

# **Korean Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions of World Englishes**

Kum Young Chang

Master's Thesis in Education  
Spring Term 2019  
Faculty of Education and Psychology  
University of Jyväskylä

## ABSTRACT

**Chang, Kum Young. 2019. Master's Thesis in Education. University of Jyväskylä. Faculty of Education and Psychology.**

As English has been more and more used all around the world, there has been calling for more inclusion of World Englishes (WEs) in English education (Dufva, Suni, Aro, & Salo, 2011; Kirkpatrick, 2006; Orikasa, 2016; Pennycook, 2008; Schulzke, 2014). English education in Korea, however, still centers on native speaker models (Ahn & Kang, 2017; Fayzrakhmanova, 2016; Song, 2013), relatively little research investigating WEs from teachers' and students' perspectives. The purpose of this study is, therefore, to explore Korean teachers' and learners' perceptions of WEs, building on previous work on WEs.

Questionnaires, which included both close-ended and open-ended questions, were designed and given to 51 teachers and 79 students in Korea, together with sample speeches representing different WEs. The questions asked participants' understanding of WEs, English varieties they had learned, taught, and been exposed to, and their attitudes towards including diverse WEs in English education.

The results indicated that the participants, in general, had some knowledge of WEs, had mostly learned, taught, and been exposed to American English, and were positive about incorporating varying WEs in English education although some of them were rather skeptical of the inclusion. Comparing the two groups, the teachers showed a better understanding of WEs, and they were more open to the inclusion.

The study concludes that English education in Korea needs to be changed into teaching/learning English as a practical language, and diversify the language, reflecting voices from teachers and students. It also suggests that information on WEs which is widely shared by research literature should also be shared with teachers and students before they make any educational choice regarding WEs.

Keywords: World Englishes (WEs), English education in Korea, teachers and learners, perceptions of WEs

# CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>WORLD ENGLISHES .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1	World Englishes .....	9
2.2	English as a Lingua Franca and English as an International Language .....	11
<b>3</b>	<b>MODELS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION.....</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1	Native Speaker Model .....	14
3.2	WEs Approach .....	16
<b>4</b>	<b>ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION IN KOREA .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>PERCEPTIONS OF WEs .....</b>	<b>24</b>
5.1	Teachers' Perceptions of WEs .....	24
5.2	Learners' Perceptions of WEs .....	27
<b>6</b>	<b>RESEARCH QUESTIONS .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>METHODS.....</b>	<b>33</b>
7.1	Participants.....	33
7.2	Instrument .....	36
7.3	Procedure .....	38
7.4	Reliability .....	39
7.5	Ethical Solutions.....	40
7.6	Analysis .....	40
<b>8</b>	<b>RESULTS.....</b>	<b>44</b>
8.1	Knowledge of WEs .....	44

8.2	Varieties of English Used .....	46
8.2.1	Varieties of English that Had Been Learned .....	46
8.2.2	Varieties of English that Had Taught/Been Taught in School.....	47
8.2.3	Varieties of English that the Participants Were Exposed to .....	49
8.3	Attitudes towards Including Diverse WEs in English Education .....	50
8.3.1	Attitudes towards Including Diverse WEs in English Teaching/Learning .....	50
8.3.2	Attitudes towards Including Diverse WEs in English Tests .....	55
8.3.3	Willingness to Change Teaching/Learning Practices regarding WEs .....	60
<b>9</b>	<b>DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>65</b>
9.1	Knowledge of WEs .....	65
9.2	English Use.....	67
9.3	Inclusion of WEs in Teaching/Learning and Tests.....	68
9.4	Teaching/Learning Practices regarding WEs.....	73
9.5	'I don't Know' Responses .....	74
9.6	Further Comments.....	76
9.7	Summary .....	77
9.8	Implications for Pedagogy .....	77
9.9	Limitations and Suggestions for Further Studies.....	78
	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>80</b>

# 1 INTRODUCTION

As the world becomes more interdependent and English is increasingly used as an instrument of global communication, English has been recognized as an international language, not limited only to countries where English is used as a first language (L1) (Schulzke, 2014; Kim & Kim, 2018; Sung, 2013). In fact, English nowadays is more used by non-native speakers than by native speakers (Abeywickrama, 2013; Ahn & Kang, 2017; Barnes, 2005; Foley, 2007; Gilmore, 2007; Kim & Kim, 2018; Orikasa, 2016; Sadeghpour & Sharifian, 2017; Schulzke, 2014; Sung, 2013; Young & Walsh, 2010). Moreover, the majority of interaction in English by non-native speakers is with other non-native speakers than with native-speakers, and this proportion is expected to increase (Ahn & Kang, 2017; Barnes, 2005; Orikasa, 2016; Sadeghpour & Sharifian, 2017; Sung, 2013; Sung, 2016; Young & Walsh, 2010). Accordingly, there has been calling for more inclusion of World Englishes (WEs) —namely, different varieties of English— in English language learning and teaching contexts as legitimate languages; as English, like any other language, is susceptible to change, any attempt to unify different WEs into one with a specific variety at its heart is not only unattainable but also undesirable (Dufva, Suni, Aro, & Salo, 2011; Kirkpatrick, 2006; Orikasa, 2016; Pennycook, 2008; Schulzke, 2014).

However, in many of English language learning contexts, especially in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, language instruction still centers on a native speaker model, where native-like command of English is encouraged and students are assessed according to native speaker English standards (Gu & So, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2006; Young & Walsh, 2010). Moreover, English teachers and learners do not necessarily have a clear idea of WEs, nor do they think WEs should be incorporated in language learning and teaching; many of them favor Inner Circle Englishes (e.g., American English, British English, and Canadian English) over other varieties, regarding them as the standard while the others seen as non-standard (Abeywickrama, 2013; Ahn,

2015; Gu & So, 2015; Kang, 2015; Lee & Hsieh, 2018; Sadeghpour & Sharifian, 2017; Sung, 2016; Takahashi, 2017; Young & Walsh, 2010).

