

Research Article

Teachers' Perception toward Factors Hindering Learning Phonetic Transcription of Received Pronunciation

Fadi K. AL Najjar

MA, Islamic University of Gaza, Teacher of English, Ministry of Education and Higher Education, Palestine

Corresponding Author: Fadi K. AL Najjar, E-mail: fadi_palestine2007@hotmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received: June 12, 2020

Accepted: July 20, 2020

Volume:3

Issue: 7

DOI: 10.32996/ijllt.2020.3.7.10

KEYWORDS

Phonetic Transcription, Received Pronunciation, Teachers' Perception

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at identifying the teachers' perception toward factors hindering learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation. The researcher used the descriptive analytical approach to suit the aims of this study. The sample consisted of (150) male and female teachers at the governmental schools in Palestine. The instrument of the study is a questionnaire. Also, the tool has three domains in which the first domain is the teachers' factors. The second domain is the language factors, and the last is the curricula and courses factors. Validity and reliability were conducted for the questionnaire, therefore, the reliability is good. Data were collected through a link prepared through Google Drive. The responses were collected and treated by SPSS statistics. The results showed that the domain of language factors occupied the first rank with a percentage weight of (72.37%), Then the domain of teachers factors occupied the second rank with a percentage weight of (66.95%). Finally, the domain of curricula and courses factors occupied the third rank with a percentage weight of (63.41%). The total degree of the domains reached a percentage weight of (67.58%). In addition, the results showed that there are statistically significant differences at (0.05) in the curricula and courses factors in favor female and there are no statistically significant differences in the other domains. Besides, there are no statistically significant differences at (0.05) due to years of experience variable. The researcher recommended the teachers to revise the rules of IPA and do efforts in practicing the use of phonetic transcription. Teachers should remember the irregularities of such English words as possible as they can to develop their schemata.

Introduction

Pronunciation is an integrated part of language mechanics in which a clear pronunciation gives a clear meaning. The teaching of pronunciation has witnessed remarkable changes around the history of language teaching and learning. As one of the most neglected aspects of English language teaching, pronunciation has been paid attention only in the second half of the 20th century with the rise of Audio-lingualism and the Direct Method strategies. In the same vein, phonetics has brought new insights to the teaching of pronunciation. Concerned with "the study of the physical properties of sounds and their place and manner of articulation in the vocal tract. Clear understanding of English speech are two skills which complement each other. It means that, if you know how to articulate the words and phrases correctly, with proper supra-segment features, your level of speech understanding is also increased. Pronunciation- is the act of producing the sounds of a language (Roach, 2009). One of the most basic activities in phonetics is the use of written individual symbols to represent speech sounds or particular properties of speech sounds. The use of symbols for studying and describing English is basically important because the spelling system is very far from representing the pronunciation of most words. Many different types of symbol have been tried, but they are almost all based on the idea of having one symbol per phoneme (Roach, 2009). Hence, the part that deals

with symbols is the phonetic transcription. Therefore, this study attempts to investigate the factors that hinder the learning of phonetic transcription of RP from since learning it is very crucial to master the pronunciation of English words, phrases or sentences.

Literature review

Pronunciation is an important subject of teaching languages especially English language. Dalton (1997), mentioned that when the new phoneme in the target language are not understood by the learners, the learners directly connect these sounds with their mother tongue similar sounds. Yarmohammadi (2000) mentioned that the rate of differences between the first language and the second language play a crucial role in recognizing the second language.

The most important is that the ongoing conversation depends on the correct pronunciation, in other words, if the pronunciation is not correct, the conversation will be blocked and will lead to a conversation failure (Brown, 2007), pronunciation rules still do not attract enough attention among teachers. Nowadays, teachers have misconception about the importance of learning the pronunciation through using the *International Phonetic Association* which is known with phonetic.

Since the sixteenth century, many phoneticians have been made to create a global method for transcribing the sounds of speech. The most well-known system, the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), has been spread since (1888) (International Phonetic Association, 1999).

