taught in the undergraduate level classes, so if there had been teachers working with graduate level students, they could have produced differences in the choice of teaching approaches. In addition, teachers in this study who chose a teacher-centered approach commented on the

students and decisions made by authorities affecting their choices, which was in line with the suggestions about teachers' freedom made by Aksoy et al. (2018).

Another finding of previous research showed that teachers choose a teacher-centered approach less frequently in smaller classrooms with one to 20 students (Aksoy et al., 2018), which is in line with the findings of the current research as the classrooms of the teachers taught in smaller classes at the preparatory school. The reason could be because the small-sized classes might enable teachers to adopt a more student-centered approach while high numbers of students might impede teachers' attempts to focus on individual students considering the limited time in the class. In fact, in the current study, the comments in the interviews showed time as a determinant of their choice of approach in teaching.

One other finding of Aksoy et al.'s study demonstrated that seniority plays a role in the tendency of choosing a more student-centered approach. One of the reasons suggested for this finding was higher numbers of graduate level classes taught by academics with higher order academic titles and their wide repertoire of pedagogical methods. However, in the current study, teachers with the highest years of experience preferred a teacher-centered approach more than the groups with less than 21 years of teaching experience. As the teachers all taught undergraduate students, differing levels of freedom resulting from the graduate or undergraduate level classes were not a factor in the current study. As for the lack of pedagogical techniques at less experienced teachers' disposal, which might cause them to resort to a teacher-centered approach, the participants of the study might present a different conclusion for two reasons. First, almost 75 percent of the teachers graduated from the ELT department and almost 39 percent held a master's degree in EFL, so it is likely that a majority of teachers were taught the contemporary pedagogical methods

and techniques of their time. Second, even the teachers with the fewest years of experience (six to fifteen years) in this study seem to have had enough years to put teaching theory into practice. Hence, because the teachers in this study did not differ in the freedom they had in the decision-making process for their classes and because even the most inexperienced ones possibly obtained theoretical and practical knowledge of pedagogy, less seniority did not lead to choices of a more teacher-centered approach.

Lastly, while CCSF was preferred by both experienced and less experienced teachers, the results of the current study showed that ITTF was adopted by experienced and old teachers significantly more than the younger and less experienced teachers. Not surprisingly, age and years of teaching experience were found among factors resulting in significant differences among teachers in their choices of teaching approaches. The reason could be because more learner-centered approaches which are a relatively new trend require adaptation to teaching materials and methods (Griffith & Lim, 2010). Hence, despite more experienced teachers' pedagogical prowess, the more experienced teachers might choose a teacher-focused approach simply because they have more experience and knowledge about how to teach that way. In fact, those teachers' experience might have equipped them with strategies to use a more teacher-centered approach effectively for the benefit of the classroom.

Relationship between EFL Teachers' Oral Competency and Their Teaching Styles

As for the relationship between non-native EFL teachers' oral competencies in English and their teaching styles, some relationships were suggested in the analysis despite being weak. The results demonstrated that Personal Model, Facilitator, and Delegator were the only teaching styles which had a relationship with

oral competency. In addition, the oral interaction subscale was the one which showed a relationship with the most teaching styles including Formal Authority, Personal Model, Facilitator, and Delegator. Also, Personal Model was the only style which had a relationship not only with oral competency but also with all its subscales: oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction. However, Expert was the only style which did not show any relationship with oral competency and its subscales.

Butler (2004) highlighted sociolinguistic aspects of teachers' language proficiency that determine the effectiveness of communication in the classroom. He stated that the inability to use the language properly by using conversational strategies might not only harm the quality of language as input but also cause conversation breakdowns between the teacher and students. Mastery of sociolinguistic aspects of language could be regarded as part of high competency in oral interaction, which might explain why oral interaction was the only competency that had a relationship to four of the teaching styles in the current study. Similarly, the reason why Expert Style did not show any relation to oral interaction could be because of the emphasis in that style which is placed on the transmission of knowledge and expertise rather than the reciprocal contribution of teachers and students to the lessons. Butler also pointed out various effects of teachers' high command of language on their performances including their confidence, their application of pedagogical knowledge, knowledge of the lesson content, etc. Hence, as part of language proficiency, high oral competency might enable teachers to choose proper teaching styles like Facilitator and Delegator as a result of their pedagogical knowledge. In other words, since language teaching requires students' active use of the language (Richards et al., 2013) and a corresponding teaching style which enables students' active participation like Facilitator and Delegator, the

relationship between high oral competency and the tendency to choose Facilitator and Delegator is expected. Hence, the relationship between oral competency and Facilitator and Delegator found in this study was in line with the suggestions made by Butler.

Tsui (2003) stated that teachers with limited knowledge of the language had a tendency to use more prescriptive ways of teaching and they took less initiative to adjust language resources depending on their appropriateness to the lesson context. Prescriptive teaching shows similarity to Expert and Formal Authority styles as the extent of the knowledge area and its transmission in Expert Style decide and prescribe what and how to teach whereas external standards lead the actions and expectations of the teachers in Formal Authority. In the light of the connection made by Tsui and its representation in the constructs of this study, the current study's findings on the lack of relationship between oral competency and Expert and Formal Authority styles have roots in the literature.

As for the relationship between Personal Model and all the competency areas, the results of the current study can also be explained in reference to the literature. Richards (2015) and Scrivener (2005) both suggested that teachers with high command of the language they teach are able to provide more effective feedback to the learners' performances. Since one of the features standing out in Personal Model Style is giving corrective feedback, the findings about the relationship between oral competencies (including oral comprehension, oral production, and oral interaction) and Personal Model Style were in line with the suggestions made previously by the researchers. Another main feature of Personal Model Style is presenting a model to students that they can imitate to master their skills. Related to this point, Naserdeen (2001) stated that teachers with high competency in the language manage to present

better examples in language use including grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. Hence, teachers who believe they have high oral competencies can also trust they can present good models to students and choose Personal Model Style, which might explain the relationship between high oral competencies and the choice of Personal Model suggested by the current study.

Relationship between EFL Teachers' Oral Competency and Their Teaching

Approaches

According to the analysis of the data about the relationship between the participants' oral competencies and their choice of teaching approaches, there found to be weak to moderate relationships between some constructs. Conceptual Change/Student-Focused approach had weak relationships with oral competency and its two subscales: oral comprehension and oral production while it had a moderate relationship with oral interaction. In contrast, Information Transmission/Teacher-Focused approach had weak relationships with oral production and oral interaction.

Farrell and Richards (2007) suggested that the teachers who perceive weaknesses in their language use and knowledge are generally so concerned about their own incompetency that they rarely have enough time to spend on students' actions. This could result in a possible relationship between high competency and the choice of a teacher-centered approach suggested by the findings of the current research since those teachers who believed to have high competency could spare enough attention to focus on students' engagement and involvement in the classroom.

McNamara (1991) pointed out that language teachers with high proficiency are more adept at adjusting the classroom materials according to the needs of the students. Emphasizing students' needs and addressing them require teachers'

placement of students in the center, which might lend itself to a more student-centered approach. As the teachers in this study who assessed their performance in oral competencies as high also showed a desire to adopt a more student-centered approach, it might be said that the relationship specified by McNamara was also justified by the finding of the current research. However, the comments in the interviews showed that teachers made the choice of their teaching approach according to students' needs no matter which approach they adopted. Thus, it might be suggested that the fact that students were placed in the center could require teachers to adopt a more teacher-centered approach depending on students' profile.