South Korea (Korea hereafter) is one of the countries that have made the choice of a native speaker model. Although its national curriculum says that English is a global language (Song, 2013), embracing cross-linguistic and cross-cultural diversity, English language education in Korea is still based on native speaker norms, mainly those of American English (Ahn, 2015; Ahn & Kang, 2017; Fayzrakhmanova, 2016; Song, 2013). Furthermore, it appears that relatively little attention has been given to perceptions of WEs that Korean teachers and learners of English have, who are thought to be among the most important stakeholders in language learning and teaching; although Korean teachers and students seem to have a preference for Inner Circle Englishes in general (Ahn, 2015; Lee & Hsieh, 2018), there has also been a contradictory finding showing Korean students' positive attitudes towards Korean accents and non-native speakers (Ahn and Kang, 2017).

This study, therefore, aims at exploring Korean teachers' and students' perceptions of WEs, building on the previous work on WEs. More specifically, this study aims to examine Korean teachers' and students' attitudes towards including more diverse WEs in English language education in Korea as well as English varieties they have used and their understanding of WEs.

The next chapter in this paper (i.e., Chapter 2) describes the key concept of the study, WEs, by reviewing the literature on WEs and related concepts of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) and English as an International Language (EIL). Chapter 3 introduces two models for English language education (i.e., native speaker model and WEs approach), examining the pros and cons of each model. Chapter 4 describes English education in Korea, which is based on the native speaker model. .

Chapter 5 presents the findings of previous studies on WEs, particularly focusing on teachers' and learners' perceptions of WEs. Chapter 6, then, defines the aim of the study, stating the research questions.

Chapter 7 details the methodology of the study: participant recruitment, the instrument employed, procedures, and data analysis. It also discusses the reliability and ethical considerations of the study. Chapter 8 presents the research results, answering to the research questions. Chapter 9 further discusses the results, relating them to the previous research findings. It also provides suggestions for further studies, together with its limitations.

## 2 WORLD ENGLISHES

### 2.1 World Englishes

It is true that in many parts of the world, especially in EFL contexts, native-speaker varieties of English, mostly American English and British English, have been learned and taught, being recognized as standard Englishes (Gu & So, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2006; Sung, 2016).

However, with the increasing use of English for global communication, along with the exponentially expanding use of English by non-native speakers, English has been gradually accepted as an international language, rather than the language of certain countries. According to estimates, while there are approximately one billion speakers of English around the world, about 400 million of them are native speakers while 600 million are presumed to be non-native speakers (Orikasa, 2016; Sung, 2013). The population of English speakers as a second (L2) or foreign language (FL) is predicted to increase whereas that of native speakers is likely to remain stable (Barnes, 2005; Orikasa, 2016). Furthermore, it has been expected that more interactions in the English language will occur between non-native English speakers than between native and non-native speakers (Orikasa, 2016; Sung, 2013).

Indeed, as early as 1980s, Kachru (1985) noted the spread and internationalization of English across the world, using the term 'world Englishes' to represent "a unique cultural pluralism, and a linguistic heterogeneity and diversity" (p. 14) in the English language. According to him, WEs can be discussed in terms of three circles: (a) the Inner Circle where English is spoken as a primary language (e.g., Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the UK, and the US), (b) the Outer Circle (or Extended Circle) where English is one of two or more official languages (e.g., India, Malaysia, and Singapore), and (c) the Expanding Circle where English is used as a foreign language (e.g., China, Greece, Japan, and Korea) (Kachru, 1985). By pointing out "the diffusion of and resultant innovations in English around the world" (p. 12), Kachru (1985)

further addressed the need for understanding linguistic diversity and creativity, escaping from the traditional notions of standards and from the dichotomy of native and non-native speakers.

The term of WEs, then, highlights “the fact that there are multiple and varied models of English across cultures and that English is not limited to countries where it has traditionally been regarded as a mother tongue” (Richards, Schmidt, Kendricks, & Kim, 2002, p. 591).

According to McKay (2018), WEs can be further discussed in three perspectives. The first is “a broad definition, which includes all varieties of English spoken around the world” (McKay, 2018, p. 10), including not only Englishes of Inner Circle countries but also Englishes of Outer Circle countries and of Expanding Circle countries. The second definition of WEs is a narrow one that includes only those varieties in Outer Circle countries such as Malaysian English and Nigerian English (McKay, 2018). The third definition of WEs is similar with the second one, but it emphasizes “the pluricentric view of English in which equal respect is given to all varieties of English” (McKay, 2018, p. 10). In this study, the broad definition of WEs (i.e., the first definition) will be used in order to avoid any possible confusion.

The linguistic creativity in English and its multicultural character are found in its uses around the world, in vocabularies, discourse strategies, speech acts, and writing including creative writing (e.g., novels and poetry), as well as in accents (Kachru, 1985). Clearly, WEs are more than spoken language accents. However, the majority of recent studies on WEs in language education appear to have mainly focused on spoken language, noting different accents in different varieties of English (e.g., Abeywickrama, 2013; Ahn & Kang, 2017; Lee & Hsieh, 2018; Orikasa, 2016; Sung, 2016). Indeed, it seems difficult to talk about WEs, particularly focusing on written language, considering that many of WEs do not yet have their own dictionaries, grammars, or writing conventions (Kirkpatrick, 2006). For example, Malaysian English has no strict rules on grammar, nor is it convincingly codified although it has become “an unmarked language of everyday information communication” in Malaysia with its distinct

phonology and lexical items “as a carrier of distinctly Malaysian identity” (Schneider, 2003, p. 55).

Another example can be found in Singlish, which is the colloquial English spoken in Singapore, comprising “elements of English, Malay, Hokkien, Mandarine-Chinese and Cantonese” (Tan, 2017, p. 87). Singlish has received much attention as a language with its own grammar, lexis, and phonology; many researchers have provided systematic analysis of the language, and some dictionaries have tried to include some of Singapore English in their pages (Chew, 2013; Salazar, 2018). However, with the launch of the Speak Good English Movement in 2000, a government-initiated campaign promoting the use of grammatically correct English in Singapore (Chew, 2013; Tan, 2017), efforts to codify Singlish seem to have remained stalled.