Phonetic transcription of RP is defined as a way of segmenting speech sounds in an organized and consistent way, also known as a 'notation' or 'script'. (Crystal, 2008:490) In addition, Phonetic transcriptions of received pronunciation are written representations of speech, like the way orthographic transcription forms the spelling of the words as groups of symbols called graphemes (Christophe, 2007, p. 2). Besides, the long existed concept for the elite accent of South East England which also adds as an elite criterion in varying classes elsewhere in Britain" (Nolan & Kerswill 1990, p. 316)

The most important thing that phonetic transcription skills need to be improved and enhanced among Palestinian learners in particular English majors at the Palestinian universities (Najjar, 2012, p. 136) also, these skills are seldom tested in the universities exams in the form of intensified phonetic transcription skills. Furthermore, pronunciation is not a priority for school teachers since those teachers are involved in other aspects of language (Hosseini 2007; Jahangard, 2007; Razmjo & Riazi 2006), Based on the aforementioned, the Palestinian teachers might find a difficulty in learning the skills of phonetic transcription.

Previous studies

Muller and Papakyritsis (2011) mentioned about some pitfalls inherent in the learning and teaching of segmental phonetic transcription. They suggest that a gestural interpretation to disordered speech data, in conjunction with segmental phonetic transcription, can add valuable insight into patterns of disordered speech.

Najjar (2012) conducted a study that aimed at identifying the mastery level of phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation among English majors and its relation with some variables. The results of the study showed that English majors at the Palestinian universities did not reach the mastery level of phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation.

Yurtbas (2016) investigated the contrastive suprasegmental features on English and Arabic IPA transcription of Surah Al Ya Sin. The results showed that the study reached to an innovative approach to Arabic transcription using a traditional pattern of transcription approach for English and other European languages.

Also, Werfel (2017) evaluated the effects of phonetic transcription training on the explicit phonemic awareness of adults. Results showed that phonetic transcription training appears to be an effective method of increasing explicit phonemic awareness in adults, and initial skill level is not related to gains as a result of phonetic transcription training.

In addition, Klintö and Anette (2017) investigated the influence of the recording medium on phonetic transcription of cleft palate speech. Results showed that phonetic transcription is influenced to some extent by visual cues.

The most important is that Limpo and Alves (2017) examined the mediating role of bursts and pauses on the link between transcription skills and writing fluency or text quality. The results showed that handwriting and spelling influenced writing fluency only indirectly via burst length and short pauses duration (full mediation); these findings suggest that better transcription skills allow students to write more words without pausing, which in turn results in more fluent and better writing.

The most noticeable is that Ghorbania (2019) examined the impact of phonetic transcription on Iranian undergraduate EFL students' word stress learning. Thus, the findings suggest that EFL learners' phonetic transcription can facilitate the process of lexical stress learning.

Jiménez and Hernández (2019) investigated the contribution of transcription skills to written composition in Spanish beginning writers. This analysis revealed that in pen mode, handwriting fluency and spelling directly contributed to writing fluency in free composition at the sentence level, with handwriting fluency contributing less than spelling and spelling contributing to both narrative writing and writing fluency.

Research Questions

The main question:

- What is teachers of English perception degree toward factors hindering learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation?

The following questions are derived from the main question:

- What are the most hindering factors to the learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation according to the teachers of English perception?
- Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the teachers of English perception toward factors hindering learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation due to sex variable?
- Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the teachers of English perception toward factors hindering learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation due to years of experience variable?

Hypotheses of the Research

- There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the teachers of English perception toward factors hindering learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation due to sex variable.
- There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the teachers of English perception toward factors hindering learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation due to years of experience variable.

The aims of the Study

- Identifying the teachers of English perception degree toward factors hindering learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation.
- Investigating the most hindering factors to the learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation according to the teachers of English perception.
- Stating the most promoting factors to the learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation according to the teachers of English perception.
- Identifying if there are statistically significant differences in the teachers of English perception toward factors hindering learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation due to sex variable.
- Knowing if there are statistically significant differences in the teachers of English perception toward factors hindering learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation due to years of experience variable.