Kim and Elder (2008) highlighted teachers' ability to be spontaneous and utilize the emergent teaching moments when they hold a high level of language proficiency. When the classrooms' vibrant nature which is inclusive of diverse qualities of students is taken into account, the ability to act on what is unexpected necessitates teachers' attention to students as the shareholders of the lesson rather than themselves or their lesson plans. The inclusion of what students bring can be possible when they are given a share of attention, which is one of the characteristics of a student-centered approach. Hence, the findings of the current research that suggested teachers who had a high level of language proficiency were likely to adopt a more student-centered approach could hold ties to what was suggested by Kim and Elder.

Implications for Practice

As the questionnaire and the semi-structured interviews offered opportunities for teachers to reflect on their teaching styles and teaching approaches, they can better acknowledge their zero beliefs which are defined as underlying reasons for practice unknown to teachers (Bem, 1970). Professional development activities

promoting similar realizations by encouraging self-reflection can take place in the institution since there will always be expectations from teachers with regard to keeping up with current developments of ELT (Ayar, 2019).

Depending on teachers' realizations, the institutions can design professional activities for the promotion of change and alterations related to teachers' needs. To this end, guidance can be offered by the supervisors for the teachers attempting to find ways to improve themselves in their teaching. Moreover, as it is found that some institution related issues have an impact on teaching styles and practices, institutions can also implement some changes in related decisions. In addition, as years of teaching experience works as a factor in different teaching styles and approaches, the professional development practices could be designed as sensitive to the needs and expectations of teachers with different years of experience.

Similar to teaching practices, the teachers having become more familiar with their competencies can be guided to pursue development regarding their oral competency. Since many benefits of a good command of the language in teaching skills are stated by the previous research (Farrell & Richards, 2007; Kim & Elder, 2008; McNamara, 1991; Scrivener, 2005), the institution can invest in the development of oral competencies of teachers by offering teachers incentives, guidance, and support in their improvement process.

Implications for Further Research

As the current study is only conducted in one institution, other studies can be conducted to shed light on the oral competency, teaching styles, and teaching approaches of EFL teachers. Future studies to be carried out with other groups of teachers who may teach at different levels of education and vary in terms of years of teaching experience, the type of institution they work for, and the profile of students

they teach can offer further insights regarding the constructs of the study. In addition, the inclusion of EFL teachers with first languages other than Turkish can help attain a better outlook on the teachers' oral competencies and teaching preferences in terms of teaching styles and approaches.

Furthermore, to examine the relationship between teachers' oral competency and teaching preferences, teachers' real teaching practices can be observed and analyzed. Similarly, for the assessment of the oral competencies of teachers, some standardized test results acknowledged as reliable can be used to assess teachers' oral competencies so that their results can reflect on their performance in relation to the domains of oral competency.

In addition, other shareholders' perceptions can be included in future studies as they will contribute to the current description of oral competency, teaching styles, and teaching approaches of EFL teachers. As all the questions required teachers' perceptions and their self-assessment, involving the perceptions of the students, the other teachers, and the administrators on individual teachers can increase the richness of the data and improve the reliability by enabling cross-checking of the findings.

Moreover, teaching styles and teaching approaches can be studied in relation to other constructs since there are different determinants influencing the teachers' choices regarding their practice. While teaching styles and preferences are affected by other competencies related to the language skills of teachers, the effect of oral competency of teachers can also be observed in teachers' performance related to material design, summative or formative assessment of students, and technology use. Thus, both oral competency and teaching styles and approaches can be studied in connection to other aspects.

Limitations

This case study was inherently restrained by some boundaries. To start with, it only investigated one teaching context and the non-native EFL teachers who are employed in that context. Also, the data collected only came from non-native EFL teachers working mostly with young adults at a state university in Türkiye. Hence, the scope of this study had to be constrained by the specific context and the participants there since the characteristics of the setting and participants were found to be representative of other educational contexts in Türkiye.

There are other limitations regarding the data collection tools of the current study. First of all, a self-assessment tool was implemented to find out about the oral competency of teachers. Since the teachers self-reported their abilities by answering action-based items of the questionnaire, their self-reflected answers may result in producing a picture different from the real description of their competency. Similarly, the inventories of teaching and teaching approaches providing self-reports of the teachers about their practice may lead to results that may not reflect their real practices objectively.

Moreover, teachers' performances hold intertwined relationships with the performance of other shareholders, all of which were not able to be included in the study. Students, co-workers, and administrators have their own place affecting and getting affected by the teaching practice that occurs in the classroom. Hence, other shareholders present in the teaching context could have contributed to the understanding of teachers' oral competencies, teaching styles and approaches. Yet, in this study, only the teachers' perceptions and their accounts regarding focus areas were disclosed by bringing the significant differences among the participants in data to light.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, F. (1993). *The making of modern Turkey*. Routledge.
- Ahmad, S., & Rao, C. (2012). Does it work? Implementing communicative language teaching approach in an EFL context. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(12), 28-35.
- Aksoy, E., Akbaş, U., & Seferoğlu, G. (2018). Adaptation of the approaches to teaching inventory into Turkish and analysis of Turkish academics' approaches to their own teaching. *Education and Science*, 43(194), 81-99.
<http://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2018.7253>
- Alderson, C. (2007). The CEFR and the need for more research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 659-663. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00627.4.x>
- Alnajami, M. L. (2019). Reflection on effective English language teaching and learning methodologies in higher education: Identifying sources of university teachers' beliefs and requirements for improvement. *International Journal of Psycho-Educational Sciences*, 8(1), 22-33.
- Altinyelken, H. K. (2011). Student-centred pedagogy in Turkey: Conceptualisations, interpretations and practices. *Journal of Education Policy*, 26 (2), 137-160.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2010.504886>
- Andersen, I. G., & Andersen, S. C. (2017). Student-centered instruction and academic achievement: Linking mechanisms of educational inequality to schools' instructional strategy. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 38(4), 533-550. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2015.1093409>
- Anderson, G. & Arsenault, N. (1998). *Fundamentals of educational research* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203978221>

- Andrews, S. (2007). *Teacher language awareness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Arikan, A. (2011). Prospective English language teachers' perceptions of the target language and culture in relation to their socioeconomic status. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 232-242. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p232>
- Arikan, A. (2015). The CEFR and reading: A document analysis. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 501-504.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.538>
- Artvinli, E. (2010). Coğrafya öğretmenlerinin öğretim stilleri. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(33), 387- 408.
- Aslam, M. (2021). Analysing gray cast iron data using a new Shapiro-Wilks test for normality under indeterminacy. *International Journal of Cast Metals Research*, 34(1), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13640461.2020.1846959>
- Ayar, Z. (2019). *Expectations and practices for continuing professional development at Turkish state and foundation universities: A suggested model* [Doctoral Dissertation, Gazi University].
<https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=Ds0bmlQJafTdoyo4yLfx4fA&no=G61tlnLquvjngGgsLpryQQ>
- Aydoğan, H., & Akbarov, A. A. (2014). The four basic language skills, whole language & integrated skill approach in mainstream university classrooms in Turkey. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(9), 672-680.
<https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n9p672>
- Aytaç, T., & Kula, S. S. (2020). The effect of student-centered approaches on students' creative thinking skills: A meta-analysis study. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 7(2), 62-80.
<https://doi.org/10.33200/ijcer.723894>