Therefore, WEs in this study will be reduced to spoken language accents with the focus being on listening and speaking aspects in language learning and teaching contexts, although it must be fully acknowledged that WEs are much more spoken language accents.

## **2.2 English as a Lingua Franca and English as an International Language**

Closely related to but different from WEs are the phenomena of ELF and EIL, which have been relatively recently discussed, compared to “the much more firmly established field of world Englishes” (Jenkins, 2009, p. 200).

English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) refers to “the common language of choice among speakers who come from different linguacultural backgrounds” (Jenkins, 2009, p. 200). In other words, ELF is not a particular linguistic variety but “a contact language by speakers from varying linguacultural backgrounds, where both the community of speakers and the location can be changing and are often not associated with a specific nation” (Cogo, 2012, p. 98). In the context of language learning and teaching, it can also mean “a reduced form of English, incorporating what textbook writers perceive to be the most relevant features of the language for communication between non-native speakers in

international contexts" (Gilmore, 2007, p. 104). The focus of ELF, therefore, can be said to be on intelligibility when speakers of English try to interact, adopting various strategies to complement breakdowns in communication, make themselves more understandable, and support their conversation (Cogo, 2012; Gilmore, 2007; McKay, 2018).

English as an International Language (EIL) is also concerned with content and interaction between speakers, but it can be distinguished from ELF in that the use of English for international communication should be based on specific principles as follows (McKay, 2018):

1. Given the varieties of English spoken today and the diversity of L2 learning contexts, all pedagogical decisions regarding standards and curriculum should be made in reference to local language needs and local social and educational factors.
2. The widely accepted belief that an English-only classroom is the most productive for language learning needs to be fully examined; in addition, careful thought should be given to how best to use the L1 in developing language proficiency.
3. Attention to the development of strategic intercultural competence should exist in all EIL classrooms.
4. EIL is not linked to a particular social/cultural context in the same way that French, Korean or Japanese are intricately associated with a particular culture. In this way EIL is or should be culturally neutral.

(McKay, 2018, p. 11)

EIL and WEs, thus, seem to share some underlying assumptions that there exist different varieties of English spoken around the world, and each variety of English has its own distinctive features, which may reflect speakers' L1 and culture (McKay, 2018). ELF also relates to WEs in that both of them are based on the belief that "effective communication in English involves deferring to ENL (English as a native language) norms as a fiction" (Jenkins, 2009, p. 206); according to Jenkins (2009), ELF is a question of "mutual negotiation involving efforts and adjustments from all parties," not of "orientation to the norms of a particular group of English speakers" (p. 201).

Accordingly, despite the subtle differences, both EIL and ELF appear to reflect the belief that English belongs to all who use it and emphasize its international use rather than claiming that there is a single, unitary variety of

English (Brown, 2014; Young & Walsh, 2010), which is in line with what WEs research has suggested.

## 3 MODELS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION

### 3.1 Native Speaker Model

The most predominant model for English language education until the early 1990s and perhaps still in most Expanding Circle countries may be a native speaker model (Coşkun, 2013; Jayanti & Norahmi, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2006; Mukminatien, 2012; Phan, 2018; Rivers, 2013; Ruecker & Ives, 2015; Sadeghpour & Sharifian, 2017; Sowden, 2011; Wang, 2015; Young & Walsh, 2010), which is based on “the belief that ‘native speaker’ teachers represent a ‘Western culture’ from which spring the ideals both of the English language and of English teaching methodology” (Holliday as cited in Holliday, 2006, p. 385). Despite the fact that the majority of English speakers are non-native speakers who use it for international communication and that English is used for various purposes in multiple new contexts, there still seems to exist “a strong tendency to cling to the traditional native-speaker as the final arbiter or authority about appropriate usage” (Foley, 2007, p. 7). In fact, while recent published English textbooks have claimed that they are targeting all English learners over the world, their reference to native English speakers and their cultures tends to outstrip the reference to Outer- and Expanding Circle countries (Khodadady & Shayesteh, 2016).

In this model, a native-like command of the English language is encouraged, learners being evaluated according to native speaker English norms (Gu & So, 2015; Jayanti & Norahmi, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2006; Mukminatien, 2012; Young & Walsh, 2010). In most cases, Englishes of Inner Circle countries, particularly American English and British English, are used as pedagogical models, being considered as standard Englishes (Jayanti & Norahmi, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2006; Sung, 2016). For instance, English teaching practices in Indonesia often establish a goal towards native speaker norms; teachers try to explain all the grammatical rules, drill students on native-like

pronunciation, provide samples of conversation between native speakers, encourage students to speak like native speakers, and correct what they believe non-standard forms of English, based on the belief that students should have near-native command of English to be able to successfully communicate and interact in English (Jayanti & Norahmi, 2015).

The rationale behind the choice of native speaker models is that they have legitimacy and prestige; Englishes spoken in Inner Circle contexts have history as well as being codified, which helps them look more appropriate as standard Englishes (Kirkpatrick, 2006). It is also said that native speaker models provide many learning and teaching resources such as dictionaries and grammar books, helping both learners and teachers (Kirkpatrick, 2006). Linguistic knowledge and information about target culture that native English speaking teachers can provide, both as language models and as cultural resources themselves, is another frequently cited advantage of native speaker models (Árva, & Medgyes, 2000).

Native speaker models, thus, allow native speakers of English to get a more favorable position in teacher recruitment than their non-native counterparts (Coşkun, 2013; Kirkpatrick, 2006). The English Program in Korea (EPIK) in Korea, the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) program in Japan, and Native-speaking English Teacher (NET) Scheme in Hong Kong are examples of government-initiated efforts to improve English education system by hiring more native English speaking teachers (Coşkun, 2013). The Turkey government also launched a project to hire 40,000 native English speaking teachers from Inner Circle countries including Australia, Canada, the UK, and the US, who could teach in Turkish EFL contexts with local Turkish teachers of English (Coşkun, 2013).