Need for the Study

Learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation is an essential for all English language learners. English learners learn four skills, and the distinct skill is the speaking. Teachers can use poor mechanics of language writing, reading, punctuation but not poor not poor pronunciation. Therefore, the correct pronunciation is needed in any English language conversation. On the other hand, the vague pronunciation leads the conversation to failure and the core of the conversation will be neglected. Based on the researcher experience, teachers should use an accurate pronunciation while teaching students. The most important is that the pronunciation relies on mastering phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation. In addition, teachers of English have flaws in learning the phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation due to factors that are specified in the results of the study. The most important is that the researcher prepared a tool in order to identify the factors that hinder teachers of English from learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation by preparing a tool for the study.

English teachers, learners, in service training teachers will benefit from the findings this study.

Methodology

To achieve the goals of this research, the researcher adopted the descriptive analytical approach; this research seeks to gather data and information about the hindering factors that face English teachers in learning the phonetic transcription Received Pronunciation. In addition, the researcher used the tool to suit the objectives of the research.

The community of the study

The community of the study consisted of all teachers at the Governmental schools in Gaza for the school year (2019 – 2020).

Participants

There are (60) English teachers were participated in this study; and they were distributed to the schools of the northern government. In addition, the researcher distributed the sample of the study based on gender and years of experience. The goal of this distribution is to extract the variant perceptions based on demographic variables.

Research variables

Independent variable: hindering factors

Dependent variable: learning phonetic transcription of RP

Instrument

The researcher prepared a questionnaire, which contained (27) items; and these items are distributed into four major domains: (Teachers factors domain, curricula domain factors and language factors domain). In addition, the questionnaire was built based on Likert scale. It has five ranges, which are: strongly disagree, disagree, do not know, agree and strongly agree. Besides the teacher can chose one class from (1 to 5). This instrument was used to collect data regarding the factors, which hinder English teacher in learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation.

Instrument building procedures

The researcher built the tool of this study through the following resources:

The previous studies: the researcher collected a real information on the research subject.

Literature review: the researcher reviewed the literature to collect items related to the factors that hinder learning phonetic transcription.

Experts' experience: the researcher consulted the experts to limit some the hindering factors.

An open question: the researcher used this question to collect more information about the study problem.

Limitations of the study

- This study was conducted on English major teachers at the Northern Gaza governorate.
- This study was limited to the English major teachers in the governmental schools
- This study was implemented at the beginning of second semester (2019 -2020) via Google Drive questionnaire.

a- Pilot study:

The pilot sample of the study consisted of (30) teachers (from the community of the study and they were excluded from the original sample. The pilot study aims to sure in the reliability and the stability of the instrument of the study:

b- Sample of the study:

The sample of the study consisted of (150) teachers were randomly chosen.

Table 1: The distribution of the sample according to gender

Gender	No.	%
Male	83	55.3
Female	67	44.7
Total	150	100.0

Table 2: The distribution of the sample according to Experience

Experience	No.	%
1-5 years	29	19.3
5-10 years	42	28.0
more than ten years	79	52.7
Total	150	100.0

The instrumentations

This study used a questionnaire as a tool for this study. This questionnaire considers main instrument in field study, to get data and information, so the researcher builds this tool to suit the aims of this study.

The validity of the questionnaire:

Validity of postal questionnaire can be seen from two viewpoints. First, whether respondents who complete questionnaire do so accurately, honestly and correctly, and second, whether those who fail to return their questionnaire would have given the same distribution of answers as did returnees.

(A) The referee validity

The questionnaire was introduced to a group of specialists in English language and methodology in Gaza universities, and experienced supervisors. The items of the questionnaire were modified based on to their recommendations.

(B) The internal consistency validity

This refers to the internal consistency validity which indicates the correlation of the degree of each item with the total average of the test. It also indicates the correlation of the average of each domain with the total average. This validity was calculated by using Person Formula.

According to the tables (3), (4) and (5) the coefficient correlation of each item within its domain is significant at levels (0.01) and (0.05).

Table (6) shows the correlation coefficient of each scope with the whole test. According to the following tables, it can be concluded that the test is highly consistent and valid as an instrument for the study.