- Babbie, E. (2010). *The practice of social research* (12th ed.). Wadsworth.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Barni, M. (2015). In the name of the CEFR: Individuals and standards. In B. Spolsky, O. Inbar-Lourie & M. Tannenbaum (Eds.), *Challenges of language education and policy: Making space for people* (pp.40-52). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847697318>
- Bem, D. J. (1970). *Beliefs, attitudes, and human affairs*. Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Benson, P. (2012). Learner-centered teaching. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to pedagogy and practice in second language teaching* (pp. 30-37). Cambridge University Press.
- Biggs, J., & Tang C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does* (4th ed.). Open University Press.
- Borg, S., & Edmett, A. (2018). Developing a self-assessment tool for English language teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(5), 655-679.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817752543>
- Bota, O., & Tulbure, C. (2015). Aspects regarding the relationship between teaching styles and school results. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 203, 285-290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.296>
- Brown, N. A., Dewey, D. P., & Cox, T. L. (2014). Assessing the validity of can-do statements in retrospective (then-now) self-assessment. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47(2), 261-285. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12082>

- Butler, Y. G. (2004). What level of English proficiency do elementary school teachers need to attain to teach EFL? Case studies from Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(2), 245-278. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588380>
- Byram, M., & Parmenter, L. (Eds). (2012). *The Common European Framework of Reference: The globalisation of language education policy*. Multilingual Matters.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>
- Canh, L. V., & Renandya, W. A. (2017). Teachers' English proficiency and classroom language use: A conversation analysis study. *RELJ Journal*, 48(1), 67-81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690935>
- Cassidy, R., & Ahmad, A. (2021). Evidence for conceptual change in approaches to teaching, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 2(5), 742-758. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1680537>
- Chacón, C. T. (2003). Hacia el desarrollo de una práctica pedagógica reflexiva mediante la actualización de los docentes de inglés de la tercera etapa de educación básica: Evaluación de una experiencia [Towards the development of reflective teaching through professional development of middle school English teachers: Evaluation of an experience]. *Acción Pedagógica*, 12, 120-129.
- Chambless, K. S. (2012). Teachers' oral proficiency in the target language: Research on its role in language teaching. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(1), 141-162. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01183.x>
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*, MIT Press.

- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (Eds.). (2017). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Cooper, T. C. (2001). Foreign language teaching style and personality. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34(4), 301-317. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2001.tb02062.x>
- Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 113-143. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298563>
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Crumly, C. L. (2014). *Pedagogies for student-centered learning: Online and on ground*. Fortress Press.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Çakır, İ., & Kafa, S. (2013). English language teachers' preferences in presenting target language grammar. *Journal of Language and Literature Education*, 8, 39-51.
- Çağatay, S., & Gürocak, F. Ü. (2016). Is CEFR really over there? *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232, 705-712. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.096>
- Çelik, S. (2013). Plurilingualism, pluriculturalism, and the CEFR: Are Turkey's foreign language objectives reflected in classroom instruction? *Procedia -*

Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70, 1872–1879.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.265>

Dancey, C. P., & Reidy, J. (2007). *Statistics without maths for psychology*. Pearson Education.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2019). The effect of classroom emotions, attitudes toward English, and teacher behavior on willingness to communicate among English Foreign Language Learners. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 38, 523-535. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X19864996>

Dewaele, J. -M., Gkonou, C., & Mercer, S. (2018). Do ESL/EFL teachers' emotional intelligence, teaching experience, proficiency and gender affect their classroom practice? In: J. D. M. Agudo (Ed.). *Emotions in second language teaching*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75438-3_8

Demirel, Ö. (2005). Avrupa Konseyi dil projesi ve Türkiye uygulaması. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 33(167).

Deygers, B. (2021). The CEFR companion volume: Between research-based policy and policy-based research. *Applied Linguistics*, 42(1), 186-191. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amz024>

Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (2006). Expanding the socio-cultural knowledge base of TESOL teacher education. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19(3), 278-295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908310608668768>

Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in second language research* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203864739>

Drotar, D. (2019). *Student-centered language teaching in the East Asian context* [Master's Thesis, Multnomah University]. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.14245.45281>

- Dunn, K., & Dunn, R. (1977). *Administrator's guide to new programs for faculty management and evaluation*. Parker Publishing.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>
- Eslami, Z. R., & Fatahi A. (2008). Teachers' sense of self-efficacy, English proficiency, and instructional strategies: A study of non-native EFL teachers in Iran. *TESLEJ*, 11(4), 1-19.
- Eslami, Z. R., & Harper, K. (2018). Language proficiency and NNESTs. In J. Lontas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1-6). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0022>
- Faez, F., & Karas, M. (2019). Language proficiency development of non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) in an MA TESOL program: A case study. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 22(4), 1-16.
- Faez, F., Karas, M., & Uchihara, T. (2021). Connecting language proficiency to teaching ability: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(5) 754-777. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819868>
- Farrell, T.S., & Richards, J.C. (2007). Teachers' language proficiency. In T.S. Farrell (Ed.), *Reflective language teaching: From research to practice* (pp. 55-66). Bloomsbury Academic. <http://doi.org/10.5040/9781474212328.ch-005>
- Figueras, N. (2012). The impact of the CEFR. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 477-485. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs037>
- Finnie, R., & Meng, R. (2005). Literacy and labour market income: Self-assessment versus test score measures. *Applied Economics*, 37, 1935-1951. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036840500244519>

- Fisher, B., & Fisher, L. (1979). Styles in teaching and learning. *Educational Leadership*, 36, 245-251.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (6th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- Freeman, D., Katz, A., Gomez, G., & Burns, A. (2015). English for teaching: Rethinking teacher proficiency in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 69(2), 129-139. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu074>
- Fulcher, G. (2004). Deluded by artifices? The common European framework and harmonization. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 1(4), 253-266. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15434311laq0104_4
- Gardner, P. L. (1995). Measuring attitudes to science: Unidimensionality and internal consistency revisited. *Research in Science Education*, 25(3), 283-289. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02357402>
- Garson, G. D. (2012). *Testing statistical assumptions*. Statistical Associates Publishing.
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Ghanizadeh, A., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2016). EFL teachers' teaching style, creativity, and burnout: A path analysis approach. *Cogent Education*, 3(1), 1-17. <http://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1151997>
- Grasha, A. F. (1994). A matter of style: The teacher as expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. *College Teaching*, 42(4), 142-149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.1994.9926845>

Grasha, A. F. (1996). *Teaching with style: A practical guide to enhancing leaning by understanding teaching and learning style*. Alliance Publishers.

Grasha, A. F. (2002). *Teaching with style*. Alliance Publishers.

Griffith, W. I., & Lim, H. Y. (2010). Making student-centered teaching work. *MexTESOL Journal*, 34(1), 75-83.