Investigating websites recruiting teachers for language schools in five Asian countries (i.e., China, Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and Thailand) and analyzing textual and visual characteristics shown in the websites, Ruecker and Ives (2015) stated that ideal candidates described in the websites were “young, White, enthusiastic native speaker[s] of English from a stable list of inner-circle

countries” (p. 733), with less emphasis given to teaching experience. This preference for native speakers is often found among English learners; in a study of 80 Japanese university students, Rivers (2013) found that Japanese students, after reading profiles of six English teachers working in Japan, rated white, native speakers of English as the most desirable English teachers.

### **3.2 WEs Approach**

Since the 2000s, an increasing number of studies have raised the question about the validity of the English native speaker model in English language teaching (Cook, 1999; Coşkun, 2013; Jayanti & Norahmi, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2006; Ruecker & Ives, 2015; Young & Walsh, 2010). For instance, a definition of a native speaker has become elusive, “an idealized figure conforming only very loosely, if at all, to the actual usage of the majority of first language (L1) speakers” (Young & Walsh, 2010, p. 124). The inefficacy of the English native speaker model has been bolstered by the fact that it undermines the value of local teachers as the source of knowledge; they are required to teach a model they do not speak, their knowledge of their students and their experience as language learners themselves being ignored (Kirkpatrick, 2006). The native speaker model has been also criticized for the reason that the model itself is unrealistic and unattainable (Cook, 1999; Kirkpatrick, 2006); students are often frustrated and ashamed when they do not speak English like a native speaker, unwilling to experiment with the language, thus feeling demotivated (Jayanti & Norahmi, 2015).

Moreover, as English speakers in Outer and Expanding Circles outnumber those in Inner Circle countries (Abeywickrama, 2013; Ahn & Kang, 2017; Barnes, 2005; Kim & Kim, 2018; Orikasa, 2016; Sadeghpour & Sharifian, 2017; Sung, 2013; Sung, 2016; Young & Walsh, 2010), the role of English as “a heterogeneous language based on multiple forms” has become important, escaping from “the traditional view of English based on the native speaker norm” (Gu & So, 2015, p. 10). This is to say, English has been considered as an international language

among people from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, who may no longer try to assimilate themselves into Inner Circle communities; multiple varieties of English developed and used in Outer- and Expanding- Circle countries are advocated as legitimate varieties, the term world Englishes—rather than “English” alone—being frequently used (Gu & So, 2015; Kobayashi, 2011; Lee & Hsieh, 2018; Young & Walsh, 2010).

Indeed, as Matsuda (2003) pointed out, the native speaker model might not be suitable for many language learners in Expanding Circle countries, given that they are more likely to use English with other non-native speakers of English in Outer and Expanding Circles than with native speakers in Inner Circle countries.

The WEs approach in English learning and teaching, therefore, challenges the native speaker model and values local linguistic and cultural influences on the English language (Brown, 2014; Gu & So, 2015; Kim & Kim, 2018; Mukminatien, 2012). In this model, different varieties of English are viewed as legitimate and thereby can be used as models in English language learning and teaching (Brown, 2014; Gu & So, 2015). The norms and usages of native speakers of English are no longer emphasized, with the focus being on global intelligibility, cultural information, and communicative strategies that can support cross-cultural communication (Jayanti & Norahmi, 2015; Kang, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2006; Mukminatien, 2012; Young & Walsh, 2010). In pronunciation instruction, for example, both teachers and learners are encouraged to set a realistic goal: improved intelligibility, rather than pursuing native-like pronunciation (Derwing, & Munro, 2005; Mukminatien, 2012).

Closely related to the WEs model is a nativized model, or what Brown (2014) calls locally defined EIL approach. This model is based on local needs for the English language, all the choices regarding objectives, content, resources, strategies, and context of English learning and teaching coming from a careful needs analysis of the language (Brown, 2014). In this model, a local variety of English is perceived as a socially acceptable, legitimate language, and the goal becomes both attainable and realistic (Kirkpatrick, 2006). Countries that are

likely to adopt this approach are those in the Outer Circle like Singapore, where its English variety has gradually replaced a native speaker model (Kirkpatrick, 2006).

The WE research has reported advantages that the WEs or nativized model can offer. First, it exposes learners to other diverse Englishes than just Inner Circle Englishes, which they are more likely to encounter in the real world (Gilmore, 2007; Jayanti & Norahmi, 2015).

Second, not only does it motivate learners by increasing their self-confidence but it also empowers teachers as role models for students, who may speak Outer- or Expanding- Circle Englishes, which are equally legitimate as those in Inner Circle (Coşkun, 2013; Jayanti & Norahmi, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2006). As a good example of successful language learners, local teachers (i.e., non-native English speaking teachers) can provide learners with more useful information about language learning by helping them make good use of first language and by helping them use proper language learning strategies (Coşkun, 2013). Local teachers can also predict language difficulties that students may encounter in their learning process, understand linguistic and cultural needs of their students, and thereby help them better learn the English language (Coşkun, 2013).

The WEs approach can also help learners to better understand other cultures and therefore regard the world from a broader perspective by teaching them there are different varieties of English spoken in different parts of the world, each of which is equally important and worth to learn (Jayanti & Norahmi, 2015).

Despite the advantages mentioned above, the WEs approach has also raised some critical questions such as how to distinguish learner errors from features of varieties in the process of language learning (Hamid & Baldauf Jr, 2013; Mukminatien, 2012; Sowden, 2011). Although it can be said that varieties are characterized by intelligibility, acceptability, and systemicity, thereby differentiated from errors, it does not seem to be always easy to draw a clear

line between what is intelligible, acceptable, and systematic, and what is unintelligible, unacceptable and unsystematic (Hamid & Baldauf Jr, 2013).