Table 3: Correlation coefficient of Teachers factors

Items	Pearson correlation	Sig.
I do not know the symbols of the International Phonetic Alphabets (IPA).	0.783	sig. at 0.01
I do not have a real knowledge about phonetic transcription of RP.	0.757	sig. at 0.01
I feel upset while segmenting the words into phonemes because I am a holistic teacher.	0.814	sig. at 0.01
I do not have an ability to search about the right transcription of the words before teaching lessons.	0.957	sig. at 0.01
I suffer from lack of practice of using phonetic transcription.	0.931	sig. at 0.01
My school burdens hinder me from of using phonetic transcription.	0.640	sig. at 0.01
I have poor motivation toward enhancing my skills search.	0.927	sig. at 0.01
I use proper dictionaries as "Longman" and "Oxford."	0.364	sig. at 0.05
The overgeneralization affected me negatively toward learning phonetic transcription.	0.570	sig. at 0.01

"r" table value at (28) d f. at (0.05) sig. level equal 0.361

"r" table value at (28) d f. at (0.01) sig. level equal 0.463

Table 4: Correlation coefficient of language factors

Items	Pearson correlation	Sig.
The number of English sounds is more than the number of letters, so this confuses me.	0.819	sig. at 0.01
Arabic pronunciation effects my learning English pronunciation.	0.544	sig. at 0.01
More than one transcription for a single word makes me confused from learning phonetics.	0.719	sig. at 0.01
The differences between American and British pronunciation may hinder learning phonetic transcription of RP.	0.519	sig. at 0.01
I face difficulty in transcribing the non-English origin words	0.478	sig. at 0.01
English Language does not have systematic phonetic rules and bases.	0.899	sig. at 0.01
Multi syllable words arise difficulty in learning transcription.	0.414	sig. at 0.05
Inconsistencies and irregularities in English spelling form a difficulty in learning phonetic transcription.	0.434	sig. at 0.05
The similarities between sounds confuses me. E.g. /ə/ and /ʌ/ sound.	0.705	sig. at 0.01

"r" table value at (28) d f. at (0.05) sig. level equal 0.361

"r" table value at (28) d f. at (0.01) sig. level equal 0.463

Table 5: Correlation coefficient of curricula and courses factors

Items	Pearson correlation	Sig.
Phonetics and phonology course was not suitable for higher level.	0.409	sig. at 0.05
Phonetics and Phonology course is insufficient to master phonetic transcription.	0.808	sig. at 0.01
Phonetics and phonology course is not clear enough to be mastered by students	0.438	sig. at 0.05
Phonetics and phonology syllabus lacks examples of phonetic transcription.	0.848	sig. at 0.01
The syllabus of phonetics and phonology does not contain all the subjects related to transcription.	0.902	sig. at 0.01
The syllabus of phonetics and phonology does not involve all aspects of connected speech.	0.762	sig. at 0.01
Connected speech examples are insufficient to learn the phonetic transcription.	0.947	sig. at 0.01
Assimilation, elision, linking "R" need to be clarified in an additional course.	0.465	sig. at 0.01
Courses are not enhanced with videos or voice records of RP.	0.699	sig. at 0.01

"r" table value at (28) d f. at (0.05) sig. level equal 0.361

"r" table value at (28) d f. at (0.01) sig. level equal 0.463

Table 6: Matrix of relation correlatin coefcient for the field with the total degree and fields with others

	Total	Scope one	Scope two	Scope three
Total	1			
Teachers factors	**0.870	1		
Language factors	**0.861	**0.569	1	
Curricula and courses factors	**0.635	*0.429	*0.439	1

"r" table value at (28) d f. at (0.05) sig. level equal 0.361

"r" table value at (28) d f. at (0.01) sig. level equal 0.463

As shown in the table (6), there is a correlation between the scopes and the

total degree and each scope with the other scopes at sig. level (0.01,0.05) that shows a high internal consistency of the questionnaire which reinforces the validity of the questionnaire.