Gibbs, G., & Coffey, M. (2004). The impact of training of university teachers on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching and the approach to learning of their students. *Active Learning in Higher Education* 5, 87-100.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787404040463>

Gomes, H. S., Farrington, D. P., Maia A., & Krohn, M. D. (2019). Measurement bias in self-reports of offending: a systematic review of experiments. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 15, 313-339. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-019-09379-w>

Güngör, M. N. (2020). English language proficiency of non-native student-teachers in Turkey. In D. L. Banegas (Ed.), *Content knowledge in English language teacher education: International experiences* (pp. 201-216). Bloomsbury. <http://doi.org/10.5040/9781350084650.0019>

Hadley, A. O. (2001). *Teaching language in context*. Heinle & Heinle.

Hagger, H., & McIntyre, D. (2000). What can research tell us about teacher education? *Oxford Review of Education*, 26(3-4), 483-495. <http://doi.org/10.1080/713688546>

Harshman, J., & Stains, M. (2017). A review and evaluation of the internal structure and consistency of the Approaches to Teaching Inventory. *International Journal of Science Education*, 39(7), 918-936. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1310411>

- Hayes, A. F., & Cai, L. (2010). Further evaluating the conditional decision rule for comparing two independent means. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 60(2), 217-244.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/000711005X62576>
- Heimlich, J. E., & Norland, E. (2002). Teaching style: Where are we now? *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 93, 17-26.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.46>
- Henson, K. T., & Borthwick, P. (1984). Matching styles: A historical look. *Theory into Practice*, 23(1), 3-9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405848409543083>
- Hişmanoglu, M. (2013). Does English language teacher education curriculum promote CEFR awareness of prospective EFL teachers? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 938-945.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.09.307>
- Hitchcock, G., & Hughes, D. (1995). *Research and the teachers*. Routledge.
- Hu, G. (2002). Potential cultural resistance to pedagogical imports: The case of communicative language teaching in China. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 15(2), 93-105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908310208666636>
- Hulstijn, J. (2007). The shaky ground beneath the CEFR: Quantitative and qualitative dimensions of language proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 663-667. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00627_5.x
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In C. J. Brumfit, & K. Johnson (Eds.). *The communicative approach to language teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 5-27). Oxford University Press.
- Ifenthaler, D., Schumacher, C., & Kuzilek, J. (2022). Investigating students' use of self-assessments in higher education using learning analytics. *Journal of*

Computer Assisted Learning, 39(1), 255-268.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12744>

Jarvis, P. (1985). Thinking critically in an information society: A sociological analysis. *Lifelong-Learning*, 8(6), 11-14.

Jarvis, P. (2004). *Adult education and lifelong learning: Theory and practice*. Routledge.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2014). *Educational research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Kang, S. J. (2005) Dynamic emergence of situational willingness to communicate in a second language. *System*, 33, 277-292.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.10.004>

Karabuga, F. (2015). Match or mismatch between learning styles of prep-class EFL students and EFL teachers. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 12(2), 276-288.

Kibiswa, N. K. (2019). Directed qualitative content analysis (DQICA): A tool for conflict analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 24(8), 2059-2079.

<https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2019.3778>

Kim, S., & Elder, C. (2008). Target language use in foreign language classrooms: Practices and perceptions of native speaker teachers. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 21(2), 167-185. <http://doi.org/10.1080/07908310802287574>

Kırkgöz, Y. (2007). English language teaching in Turkey: Policy changes and their implementations. *RELC Journal*, 38(2), 216-228.

<https://doi.org/10.30831/akukeg.532955>

- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher: Towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(1), 77-97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2003.10.002>
- Köksal, D., & Ulum, Ö. G. (2019). Pre-service EFL teachers' conceptions of language proficiency: Entry and exit level qualifications. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 484-495. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.586144>
- Krumm, H.-J. (2007). Profiles instead of levels: The CEFR and its (ab)uses in the context of migration. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 667–669. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00627_6.x
- LaBillois, J. M., & Lagacé-Séguin, D. G. (2007). Does a good fit matter? Exploring teaching styles, emotion regulation, and child anxiety in the classroom. *Early Child Development and Care*, 3, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430601078636>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques & principles in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Lee, D., Myers, R. D., & Reigeluth, C. M. (2016). The learner-centered paradigm of education. In C. M. Reigeluth, B. C. Beatty, & R. D. Myers (Eds.), *Instructional-design theories and models* (Vol. IV, pp. 21-48). Routledge.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40(3), 243-249. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004363>
- Littlewood, W. (2012). Communication-oriented language teaching: Where are we

now? Where do we go from here? *Language Teaching*, 47(03), 349-362.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000134>

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). Academic Press.

Lueddeke, G. R. (2003). Professionalising teaching practice in higher education: A study of disciplinary variation and 'teaching-scholarship'. *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(2), 213-228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0307507032000058082>

Mak, B. (2011). An exploration of speaking-in-class anxiety with Chinese ESL learners. *System*, 39, 202-214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.04.002>

Martin, E., Prosser, M., Trigwell, K., Ramsden, P., & Benjamin, J. (2002). What university teachers teach and how they teach it. In N. Hativa, & P. Goodyear (Eds.), *Teacher thinking, beliefs and knowledge in higher education* (pp. 103-126). Springer.

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3 ed.). Sage Publications.

McCaskey, S. J., & Crowder, C. L. (2015). Reflection on one's own teaching style and learning strategy can affect the CTE classroom. *CTE Journal*, 3(1), 2-12.

McKay, S. L. (2018). Globalization, English language teaching, and teachers. In J. Lontas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1-7). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0705>

McMillan, J. H., & Hearn, J. (2008). Student self-assessment: The key to stronger student motivation and higher achievement. *Educational Horizons*, 87(1), 40-49.

- McNamara, D. (1991). Subject knowledge and its application: Problems and possibilities for teacher educators. *The Journal of Education for Teaching*, 17(2), 113-128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260747910170201>
- McNamara, T. (2014). 30 years on-Evolution or revolution? *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 11(2), 226-232. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2014.895830>
- Michael, J. (2006). Where's the evidence that active learning works? *Advances in Physiology Education*, 30(4), 159-167. <https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00053.2006>.
- Miller, L., & Aldred, D. (2000). Student teachers' perceptions about communicative language teaching methods. *RELC Journal*, 31(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820003100101>
- Milambiling, J. (2011). Bringing one language to another: Multilingualism as a resource in the language classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 49(1), 18-25.
- Ministry of National Education (MoNE). (2005). Avrupa Konseyi dil projesi ve Türkiye uygulaması, Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 33(167). Retrieved from http://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/milli_egitim_dergisi/167/index3-demirel.htm
- Mirici, İ. H. (2008). Development and validation process of a European language portfolio model for young learners. *The Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE*, 9(2), 26-34.
- Mladenovici, V., Ilie, M. D., Maricuțoiu, L. P., & Iancu, D. E. (2021). Approaches to teaching in higher education: the perspective of network analysis using the revised approaches to teaching inventory. *Higher Education*, 84, 255-277. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-00766-9>