Another controversial issue, especially among language teachers, is what form or forms of language to be adopted while trying to teach EIL and which target language culture should be dealt with in language classrooms (Dogancay-Aktuna, 2018; Gilmore, 2007). Language learners should be able to develop awareness of basic phonological features of the language as well as lexical and grammatical aspects before they could recognize variation in language forms and uses (Dogancay-Aktuna, 2018). What forms of language to use in language classrooms, then, becomes one of the main concerns that make pedagogical decisions even more complicated (Dogancay-Aktuna, 2018; Gilmore, 2007).

Furthermore, Sowden (2011) expressed concern about attitudinal difficulty that both teachers and learners might face. According to him, teachers and students might compromise their “academic self-image” and limit their “professional aspirations” (p. 92) if they are forced to accept and use different varieties of English, which they have taught and learned to treat as inferior. That is, teachers and learners, when compelled to embrace the diversity in English, whose varieties other than native ones have been thought to be inferior, might think that they are teaching and learning less important, illegitimate varieties, which makes them feel less academic and unprofessional.

## 4 ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION IN KOREA

Since adopted as a regular subject at secondary schools in the 1950s, English has become a crucial part of education in Korea to be included in the primary school curriculum in 1997 (Byean, 2015; Cho, 2004).

English language education in Korea, particularly in school contexts, has been characterized by a high level of dependence on grammar and reading, little exposure to spoken English, and exam-oriented lessons despite all the changes in education policy to promote communicative skills and encourage cooperative learning in learner-centered classes (Cho, 2004; Moodie & Nam, 2016). Indeed, many of English teachers in Korea tend to take teacher-centered approaches for their instruction, focusing on written forms of English and teaching skills required to answer exam questions, because secondary schools are generally thought of as preparatory steps for college admission, for which getting good grades on tests including the College Scholastic Aptitude Test is extremely important (Cho, 2004; Moodie & Nam, 2016).

Another characteristic of English education in Korea is that it is based on the native speaker model. As stated earlier, the ability to deal with linguistically and culturally diverse contexts and to interact with people from varying backgrounds has become increasingly important in English language teaching in this globalized world. In the context of Korea—one of the countries from the Expanding Circle—while the revised national English language curriculum sees English as “a major means of communication between people from different linguistic backgrounds” (Korean Ministry of Education, 2015, p. 3), embracing cultural diversity and cross-linguistic and cross-cultural differences, it is undeniable that English language education in Korea still centers on the native speaker model (Ahn & Kang, 2017; Byean, 2015; Choi, 2016; Fayzrakhmanova, 2016; Song, 2013).

In other words, native-like English proficiency has often been a major goal of English education in Korea (Choi, 2016), allowing the government to consistently pursue English policies such as “placing native-English-speaking

teachers in public schools” and “teaching English using a policy of English only (TEE)” (Byean, 2015, p. 874). The Teaching English in English only (TEE) policy, which has been supported by the TEE certification policy, according to Byean (2015), has functioned as a means to evaluate English teachers in Korea based on their language proficiency. It has also contributed to justifying “dominant ideologies of monolingual instruction as well as native-speakerism” (p. 874), which may in turn have helped to create the misunderstanding that good English to be learned is the one from Inner Circle countries spoken by white people (Byean, 2015).

Moreover, the majority of English textbooks for secondary school students in Korea are based on American English, not providing students with enough opportunities to be exposed to different varieties of English (Park, 2017). Kwon and Lim (2018), through the analysis of 11 Korean High School English textbooks, for instance, suggested that although European and Asian cultures showed high distribution (i.e., 26.7 per cent and 20.3 per cent, respectively) regarding cultural background, the percentage of Inner Circle English cultures was still the highest (i.e., 28.4 per cent), whereas other cultures such as African and Latin American cultures were rarely addressed.

Foreign English teacher recruitment systems in Korea also demonstrate how dependent English education in Korea has become on the native speaker model. Every year, hundreds of thousands of English native speakers are coming to Korea to teach English in schools, academic institutes, or English villages, where native speakers are believed to be better qualified to teach the English language compared to non-native speakers (Ahn & Kang, 2017; Fayzrakhmanova, 2016; Kirkpatrick, 2006); quite often, being a native speaker is the only qualification as seen in the past Korean government’s advertisements for native speaker English teachers in the Korean Herald below (Kirkpatrick as cited in Kirkpatrick, 2006, p. 6):

Type 1 teachers require a Certificate in TESOL or three years full-time teaching experience with a graduate degree in TESOL or experience and interest in Korean culture and language.

Type 2 teachers only have to be native speakers of English with a bachelor's degree in any field.

In other words, without pedagogical studies in the English language, anyone who had “experience and interest in Korean culture and language” appeared to teach English in Korea only if he or she is a native speaker of English (Kirkpatrick, 2006). Two government-established programs of English Program in Korea (EPIK, created in 1995) and Teach and Learn in Korea (TaLK, created in 2008) as part of educational reforms to enhance English-speaking abilities of students and teachers, promote cultural exchanges, and reform English teaching methods, are not free from the native speaker norm, either (Choi, 2016; Wang & Lin, 2013). The EPIK teachers, for example, should hold bachelor degrees and be citizens of countries where English is used as a primary language of communication (Wang & Lin, 2013). The following are current selection criteria that EPIK applicants must meet, published in the website of the National Institute for International Education of the Ministry of Education, Korea (<http://www.niied.go.kr/eng/main.do>):

Applicants must

- Be a citizen of one of the seven designated English-speaking countries  
\*Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa, U.K., U.S.A.
- Hold a minimum of a bachelor's degree from an accredited university
- Have a good command of the English language
- Have the ability and willingness to adapt to Korean culture and lifestyle
- Be mentally and physically healthy

Still, one of the most important prerequisites for becoming an EPIK teacher is being a native speaker of English, and one does not need to have teaching qualifications or experience in order to be an EPIK teacher in Korea although those who have experience or qualifications in language teaching might be paid more (Wang & Lin, 2013). As Choi (2016) notes, by designating English-speaking countries as seven countries that are Inner Circle countries, the EPIK program appears to strengthen the ideology of native-speakerism that English spoken by native speakers from the Inner Circle is the only English that should be learned and taught as a language model (Choi, 2016).