Reliability of the test

Reliability takes two main forms, both of which are measures of internal consistency: the split- half technique and the alpha coefficient. Both calculate a coefficient of reliability that can between (0) and (1).

Table 7: Reliability coefficient

Alpha Cronbach Technique		
Domain	Total	Correlation
Teachers factors	9	0.908
Language factors	9	0.725
Curricula and courses factors	9	0.811
Total	27	0.764

From table (7) we can sure the questionnaire has a good reliability.

2- Using Split half:

Table 8: Correlation between two parts (even X odd) and modify by Spearman brown:

Split- half technique			
Domain	Total	Before	After
Teachers factors	9	0.750	0.813
Language factors	9	0.791	0.794
Curricula and courses factors	9	0.672	0.681
Total	27	0.783	0.818

From table (8) we can sure the questionnaire has a good reliability.

Tables (7) and (8) , the test is proved to be reliable . Alpha Cronbach coefficient is (0.764) and the Spilt- half coefficient is (0.818) that indicates the questionnaire is pass to applied in the study.

Statistical models:

Frequencies and percent.

t. test.

One Way ANOVA.

Results of the study

The first question is: *What are the most hindering factors to the learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation according to the of teachers English perception?*

To answer this question, the researcher used the frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation. And the % weight and rank of each item from the questionnaire:

The first domain (Teachers factors)

Table 9: Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation . And the % weight and rank of each items

No	Item	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank
1	I do not know the symbols of the International Phonetic Alphabets (IPA).	377	2.513	1.549	50.27	9
2	I do not have a real knowledge about phonetic transcription of RP.	406	2.707	1.403	54.13	8
3	I feel upset while segmenting the words into phonemes because I am a holistic teacher.	530	3.533	1.085	70.67	4
4	I do not have an ability to search about the right transcription of the words before teaching lessons.	474	3.160	1.306	63.20	6
5	I suffer from lack of practice of using phonetic transcription.	494	3.293	1.173	65.87	5
6	My school burdens hinder me from of using phonetic transcription.	537	3.580	1.342	71.60	3
7	I have poor motivation toward enhancing my skills search.	455	3.033	1.454	60.67	7
8	I use proper dictionaries as "Longman" and "Oxford."	655	4.367	0.484	87.33	1
9	The overgeneralization affected me negatively toward learning phonetic transcription.	591	3.940	0.943	78.80	2
		4519	30.127	8.352	66.95	

From table (9) we can see that the most to the least arranged in order according to the percentage weight and rank:

The most are

no (8) " " occupied the first rank with percent weight (87.33%).

no(9)"" occupied the second rank with percent weight (78.80%).

And the least are:

no (1) " " occupied the eighth rank with percent weight (50.27%).

no (2) " " occupied the last rank with percent weight (54.13%).

The second domain (Language factors)

Table 10: Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation . And the % weight and rank of each items

No	Item	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank
1	The number of English sounds is more than the number of letters, so this confuses me.	612	4.080	1.179	81.60	1
2	Arabic pronunciation effects my learning English pronunciation.	506	3.373	1.303	67.47	8
3	More than one transcription for a single word makes me confused from learning phonetics.	523	3.487	1.441	69.73	6
4	The differences between American and British pronunciation may hinder learning phonetic transcription of RP.	512	3.413	1.094	68.27	7
5	I face difficulty in transcribing the non-English origin words	556	3.707	0.457	74.13	4
6	English Language does not have systematic phonetic rules and bases.	504	3.360	0.780	67.20	9
7	Multi syllable words arise difficulty in learning transcription.	524	3.493	1.284	69.87	5
8	Inconsistencies and irregularities in English spelling form a difficulty in learning phonetic transcription.	590	3.933	1.079	78.67	2
9	The similarities between sounds confuses me. E.g. /ə/ and /^/ sound.	558	3.720	0.743	74.40	3

From table (10) we can see that the most to the least arranged in order according to the percentage weight and rank: the most are

no (1) " " occupied the first rank with percent weight (81.60%).

no(8)"" occupied the second rank with percent weight (78.67%).