- Murdoch, G. (1994). Language development provision in teacher training curricula. *The ELT Journal*, 48(3), 253-265. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/48.3.253>
- Naserdeen, D. (2001). Second language study in elementary schools. *Multicultural Education*, 8(3), 21-23.
- Nayernia, A., & Babayan, Z. (2019). EFL teacher burnout and self-assessed language proficiency: Exploring possible relationships. *Language Testing in Asia*, 9(3), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-019-0079-6>
- North, B., & Piccardo, E. (2016). Developing illustrative descriptors of aspects of mediation for the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). *Language Teaching*, 49(03), 455–459. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000100>
- Nunan, D. (2013). *Learner-centered English language education*. Routledge.
- Okmen, B., & Kilic, A. (2016). The language teaching methods scale: Reliability and validity studies. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 5(3), 137-148. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.5.3.137>
- Opdenakker, M.-C., & Van Damme, J. (2006). Teacher characteristics and teaching styles as effectiveness enhancing factors of classroom practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.07.008>
- Ornstein, A.C., & Miller, H.C. (1980). *Looking into teaching: An introduction to American education*. Houghton.
- Osborne, J. W., & Waters, E. (2002). Four assumptions of multiple regression that researchers should always test. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 8, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.7275/r222-hv23>

- Oscarson, M. (1989). Self-assessment of language proficiency: rationale and applications. *Language Testing*, 6(1), 1-13.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/026553228900600103>
- Ozkan, Y., & Kesen, A. (2008). Memorization in EFL learning. *Journal of Faculty of Education Çukurova University*, 35, 58-71.
- Papageorgiou, S., Tannenbaum, R. J., Bridgeman, B., & Cho, Y. (2015). *The association between TOEFL iBT® test scores and the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) levels* (Research Memorandum No. RM-15-06). Educational Testing Service.
- Patri, M. (2002). The influence of peer feedback on self- and peer-assessment of oral skills. *Language Testing*, 19(2), 109-131.
<https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532202lt224oa>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Peters, E. E. (2010). Shifting to a student-centered science classroom: An exploration of teacher and student changes in perceptions and practices. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 21(3), 329-349. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-009-9178-z>
- Peterson, K. D. (2006). Using multiple data sources in teacher evaluation systems. In H. J. Stronge (Ed.), *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice* (2nd ed., pp. 212-230). Corwin.
- Prosser, M., Trigwell, K., & Taylor, P. (1994). A phenomenographic study of academics' conceptions of science learning and teaching. *Learning and Instruction*, 4(3), 217-231. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-4752\(94\)90024-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-4752(94)90024-8)
- Rachman, A., Rahman, A., & Noni, N. (2021). English teachers' teaching styles and

- their effects on students' reading interest at senior high school. *PINISI Journal of Art, Humanity and Social Studies*, 1(4), 27-35.
- Rahimi, M., & Asadollahi, F. (2012). Teaching styles of Iranian EFL teachers: Do gender, age, and experience make a difference? *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(2), 157-164. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n2p157>
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2015). *Key issues in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2017). Teaching English through English: Proficiency, pedagogy and performance. *RELJ Journal*, 48(1), 7-30.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690059>
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, H., Conway, C., Roskvist, A., & Harvey, S. (2013). Foreign language teachers' language proficiency and their language teaching practice. *The Language Learning Journal*, 41(2), 231-246.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2012.707676>
- Ross, J. A. (2006). The reliability, validity, and utility of self-assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 11(10), 1-13.
<https://doi.org/10.7275/9wph-vv65>
- Roulston, K., & Choi, M. (2018). Qualitative interviews. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data collection* (pp. 233-249). SAGE.
- Runnels, J. (2013). A preliminary exploration of the relationship between student ability, self-assessment and teacher assessment on the CEFR-J's can do statements. *Framework & Language Portfolio (FLP) SIG Newsletter*, 9, 6-18.

Ruxton, G. D., & Beauchamp, G. (2008). Time for some a priori thinking about post hoc testing. *Behavioral Ecology*, 19(3), 690–693.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arn020>

Savignon, S. J. (2005). Communicative language teaching: Strategies and goals. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 635-651). Routledge.

Schober, P., Boer, C., & Schwarte, L. A. (2018). Correlation coefficients: Appropriate use and interpretation. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, 126(5), 1763-1768. <https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000002864>

Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning teaching: A guidebook for English language teachers* (2nd ed.). Macmillan Education.

Shapiro, S. S., & Wilk, M. B. (1965). An analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples). *Biometrika*, 52(3/4), 591-611. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2333709>

Shavelson, R. J., Hubner, J. J., & Stanton, G. C. (1976). Self-concept: Validation of construct interpretations. *Review of Educational Research*, 46(3), 407-441. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543046003407>

Shin, S. (2008). Preparing non-native English speaking ESL teachers. *Teacher Development*, 12(1), 57-65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530701827749>

Sim, C. H., Gan, F. F., & Chang, T. C. (2005). Outlier labelling with boxplot procedures. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100(470), 642-652. <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214504000001466>

Singh, S., & Garg, A. (2015). A comparative study of holistic growth amongst student centered and teacher centered learning institutions. *International Journal of Management, & Behavioural Sciences*, 6, 367-371.

- Soleimani, N. (2020). ELT teachers' epistemological beliefs and dominant teaching style: A mixed method research. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(12). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00094-y>
- Sullivan, J. H. (2011). Taking charge: Teacher candidates' preparation for the oral proficiency interview. *Foreign Language Annals*, 44, 241-257. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2011.01129.x>
- Süral, S., & Sarıtaş, E. (2010). The relationship between learning styles and academic achievements of primary candidate teachers in science and technology teaching lesson. *Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (RTEÜ Journal of Social Sciences)*, 1, 31-44.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Newbury.
- Swan, M. (2018). *Applied linguistics: A consumer's view*. *Language Teaching*, 51(2), 246-261. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000058>
- Szmigiera, M. (2021). The most spoken languages worldwide in 2021 [Report]. In *Statista*. Retrieved January 09, 2022, from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/266808/the-most-spoken-languages-worldwide/#statisticContainer>
- Şahinkarakaş, S., Yumru, H., & Inozu, J. (2009). A case study: Two teachers' reflections on the ELP in practice. *ELT Journal*, 64(1), 65-74. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp020>

- Şekerci, A. S. (2011). *Self-efficacy levels of prep-school instructors and its predictors* [Master's Thesis, Middle East Technical University]. Institutional Repository of METU. <http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12613469/index.pdf>
- Taber, K. S. (2017). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273-1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Tang, T. (2007). *Investigating NNS English teachers' self-assessed language proficiency in an EFL context* [Master's thesis, McGill University]. Library and Archives Canada <https://escholarship.mcgill.ca/concern/theses/tq57nr25f>
- T. C. Cumhurbaşkanlığı [The Presidency of the Republic of Türkiye]. (2018, November 9). *Öğretim üyesi dışındaki öğretim elemanı kadrolarına yapılacak atamalarda uygulanacak merkezi sınav ile giriş sınavlarına ilişkin usul ve esaslar hakkında yönetmelik*. <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/mevzuat?MevzuatNo=28947&MevzuatTur=7&MevzuatTertip=5>
- Tichenor, M. S., & Tichenor, J. M. (2005). Understanding teachers' perspectives on professionalism. *Professional Educator*, 27, 89-95.
- Tezci, E. (2016). Adaptation of ATI-R scale to Turkish samples: Validity and reliability analyses. *International Education Studies*, 10(1), 67-81. <http://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v10n1p67>
- Thornbury, S. (2017). *Scott Thornbury's 30 language teaching methods*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tondeur, J., van Braak, J., Ertmer, P. A., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. (2017). Understanding the relationship between teachers' pedagogical beliefs and technology use in education: A systematic review of qualitative evidence.