Furthermore, the emphasis of English instruction in Korea, as with most of other Expanding Circle countries, is placed on the mastery of English from the Inner Circle; American (or sometimes British) English is perceived as the standard with a prestigious status, by which one's English proficiency can and should be assessed (Ahn, 2015; Ahn & Kang, 2017; Fayzrakhmanova, 2016; Kirkpatrick, 2006; Lee & Hsieh, 2018). In fact, the most commonly found English variety in textbooks and high-stakes testing in Korea is American English (Ahn, 2015; Ahn & Kang, 2017; Fayzrakhmanova, 2016; Kirkpatrick, 2006; Lee & Hsieh, 2018). According to Song (2013), high school English textbooks in Korea, which are presumed to reflect the national curriculum, appear to favor American English and culture over others; most of the texts, where white American male characters play a dominant role, are narrated in the US variety while other varieties from Outer- and Expanding- Circle countries are ignored.

This strong preference for American English is also found in many tests implemented in Korea including the College Scholastic Ability Test as well as English education policies (Ahn & Kang, 2017), thereby English becoming a synonym of American English for most Koreans. Indeed, most of test items in English Listening Test, which is organized by 15 education offices in Korea and administered to almost all secondary school students in Korea, are recorded by voice actors speaking American English (15 test items out of 20), the rest by those speaking British English (Park, 2017).

## 5 PERCEPTIONS OF WEs

Since the emergence of the term “World Englishes,” there has been much research on language teachers’ and/or learners’ awareness of and attitudes towards different varieties of English, as attitudes to a language, according to Dörnyei (2006) and Gardner (1985, 2001), are among major factors that influence L2 learning motivation, which in turn can affect the whole process of L2 learning (as cited in Kormos & Csizér, 2008). Attitudes, here, are defined as “one’s or a group’s evaluation of the relative value of that language” including “some sort of prejudices about the speaker and the community using the language to which the speaker belongs” (Nguyen & Hamid, 2016, p. 89).

### 5.1 Teachers’ Perceptions of WEs

Studies on WEs have reported teachers’ hesitation in incorporating more diverse WEs into their teaching despite their positive attitudes to the concept of EIL and related changes in the English language (Dogancay-Aktuna, 2018); teachers in many studies often did not have a clear idea of WEs and continued to value teaching English from the Inner Circle as the most proper instructional model although they seemed to understand the diversity in the English language and the need to change some of their teaching practices to some extent (Ahn, 2015; Dogancay-Aktuna, 2018; Gu & So, 2015; Phan, 2018; Sadeghpour & Sharifian, 2017; Takahashi, 2017; Wong, 2018; Young & Walsh, 2010).

For example, in a study of 33 English teachers in Vietnam, Phan (2018) concluded that while the teachers acknowledged that English was a pluralistic language having different varieties, they were reluctant to teach English varieties other than what they called standard. After providing handouts containing information on WEs, Phan conducted focus group interviews with the participants, which revealed their preference for American English and British English as an instructional model despite their awareness of the diversity in the English language and perceived importance of knowing about it.

By noting that nearly half of the teachers raised the possibility of going beyond native speaker models, questioning the definition of so-called standard English, Phan speculated that teaching constraints teachers faced in Vietnam such as “the lack of teaching materials and examinations that reflect the diversity of English” (p. 383) led them to prioritize native speaker models.

Similarly, in order to explore the value of EIL from teachers’ perspectives, Young and Walsh (2010) conducted a study of 26 non-native English speaking teachers studying at the same university in the UK, who were asked to participate in focus group interviews after reading articles about EIL and English native speaker models. Individual interviews with two volunteers from each group were also conducted after the focus group interviews to make sure that the views expressed in group discussion were not affected by group pressures. The authors pointed out that the teachers favored native speaker models, more concerned with selecting and adapting an appropriate variety to their local context rather than with issues on the EIL, although they found the concept of the EIL attractive.

Takahashi (2017), through questionnaire survey, focus group discussion, and interviews, also suggested that high school English teachers in Japan were concerned about inclusion of non-standard varieties of English in textbooks although they were open to the idea of including an extract informing learners of the existence of different English varieties.

Teachers in Wong’s research (2018) appeared to display more negative attitudes towards using English varieties other than English from the Inner Circle. Twenty one pre-service EFL teachers in Hong Kong participated in her study by completing a questionnaire and a listening task, four of whom attended a focus group interview. The results indicated that the participants had negative opinions about using the localized English accent (i.e., the Hong Kong English accent) as a teaching and learning model; they preferred native English as a teaching model and favored the UK accent over other English accents.

In a similar vein, Sadeghpour and Sharifian (2017) investigated English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers' attitudes towards WEs and found that not many teachers regard the Expanding Circle Englishes as legitimate. Twenty seven ESL teachers in Australia were interviewed for their study; 14 of them were Asian migrants to Australia, while the rest were English native speakers with experience of teaching English in Asian country. Analysis of the interview implied that while most of the teachers acknowledged that there existed new varieties of English, more than half of them did not recognize the legitimacy of English varieties from the Expanding Circle, some of whom did not even name these Englishes as English varieties.

In Korea, Ahn (2015) showed that not only were teachers ignorant of Asian Englishes, but they also repudiated the legitimacy of those Englishes; the majority of the teachers had negative attitudes towards Asian Englishes, describing these Englishes as problematic, difficult, or strange, and showed little desire to learn these Englishes. Although there were some teachers who had international experiences and thus held more positive attitudes towards these Englishes, in general, Asian Englishes tended to be stigmatized as wrong Englishes by teachers of English in Korea while American English was favored as the prestigious English (Ahn, 2015).

In the context of language testing, previous research suggests that teachers are more likely to be cautious about the inclusion of more diverse WEs (Gu & So, 2015). According to Gu and So (2015), both ESL teachers (i.e., teachers who teach English in places like the US and South Africa where English is used as an L1 or an L2) and EFL teachers (i.e., teachers who teach English in places like China and Korea where English is used as a FL) (Kang, 2015) were less supportive of incorporating English varieties from Outer- and Expanding-Circle countries; while the teachers showed positive attitudes towards including different English varieties from the Inner Circle, regarding non-native varieties, especially in terms of accents and written conventions, their responses were less positive.