And the least are:

no (2) " " occupied the eighth rank with percent weight (67.47%).

no (6) " " occupied the last rank with percent weight (67.20%).

The third domain (curricula and courses)

Table 11: Frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation . And the % weight and rank of each items

No.	Item	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank
1	Phonetics and phonology course was not suitable for higher level.	333	2.220	0.896	44.40	9
2	Phonetics and Phonology course is insufficient to master phonetic transcription.	483	3.220	0.896	64.40	5
3	Phonetics and phonology course is not clear enough to be mastered by students	549	3.660	0.475	73.20	2
4	Phonetics and phonology syllabus lacks examples of phonetic transcription.	456	3.040	1.399	60.80	7
5	The syllabus of phonetics and phonology does not contain all the subjects related to transcription.	463	3.087	1.117	61.73	6
6	The syllabus of phonetics and phonology does not involve all aspects of connected speech.	385	2.567	1.353	51.33	8
7	Connected speech examples are insufficient to learn the phonetic transcription.	518	3.453	0.994	69.07	3
8	Assimilation, elision, linking "R" need to be clarified in an additional course.	599	3.993	0.728	79.87	1
9	Courses are not enhanced with videos or voice records of RP.	494	3.293	0.856	65.87	4

From table (11) we can see that the most to the least arranged in order according to the percentage weight and rank:

The most hindering factors are:

no (8) " " occupied the first rank with percent weight (79.87%).

no(3)"" occupied the second rank with percent weight (73.20%).

And the least are:

no (1) " " occupied the eighth rank with percent weight (44.40%).

no (6) " " occupied the last rank with percent weight (51.33%).

To conclude the results, the researcher used, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation . And the % weight and rank of each field from the questionnaire and table (12) shows this:

Table 12: Sum of responses, means, std. deviation . And the % weight and rank of each field from the questionnaire

Field	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	Rank
Teachers factors	4519	30.127	8.352	66.95	2
Language factors	4885	32.567	5.368	72.37	1
Curricula and courses factors	4280	28.533	5.833	63.41	3
Total	13684	91.227	10.948	67.58	

From table (12) we can see that the (Language factors) occupied the first rank with weight (72.37%). Then (Teachers factors) occupied the second rank with weight (66.95%), Finally, the (Curricula and courses factors) got the third rank with weight (63.41%), and we can see the total degree is (67.58%).

The second question is: *Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the teachers of English perception toward factors hindering learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation due to sex variable?*

To answer this question, the researcher used t.test in table (13)

Table 13: Means, std. deviation t. value, and sig. level to know the difference between male and female

Field	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T value	Sig. level
Teachers factors	male	83	30.831	8.876	1.151	Not sig.
	female	67	29.254	7.628		
Language factors	male	83	33.229	5.192	1.692	Not sig.
	female	67	31.746	5.506		
Curricula and courses factors	male	83	26.843	5.580	4.160	sig. at 0.01
	female	67	30.627	5.485		
Total degree	male	83	90.904	10.194	0.401	Not sig.
	female	67	91.627	11.882		

“t” table value at (148) d f. at (0.05) sig. level equal 1.96

“t” table value at (148) d f. at (0.01) sig. level equal 2.58

After calculating value T, the researcher found that it is less than the critical ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), in the teachers factors and language factors and total degree is no statistically significant differences due to gender, but there are statistically significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the Curricula and courses factors in favor female.

The third question is: *Are there statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the teachers of English perception toward factors hindering learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation due to years of experience variable?*

To answer this question, the researcher used One Way ANOVA table (14) shows this:

Table 14: Source of variance, Sum of Squares, df, Mean Square, f, and sig. level to know the difference between years of experience

Field	Source of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	f	Sig. level
Teachers factors	Between Groups	1.586	2	0.793	0.011	Not sig.
	Within Groups	10391.008	147	70.687		
	Total	10392.593	149			
Language factors	Between Groups	28.651	2	14.326	0.494	Not sig.
	Within Groups	4264.182	147	29.008		
	Total	4292.833	149			
Curricula and courses factors	Between Groups	197.928	2	98.964	2.986	Not sig.
	Within Groups	4871.405	147	33.139		
	Total	5069.333	149			
Total degree	Between Groups	183.727	2	91.864	0.764	Not sig.
	Within Groups	17674.566	147	120.235		
	Total	17858.293	149			

"F" table value at (2, 147) d f. at (0.05) sig. level equal 3.06

"F" table value at (2, 147) d f. at (0.01) sig. level equal 4.75

After calculating value "F", the researcher found it is less than the critical (0.05), in the all domain and the total degree. This means that there are no statistically significant differences due to years of experience.