Educational Technology Research and Development, 65(3), 555-575.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-016-9481-2>

Tono, Y. (2019). Coming full circle: From CEFR to CEFR-J and back. *CEFR*

Journal, 1, 5-17. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTSIG.CEFR1-1>

Trigwell, K., & Prosser, M. (1996). Congruence between intention and strategy in

university science teachers' approaches to teaching. *Higher Education*, 32(1),

77-87. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00139219>

Trigwell, K., & Prosser, M. (2004). Development and use of the approaches to

teaching inventory. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4), 409-424.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-004-0007-9>

Trigwell, K., Prosser, M., & Ginns, P. (2005). Phenomenographic pedagogy and a

revised approaches to teaching inventory. *Higher Education Research &*

Development, 24(4), 349-360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360500284730>

Tsang, A. (2017). EFL/ESL teachers' general language proficiency and learners'

engagement. *RELC Journal*, 48(1), 99-113.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690060>

Tsui, S. B. M. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching*. Cambridge University

Press.

Valmori, P., & De Costa, P. I. (2016). How do foreign language teachers

maintain their proficiency? A grounded theory investigation. *System*, 57, 98-

108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.02.003>

Wang, Q. (2007). The National Curriculum changes and their effects on English

language teaching in the People's Republic of China. In J. Cummins & C.

Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp.

87-105). Springer Science & Business Media.

- West, R., Güven, A., Parry, J. D., & Ergenekon, T. (2015). *The state of English in higher education in Turkey*. British Council.
- Yan, Z., & Brown, G. T. L. (2016). A cyclical self-assessment process: Towards a model of how students engage in self-assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(8), 1247-1262.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1260091>
- Yan, Z., & Carless, D. (2021). Self-assessment is about more than self: the enabling role of feedback literacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(7), 1116-1128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.2001431>
- Yılmaz, C. (2011). Teachers' perceptions of self-efficacy, English proficiency, and instructional strategies. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 39(1), 91-100.
<https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2011.39.1.91>
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Yusuf, F. N., & Novita, O. E. (2020). EFL teachers' perceived language proficiency and teaching effectiveness. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9, 580-588. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i3.23208>
- Zhang, L.-F. (2008). Preferences for teaching styles matter in academic achievement: Scientific and practical implications. *Educational Psychology*, 28(6), 615-625. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410802004634>
- Zhang, Y. (2019). *Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs in relation to perceived English proficiency and teaching practices: An investigation of Chinese primary English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers* (Publication No.

27663038) [Doctoral Dissertation, University of the Pacific Stockton].

ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Zinn, L. M. (1991). Identifying your philosophical orientation. In M. Galbraith (Ed), *Adult learning methods* (pp. 39-77). Krieger Publishing Company.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekarts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Self-regulation: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 13-39). Academic Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012109890-2/50031-7>

Zorba, M. G., & Arikan, A. (2016). A study of Anatolian high schools' 9th grade English language curriculum in relation to the CEFR. *Uşak Üniversitesi Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(2), 13-24

Appendix A

Informed Consent Form for the Questionnaire

Dear participant,

This questionnaire was prepared for my thesis within the scope of İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, Teaching English as a Foreign Language Master's Program, under the supervision of Asst. Prof. Dr. Tijen Akşit, with the purpose of investigating EFL teachers' oral competency in relation the CEFR self-assessment grid (Council of Europe, 2020), their teaching style with reference to Grasha's (2002) Teaching Style Inventory, and their teaching approaches in regards to Teaching Approaches Inventory (Trigwell et al., 2005) at a English language preparatory program in Türkiye. Additionally, this study aims to explore the relationship between the oral competency of teachers' and their teaching style and between their oral competency and their teaching approach. Your help by completing this questionnaire would be greatly appreciated. This questionnaire should take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. In terms of this questionnaire;

- Your identification will never be disclosed.
- Your institution will not be disclosed to anyone.
- Your data will only be accessed by the researcher, will be kept on a password protected laptop, and will only be used for this thesis and possible related conference presentations, and journal publication purposes.
- Your answers will not be shared with your university and will not affect your working rights.
- You can leave the questionnaire at any time you want.

Appendix B

Questionnaire Part 1

Part 1. Personal Information

1. Gender
 - a) Female
 - b) Male
 - c) I prefer not to mention.

2. Age
 - a) 21-25
 - b) 26-30
 - c) 31-35
 - d) 36-40
 - e) 41-45
 - f) 46-50
 - g) 51+

3. Years of English language teaching experience
 - a) Less than 1 year
 - b) 1-5 year(s)
 - c) 6-10 years
 - d) 11-15 years
 - e) 16-20 years
 - f) 21+

4. Undergraduate field of study
 - a) Teaching English as a Foreign Language
 - b) English Language and Literature

- c) American Culture and Literature
 - d) English Translation and Interpreting
 - e) English Linguistics
 - f) Other (Please specify):
5. If you have any postgraduate degrees, please choose from the following that apply to you.
- a) MA/ MSc Degree
 - i. Teaching English as a Foreign Language
 - ii. English Language and Literature
 - iii. American Culture and Literature
 - iv. English Translation and Interpreting
 - v. English Linguistics
 - vi. Other (Please specify):
 - b) PhD
 - i. Teaching English as a Foreign Language
 - ii. English Language and Literature
 - iii. American Culture and Literature
 - iv. English Translation and Interpreting
 - v. English Linguistics
 - vi. Other (Please specify):
 - c) I do not hold a postgraduate degree.
6. If you speak other languages, choose from the following that apply to you. For the languages you speak, please specify your proficiency level.
- a) German
 - i. Starter

- ii. Elementary
- iii. Lower Intermediate
- iv. Intermediate
- v. Upper Intermediate
- vi. Advanced

b) French

- i. Starter
- ii. Elementary
- iii. Lower Intermediate
- iv. Intermediate
- v. Upper Intermediate
- vi. Advanced

c) Russian

- i. Starter
- ii. Elementary
- iii. Lower Intermediate
- iv. Intermediate
- v. Upper Intermediate
- vi. Advanced

d) Italian

- i. Starter
- ii. Elementary
- iii. Lower Intermediate
- iv. Intermediate
- v. Upper Intermediate

vi. Advanced

e) Spanish

i. Starter

ii. Elementary

iii. Lower Intermediate

iv. Intermediate

v. Upper Intermediate

vi. Advanced

f) Japanese

i. Starter

ii. Elementary

iii. Lower Intermediate

iv. Intermediate

v. Upper Intermediate

vi. Advanced

g) Other (Please Specify)

Appendix C

Questionnaire Part 2.1

Part 2. This questionnaire is to learn about your self-assessed oral competency, teaching style and teaching approach. Please do not spend too much time answering each item. The best answer is probably your first reaction to the item.