## 5.2 Learners' Perceptions of WEs

Previous research on WEs, in general, appears to indicate that learners, when compared to teachers, have lower awareness of and less positive attitudes towards WEs, although they tend to be open to WEs for less stressful, communicative uses (Abeywickrama, 2013; Gu & So, 2015; Kang, 2015; Kobayashi, 2011; Lee & Hsieh, 2018; Lee & Warren Green, 2016; Saito & Hatoss, 2011; Sung, 2016; Takahashi, 2017).

More specifically, Sung (2016) noted that university students in Hong Kong, although they did understand the value of multiple accents of English, were questioning the idea of being exposed to different English accents in classrooms, preferring a native variety as the instructional model. In order to draw that conclusion, he conducted a study of students enrolled in an English for Academic Purposes course at a university in Hong Kong: 28 for the interview and 318 for the questionnaire. By highlighting the fact that the participants showed ambivalent attitudes towards exposure of various English accents in language classrooms, Sung asserted that “a careful and systematic approach to introducing multiple varieties of English must be in place before any attempts to incorporate a world Englishes approach in the classroom” (p. 203).

Kang (2015), through her study of adult ESL or EFL students, also maintained that English learners, particularly those in the Expanding Circle, preferred to strive for Inner Circle norms, noting that they were not satisfied with their teachers' English pronunciation while expressing their desire to sound like a native speaker. A total of 617 adult learners of English participated in questionnaire survey for her study: 238 learners of English who were studying English in the Inner Circle countries (i.e., the US and New Zealand), 194 in the Outer Circle countries (i.e., Pakistan and South Africa), and 185 in the Expanding Circle countries (i.e., Japan and Korea). The results indicated that learners studying English in the Expanding Circle countries were less satisfied with their pronunciation instruction, compared to those in the Inner and Outer Circles.

Investigating Japanese students' motives for learning English in one of the Outer Circle countries, Singapore, Kobayashi (2011) further stated that Japanese learners of English in Singapore, in general, seemed to yearn for Inner Circle Englishes taught by white, native speakers of English although they also wanted to develop friendships with other students including Singaporeans. She conducted a study of 22 Japanese students and seven administrative/teaching staff in three private language schools in Singapore, based on student questionnaires, interview with students, and formal and informal meetings with the staff. Results implied that one of the most decisive factor that motivated most of the students to study English in Singapore was their "perceived image of Singapore as a 'standard English' speaking country" (p. 243), which might help explain students' disappointment on their unanticipated encounter with Singapore English and teachers' concern about students' expectations of learning Inner Circle Englishes from European-looking teachers.

In a similar vein, Takahashi (2017) asserted that educators need to "continue to discuss when, how, and to whom non-standard forms of English can be introduced" (p. 50) by pointing out that Japanese students in her study were less positive about including non-native varieties of English in their course books as well as less open to multiple varieties than the teachers.

With regard to learners' attitudes towards WEs, Abeywickrama's study (2013) revealed that English language learners in her study (i.e., university students who had learned English as an L2 or a FL and would attend US universities) had rather unfavorable attitudes towards non-native varieties of English despite the fact that English varieties did not affect their performance in the listening test; the majority of participants preferred American and British English, considering it the standard, as opposed to the reality where English is used by more non-native speakers than native speakers.

Saito and Hatoss (2011), likewise, investigated 175 Japanese high school students' attitudes towards different varieties of English through questionnaire survey, and found that Japanese learners of English had more positive attitudes towards native varieties of English (i.e., UK and US varieties), whereas

devaluing other non-native varieties of English (i.e., China, India, Japan, and Singapore varieties), especially Japanese variety of English. They also claimed that Japanese students were learning English for “its intra-Anglosphere currency and utility, rather than for its transnational functionality in the global arena” (p. 118), noting their high motivation to learn English in native speaker contexts.

In respect of including a variety of WEs in academic English tests, learners have shown further reservations. For instance, Gu and So (2015) investigated stakeholders’ (i.e., test takers, teachers, score users, and language testing professionals) perceptions of accommodating differences in international academic English tests. They found out that students, although they were generally positive about including different English varieties from the Inner Circle as both oral and written input in tests, were more resistant to the idea of embracing different varieties of English as the oral input than the other three groups, believing that English should be measured in accordance with the native speaker norm. This tendency became more pronounced when the input was thought to be Outer- or Expanding- Circle Englishes.

In a study by Hamid (2014), English learners also assumed negative attitudes towards including different varieties of English in the International English Language Testing System (IELTS); although the participants (i.e., 430 IELTS test takers from 49 countries) supported WEs in a broader and more abstract sense, they were against their inclusion in the test, judging concrete examples of WEs unacceptable.

In the case of Korea, Lee and Warren Green (2016) implied that Korean university students preferred Inner Circle Englishes as well as showing better understanding of them although they were also interested in being exposed to and learning WEs, especially for less stressful and more communicative uses. Through a study of 60 university students in Korea, they found that Englishes from the US and the UK were perceived the easiest forms of English by the students, whereas Englishes from Outer- or Expanding- Circle countries were thought to be more difficult to comprehend. They also noted that while more

than half of the participants (i.e., 65 per cent), when asked which form of English —between Inner Circle Englishes and Outer- and Expanding- Circle Englishes— was thought to be more important, reported that it was more important to learn Inner Circle Englishes, none of them responded learning Outer- or Expanding- Circle Englishes was more important; only 35 per cent of the respondents said that learning both Inner Circle Englishes and Outer- or Expanding- Circle Englishes was important.

Lee and Hsieh (2018) also maintained that although both Taiwanese and Korean university students supported general concepts of EIL and perceived their varieties of English as positive, non-native English-speaking accents and interaction between non-native speakers of English were less accepted by Korean students. A study conducted by Kim and Kim (2018), similarly, suggested that Korean adult learners preferred Inner Circle Englishes despite their positive attitudes towards WEs.