Discussion

First: the domain of language factors

The researcher attributes this percentage to the fact which is related to English language. English language is full of irregularities in its sound system. Majority of the sample stressed this factor as a major hinder to their perception towards learning phonetic transcription of Received Pronunciation. When we talk about the rules, we talk about a system full of exceptions. Therefore, any theory full of exceptions tends to be weak. One of the difficulties facing teacher English in their learning phonetics transcription of RP. "homophone" even it is related to semantics.

Ghilzai (2010) stated that the EFL learners' pronunciation problems came from the irregularities of English language. Roach (2009) and crystal (2008) state that if two different words are pronounced identically, they are homophones. For example, (saw – sore – soar rode and rowed in BBC pronunciation.

Second: the domain of teachers' factors

This domain occupied the second rank in which the teachers feel bored of searching for the right transcription of the words while reading since searching for the right transcription enhances their skill of phonetic transcription of RP.

Through analyzing the responses of the sample in this study, teachers agreed that lack of practice of phonetic transcription of RP hinder their ability to learn phonetic transcription of RP. Also, the teachers' responses showed that their knowledge about the IPA is simple and tends to be less than the required level. Also, a number of teachers feel that some symbols are strange and they are not accustomed or not exposed to these symbols.

Third: the domain of curricula and courses factors

This domain occupied the second rank in which the available syllabi at the universities require some modification to suit English majors' needs.

Graves (2000: 3) stated the well- designed syllabus should:

1. Include very good and clear measurable objectives.
 2. Reflect students' need variety, i.e. focusing on all skills and systems, language areas, functions, task, materials, input and output.
 3. Be flexible, informative and informing.
- In this domain, the researcher pays attention on connected speech aspects in the courses of phonetics and phonology.

The researcher attributes this to the existence of connected speech aspects in the courses of phonetics and phonology sufficiently, but this existence is still insufficient to be taught to the English majors. The researcher investigated the Peter Roach course and Ladefoged courses and found that the connected speech topic is not mentioned in a systematic point. For example, chapter fourteen, page 123 to 126 of Peter Roach course, the writer didn't mention the rules of assimilation (place & manner of articulations). In addition to the limited number of examples in the courses. Besides, the topics of courses are required to be more highlighted to all English majors.

Conclusion

The following conclusions were drawn from the study:

1. The most hindering factors are related to the second domain (language factors. Also, these factors formed such restrictions on learning phonetic transcription of RP.
2. Male and female teachers agreed on the most hindering factors regardless their years of experience.
3. Male and female teachers agreed on the most hindering factors regardless their years except curricula and courses factors. This is relatively due to their homogeneity conditions of learning phonetic transcription of RP.
4. This paper focuses on an essential and an integrated part of pronunciation which is learning phonetic transcription of RP that helps teachers understand and learn English sound system or even to improve their own pronunciation.
5. The importance of this paper is the additional and the systematic identification of the most hindering factors that hinder learning phonetic transcription of RP. This can help teachers avoid or overcome these factors through the aforementioned discussion.
6. This paper helps the curricula and courses designers involve all phonetic transcription topics in an organized and orderly manner.

Limitations of the study

The results are only generalized on the teachers of English who work at the ministry of education in Gaza Strip.

Suggestions for future research

1. Doing a qualitative research paper that focuses on factors promoting learning phonetic transcription.
2. Conducting an international and experimental research paper that involves more than two countries in the difficulties of learning connected speech aspects.