2.1. This sub-section is to learn about your self-assessed oral competency. of EFL teachers. Please read select the frequency to indicate your answer.						
1- never 2- seldom 3- about half the time 4- usually 5- always						
	Items	1	2	3	4	5
1.	I can understand extended talk and lectures and follow even complex lines of argument provided the topic is reasonably familiar.					
2.	I can understand most TV news and current affairs programs.					
3.	I can understand the majority of films in standard language.					
4.	I can understand extended talk even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signalled explicitly.					
5.	I can understand television programmes and films without too much effort.					
6.	I have no difficulty in understanding any kind of oral language live or broadcast even when delivered at fast natural speed, provided time to get familiar with the accent.					
7.	I can present clear and detailed descriptions on a wide range of subjects related to my field of interest.					
8.	I can explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various opinions.					
9.	I can present clear descriptions of complex subjects					
	a) integrating sub-themes.					
	b) developing particular points.					
	c) rounding off with an appropriate conclusion.					
10.	I can present a clear argument					

	a) in a style appropriate to the context					
	b) with an effective logical structure that helps the recipient notice and remember significant points.					
11.	I can present a smoothly flowing argument					
	a) in a style appropriate to the context.					
	b) with an effective logical structure that helps the recipient notice and remember significant points.					
12.	I can present a clear description					
	a) in a style appropriate to the context					
	b) with an effective logical structure that helps the recipient notice and remember significant points.					
13.	I can present a smoothly flowing description					
	a) in a style appropriate to the context.					
	b) with an effective logical structure that helps the recipient notice and remember significant points.					
14.	I can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with users of the target language quite possible.					
15.	I can take an active part in discussion in familiar contexts					
	a) accounting for my views.					
	b) sustaining my views.					
16.	I can express myself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions.					
17.	I can use language flexibly and effectively					
	a) for social purposes.					
	b) for professional purposes					
18.	I can formulate ideas and opinions with precision.					

19.	I can relate my contribution during a conversation skilfully and meaningfully to others' contributions.					
20.	I can take part effortlessly in any conversation and any discussion.					
21.	I have a good familiarity with idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms.					
22.	I can express myself fluently.					
23.	I can express small/subtle differences in meaning between similar words or phrases precisely.					
24.	If I do have a problem expressing myself in a conversation, I can restructure sentences causing me difficulty smoothly without people realizing.					



Appendix D

Questionnaire Part 2.2

2.2. This sub-section aims to find out about your teaching style. Please choose the number to indicate your teaching style. 1- strongly disagree 2-somewhat disagree 3-neither agree or disagree 4- somewhat agree 5- strongly agree					
Items	1	2	3	4	5
1. Facts, concepts, and principles are the most important things that students should acquire.					
2. I set high standards for students in this class.					
3. What I say and do models appropriate ways for students to think about learning English.					
4. My teaching goals and methods address a variety of student learning styles.					
5. Students typically work on course tasks alone with little supervision from me.					
6. Sharing my knowledge and expertise with students is very important to me.					
7. I give students negative feedback when their performance is unsatisfactory.					
8. Students are encouraged to imitate the example I provide.					
9. I spend time consulting with students on how to improve their work on individual and/or group tasks.					
10. Activities in this class encourage students to develop their own ideas about content issues.					
11. What I have to say about a topic is important for students to acquire a broader perspective on learning languages.					
12. Students would describe my standards and expectations as somewhat strict and rigid.					
13. I typically show students how and what to do in order to master course content.					
14. Small group discussions are employed to help students develop their ability to think critically.					
15. Students design one of more self-directed learning experiences.					
16. I want students to leave the semester well prepared for their future studies.					

17. It is my responsibility to define what students must learn and how they should learn it.					
18. Examples from my personal experiences often are used to illustrate points about the material.					
19. I guide students' work on course projects by asking questions, exploring options, and suggesting alternative ways to do things.					
20. Developing the ability of students to think and work independently is an important goal.					
21. Lecturing is a significant part of how I teach each of the class sessions.					
22. I provide very clear guidelines for how I want tasks completed in this course.					
23. I often show students how they can use various principles and concepts.					
24. Course activities encourage students to take initiative and responsibility for their learning.					
25. Students take responsibility for teaching part of the class sessions.					
26. My expertise is typically used to resolve disagreements about content issues.					
27. This course has very specific goals and objectives that I want to accomplish.					
28. Students receive frequent verbal and/or written comments on their performance.					
29. I ask for student advice about how and what to teach in this course.					
30. Students set their own pace for completing independent and/or group tasks.					
31. Students might describe me as "storehouse of knowledge" who dispenses the facts, principles and concepts they need.					
32. My expectations for what I want students to do in this class are clearly defined at the beginning of the semester.					
33. Eventually, many students begin to think like me about learning English.					
34. Students can make choices among activities in order to complete course requirements.					
35. My approach to teaching is similar to a manager of a work group who delegates tasks and responsibilities to subordinates.					

36. There is more material in this course than I have time available to cover it.					
37. My standards and expectations help students develop the discipline they need to learn.					
38. Students might describe me as a “coach” who works closely with someone to correct problems in how they think and behave.					
39. I give students a lot of personal support and encouragement to do well in my classes.					
40. I assume the role of a resource person who is available to students whenever they need help.					



Appendix E

Questionnaire Part 2.3

2.3. This sub-section aims to learn about your teaching approach. Please choose the number that is true about your teaching.						
1- only rarely true for me 2- sometimes true for me 3- about half the time true for me 4- frequently true for me 5- almost always true for me						
	Items	1	2	3	4	5
1.	In my classes, students should focus their study on what I provide them.					
2.	It is important that my classes should be completely described in terms of specific objectives that relate to formal assessment items.					
3.	In my interactions with students in my classes, I try to develop a conversation with them about the topics we are studying.					
4.	It is important to present a lot of facts to students so that they know what they have to learn for my classes.					
5.	I set aside some teaching time so that the students can discuss, among themselves, key concepts and ideas in my classes.					
6.	In my classes, I concentrate on covering the information that might be available from key texts and readings.					
7.	I encourage students to restructure their existing knowledge in terms of the new way of thinking about the language that they will develop.					
8.	In teaching sessions for my classes, I deliberately provoke debate and discussion.					
9.	I structure my teaching to help students to pass the formal assessment items.					
10.	I think an important reason for running teaching sessions in my classes is to give students a good set of notes.					
11.	In my classes, I provide students with the information they will need to pass the formal assessments.					
12.	I should know the answers to any questions that students may put to me during my classes.					
13.	I make available opportunities for students in my classes to discuss their changing understanding of the language.					
14.	14. It is better for students in my classes to generate their own notes rather than copy mine.					
15.	A lot of teaching time in my classes should be used to question students' ideas.					

16.	In my classes, my teaching focuses on the good presentation of information to students.					
17.	I see teaching as helping students develop new ways of thinking in my classes.					
18.	In teaching language, it is important for me to monitor students' changed understanding of the language.					
19.	My teaching language focuses on delivering what I know to students.					
20.	Teaching in my classes should help students question their own understanding of the language.					
21.	Teaching language should include helping students find their own learning resources.					
22.	I present material to enable students to build up an information base in the language.					



Appendix F

Informed Consent Form for the Interview

This research study is designed to study EFL teachers' oral competencies in relation to oral comprehension, oral production and oral interaction, their teaching styles and teaching approaches. It is also aimed to find out about the relationship between oral competency and teaching style, and teaching approach. The data will be collected by questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The interview will be conducted face to face.