References

- [1] Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). New York: Pearson.
- [2] Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D., & Goodwin, J. (1996). *Teaching pronunciation: A reference for teachers of English to speakers of other languages*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Christophe, V.B. (2007) *Validation, Automatic Generation And Use of Broad Phonetic Transcription*. Ipskamp: Nijmegen.
- [4] Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. (6th edition). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- [5] Dalton, D.F. (1997). Some techniques for listening pronunciation. *The Internet TESL Journal*. 3 (1). Available online at <http://iteslj.org/>.
- [6] Ghilzai, s. (2010). *The Role of Transfer in the Acquisition of L2 Possessives by German, Greek, Japanese & Chinese L1 Speakers* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Essex.
- [7] Ghorbania, M .R. (2019). The Effect of Phonetic Transcription on Iranian EFL Students' Word Stress Learnin. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15 (2) 400-410 .
- [8] Hosseini, S. M. H. (2007). *ELT in higher education in Iran and India – A critical view*. *Language in India*, 7, 1-11. Retrieved October 9, 2008, from [http://www. languageinindia.com /dec2007/eltinindiaandiran.pdf](http://www.languageinindia.com/dec2007/eltinindiaandiran.pdf)
- [9] International Phonetic Association.(1999). *Handbook of the International*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [10] Jahangard, A. (2007). Evaluation of EFL materials taught at Iranian public high schools. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 9 (2), 130-150.
- [11] Jiménez, J.; &Hernández, C. (2019). Transcription Skills and Written Composition in Spanish Beginning Writers: Pen and Keyboard Modes. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 32 (7), 1847-1879.

- [12] Klintö, K;&, Anette, L. (2017). Does the Recording Medium Influence Phonetic Transcription of Cleft Palate Speech? *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 52 (4), 440-449.
- [13] Limpo, T; Alves, R.A. (2017). Written Language Bursts Mediate the Relationship between Transcription Skills and Writing Performance. *Written Communication*, 34 (3), 306-332.
- [14] Muller, N; & Papakyritsis, I. (2011). Segments, Letters and Gestures: Thoughts on Doing and Teaching Phonetics and Transcription. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 25 (11-12), 949-955.
- [15] Najjar, F. (2012). *Mastery level of phonetic transvription of Received Pronunciation among English Majors and its Relation with Some Variables*. Unpublished master dissertation. Faculty of Education. Islamic University of Gaza.
- [16] Nolan, F.J. & Kerswill, P.E. (1990) . *The description of connected speech Phonetic Association: A guide to the use of the International Phonetic Alphabet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-52165236-7 (hb); ISBN 0-521-63751-1 (pb).
- [17] Razmjo, S. A. & Riazi, M. (2006). Is communicative language teaching practical in the expanding circle? A case study of teachers of Shiraz high schools and institutes. *Journal of Language and Learning*, 4 (2), 144-171.
- [18] Roach, P. (2009). *English Phonetics and Phonology*. Routledge: London.
- [19] Werfel, K. (2017). Phonetic Transcription Training Improves Adults' Explicit Phonemic Awareness: Evidence from Undergraduate Students. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 39 (1), 281-287.
- [20] Yarmohammadi, L. (2005). *A contrastive phonological analysis of English and Persian*. (3rd ed.). Shiraz: Shiraz University Press.
- [21] Yurtbasi, M. (2016). Contrastive Suprasegmental Features on English and Arabic IPA Transcription of Surah Al Ya Sin. *International Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences (IJAHSS)*, 1 (2), 100-119.



©2020 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license.

You are free to:

Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format.
Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially.

Under the following terms:

Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.
You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use.
No additional restrictions

International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation is published by Al-Kindi Center for Research and Development.

Why Publish with Us?

Indexed in world-class databases
Open access format of published content ensures maximum visibility
Prestigious Editor-in-Chief with a strong expertise in the field
Prompt submission and review process
Retention of full copyright of your article
Nominal article processing charges (APCs)
Rapid online publication of your paper following expert peer review
Every article is provided with DOI (Digital Object Identifier)
Free certificate of Article publication
Extensive global readership and online visibility
Discounts and waivers for authors in developing regions

Submit your manuscript to International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation at editor@ijllt.org