Confidentiality: Your responses to interview questions will be kept confidential. At no time will your actual identity be revealed. You will be assigned a random numerical code. The recording will be erased as soon as it has been transcribed. The transcript, without your name, will be kept until the research is complete with a password that only the researcher will have an access. Your response will not be shared with third parties and will have no effect on your relations with your university.

Agreement:

☐ The nature and purpose of this research have been sufficiently explained and I agree to participate in this study. I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time without incurring any penalty.

Date: _____

Name: _____

Appendix G

Interview Questions

The Semi-structured Interview Protocol

1. While answering the questions in the questionnaire, have you noticed anything about your oral competency, teaching style or teaching approaches that you had not noticed before? If yes, can you give details?

2. Oral comprehension is defined as a receptive language activity as part of communicative competence. This kind of language activity comes into play in the attempts of understanding the contents of public announcements, media, live performances, or overheard conversations (Council of Europe, 2001).

What do you think about your strengths and weaknesses in oral comprehension?

- i. What can you tell about your competency in oral comprehension when public announcements include information, instruction or warning related to a content area that you are not familiar with? Why? Can you give examples?
- ii. What can you tell about your competency in oral comprehension when media is in the form of radio or TV/online programs, a recorded extract, or movies? Why? Can you give examples?
- iii. What can you tell about your competency in oral comprehension when you are in a live audience of a theatre play, a public meeting or lecture, or an entertainment show? Why? Can you give examples?
- iv. What can you tell about your competency in oral comprehension when you listen for gist, for specific information, for detailed information or for implications? Why? Can you give examples?

3. Oral production is defined as a productive language activity as part of communicative competence. This kind of language activity comes into play in the

events of addressing the public to give instructions or information or addressing audiences in meetings, lectures, presentations, entertainment arrangements (Council of Europe, 2001).

What do you think about your strengths and weaknesses in oral production?

i. What can you tell about your competency in oral production for occasions when you need to describe an experience? Why? Can you give examples?

ii. What can you tell about your competency in oral production for occasions when you need to put a case for example in a debate or discussion? Why? Can you give examples?

iii. What can you tell about your competency in oral production for occasions when you need to make a public announcement? Why? Can you give examples?

iv. What can you tell about your competency in oral production for occasions when you need to address audiences? Why? Can you give examples?

v. What can you tell about your competency in oral production for occasions when you speak after rehearsals, from written notes or visual aids, or spontaneously? Why? Can you give examples?

4. Oral interaction is defined as language activity as part of communicative competence, which embodies the other productive and receptive language acts. This kind of language activity comes into play when the language user as a speaker and listener interacts with one or more interlocutors to construct and negotiate meaning (Council of Europe, 2001).

What do you think about your strengths and weakness in oral interaction?

i. What can you tell about your competency in oral interaction when you are involved in transaction of goods and services? Why? Can you give examples?

ii. What can you tell about your competency in oral interaction when you are involved in a casual, informal, or formal conversations? Why? Can you give examples?

iii. What can you tell about your competency in oral interaction when you are involved in a debate, negotiation, or interview (as an interviewee or interviewer)? Why? Can you give examples?

iv. What can you tell about your competency in oral interaction when there is co-planning and goal-oriented co-operation? Why? Can you give examples?

v. What can you tell about your competency in oral interaction when you are interacting with students, non-native speakers of English or native speakers of English? Why? Can you give examples?

5. Teaching style represents a pattern of behaviors, needs and beliefs that teachers display in their classrooms. It affects how people present information, how they mentor students and interact with them, how they supervise the course work and manage tasks (Grasha, 1994).

In the light of this information, how would you define your teaching style? Why? Can you give examples from your teaching experience?

6. There are five teaching styles defined by Grasha (1994). An Expert Style teacher possesses expertise and knowledge. For them, it is important to transmit information and to ensure students are well-prepared. A Formal Authority Style teacher possesses status because of his/her knowledge and membership to the academia. For them, it is important to prepare students according to acceptable, correct, and standard ways of doing things. A personal model type teacher believes in teaching by personal example. For them, it is important to establish a prototype for how students should behave and think. A facilitator type teacher tries to develop students' capacity to act

independently and responsibly. For them, it is important to provide support and encouragement while teachers work with students in tasks or projects. A Delegator Style teacher tries to develop students' capacity to act autonomously. For them, it is important to be present as a resource person if students request help.

Which style or styles do you think you perform in your classes? Can you give examples?

- i. What factors do you think affect your teaching style?
- ii. How do you think it changes when you are teaching different skills?
- iii. How do you think it changes when you are teaching vocabulary, grammar, or pronunciation?

7. What do you think about the relationship between your oral competency regarding oral comprehension, oral production and oral interaction and your teaching style?

8. There are two approaches to teaching defined by Trigwell et al., (2005) One is conceptual change/student-focused (CCSF) and the other is information transmission/teacher-focused (ITTF). CCSF aims to change students' ways of thinking about the subject matter. Teachers assume students construct their own knowledge so teacher's role is to challenge students' perceptions, understanding and activity. In ITTF, the focus is on teachers and their actions. Teachers' role is to transmit knowledge and teachers have great competency in planning, management skills and transmitting knowledge.

In line with this information, how would you describe your teaching approach?

Why? Can you give examples?

- i. What factors do you think affect your teaching style?
- ii. How do you think it changes when you are teaching different skills?

iii. How do you think it changes when you are teaching vocabulary, grammar, or pronunciation?

9. What do you think about the relationship between your oral competency regarding oral comprehension, oral production and oral interaction and your teaching approach?



Appendix H

Priori List for Teaching Styles

Main category	Sub-category
1. Expert	1.1. Sharing Knowledge 1.2. Dispensing Facts 1.3. Preparation for the Future Studies 1.4. Sharing Expertise
2. Formal Authority	2.1. Focus on Expectations 2.2. Giving Clear Guidelines 2.3. Decisions about What and How to Learn 2.4. Focus on Standards
3. Personal Model	3.1. Constructive Feedback 3.2. Coaching 3.3. Setting an Example 3.4. Giving Personal Examples
4. Facilitator	4.1. Providing Consultation & Guidance 4.2. Accommodating Students' Needs and Styles 4.3. Providing Freedom & Chance for Self-expression 4.4. Giving Responsibility
5. Delegator	5.1. Providing Less Guidance 5.2. Giving Teaching Responsibility 5.3. High Levels of Autonomy 5.4. Providing More Freedom

Appendix I

Priori List for Teaching Approaches

Main Category	Sub-category
1. ITTF (Information Transmission-Teacher-Focused)	1.1. Presenting information
	1.2. Preparation for formal assessment
	1.3. Focus on specific objectives relating to formal assessment
2. CCSF (Conceptual Change-Student-Focused)	2.1. Discussion & Monitoring
	2.2. Finding one's own learning resources
	2.3. Reconstructing present knowledge



Appendix J

Emerging Categories for Teaching Styles and Teaching Approaches

Level of Analysis	Categories
Second Level Analysis	Eclectic & Combination Dominant Forced Unsatisfied Desired Attempted
Third Level Analysis	Determinant When Teaching Language Systems (Grammar, Vocabulary, Pronunciation) When Teaching Productive Skills (Speaking, Writing) When Teaching Receptive Skills (Reading, Listening) Evidence