Ahn and Kang's study (2017), on the contrary, presented different results; not only did Korean students hold positive attitudes towards Korean accent English over the Italian, Indian, and even American counterparts, they also revealed a similar level of desire to communicate with non-native speakers as with American native speakers. In more detail, 101 university students in an English course at a university in Korea participated in their study and were required to complete three different tasks: (a) a country rating task, where the participants rated Englishes used in 45 different countries according to familiarity, correctness, pleasantness, and friendliness, (b) a questionnaire asking participants' perceptions of diverse English varieties spoken by four speakers of different nationalities (i.e., the United States, India, Italy, and Korea), and (c) a self-assessment of learning English as a foreign language and learning of multiple varieties of English. The findings implied that extra-linguistic factors such as familiarity with certain countries or accents may have affected the students' perceptions of different English varieties, presenting the need for providing EFL learners with more opportunities to experience multiple varieties of English in order to broaden their "awareness of the linguistic reality

in the globalized world" (p. 724) where speakers from both the Inner Circle and the Outer/Expanding Circles communicate and interact with one another.

In sum, as opposed to the reality that English is used by more non-native speakers than native speakers as well as a view shared by research literature that English is an international language embracing diversity, both teachers and learners in general tend to prefer the Inner Circle English to other varieties, considering it 'standard,' 'legitimate,' and 'prestigious.' Although they recognize the need to embrace cultural differences and accept different varieties of English to some extent, they seem to favor a native variety, especially as an instructional model.

## 6 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

As mentioned earlier, English language instruction in Korea, in the contexts of WEs, still centers on the native speaker model (Ahn & Kang, 2017; Fayzrakhmanova, 2016; Song, 2013). Furthermore, both teachers and students in Korea seem to prefer Inner Circle Englishes to other varieties, some of them even denying the legitimacy of Outer- and Expanding- Circle Englishes (Ahn, 2015; Lee & Hsieh, 2018). However, in Ahn and Kang's study (2017), Korean students' attitudes towards both Korean accents and non-native speakers were positive. These rather conflicting results might be attributed to the fact that relatively little research has investigated WEs from teachers' and students' perspectives in the context of Korea.

The aim of this study is, therefore, to examine Korean teachers' and students' perceptions of WEs, building on the previous work on WEs, and provide some pedagogical suggestions for English language education in Korea.

The research questions for this study are:

1. What knowledge do Korean teachers and students have about WEs?
2. Which varieties of English have Korean teachers and students learned, taught, and been exposed to?
3. What are the attitudes of Korean teachers and students towards incorporating more diverse WEs in English language education in Korea?

## 7 METHODS

### 7.1 Participants

Two groups participated in this study. The first group provided speech samples of WEs, serving as speakers, and the second group, as survey participants, completed questionnaires while listening to the speech samples.

Four graduate students who were studying at a university in Finland for a master's degree in Education, and one teacher who was teaching at the same university participated as speakers. The teacher was an L1 English speaker from the UK, and the graduate students were either L1 or L2 speakers of English from China, Finland, India, and the US. They were fluent speakers of English, studying or teaching the international master's degree program taught in English; students needed to prove their English proficiency in order to be accepted to the program (e.g., 580 + on paper-based TOEFL). All the five participants were female.

The second group, on the other hand, was further divided into two: (a) Korean English teachers (n=51) and (b) Korean learners of English (n=79). The teachers were Korean teachers of English employed at public schools (three at primary schools, 12 at lower secondary schools, 27 at general upper secondary schools, and 9 at vocational upper secondary schools) in a small municipality of Korea. This small municipality was chosen because it was where the researcher had worked as a teacher for 15 years, enabling her to reach many participants in a short time. Most of the teachers were female (i.e., 84.3 per cent) and were working at schools located in a city (i.e., 80.4 per cent). More than half of the teachers (i.e., 56.9 per cent) were in their 30s, about half of them (i.e., 49 per cent) having 5 to 14 years of teaching experience. About 71 per cent of the teachers had lived/studied in English-speaking countries, the length of residence/study varying from 2 to 120 months ( $M= 15.63$ ,  $SD= 20.03$ ) (see Table 1).

TABLE 1 Background Information: Teachers

		<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Gender</b>	Male	7	13.7
	Female	43	84.3
	I prefer not to tell.	1	2.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Age</b>	Under 30	5	9.8
	30 ~ 39	29	56.9
	40 ~ 49	9	17.6
	50 ~ 59	6	11.8
	Over 59	2	3.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Teaching Experience</b>	Less than 5 years	9	17.6
	5 ~ 14 years	25	49.0
	15 ~ 24 years	10	19.6
	25 years or more	7	13.7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience Living/Studying in English-Speaking countries</b>	Yes	36	70.6
	No	15	29.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>School Level</b>	Primary school	3	5.9
	Lower secondary school	12	23.5
	General upper secondary school	27	52.9
	Vocational upper secondary school	9	17.6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>School Location</b>	City	41	80.4
	Country	10	19.6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>

Participants for the student group were recruited among college freshmen from different universities located in different regions in Korea. College freshmen were chosen because they had recently graduated from secondary schools, thus more likely to represent perspectives of secondary school students, while looking at their school lives more objectively, connecting what they had learned with real life experience after one semester of college. All the student participants had attended high schools (i.e., upper secondary schools) in the same municipality as the teachers. They were Korean learners of English (21 male and 57 female) who had studied English at least from primary schools; public English education in Korea does not start until the third grade in

primary school. As one of the purposes of this study was to explore ordinary Korean students' perceptions of WEs, not necessarily those majoring in English, restrictions on major or English skills were not imposed. Consequently, more than 80 percent of the students were majoring in other than English, and about 90 percent of them had never lived or studied in English-speaking countries. Regarding English skills, about 42 percent of the students considered their English poor or not good, while about 23 percent of the students rated them as good or very good (see Table 2).

TABLE 2 Background Information: Students

		N	Percent
<b>Gender</b>	Male	21	26.6
	Female	57	72.2
	I prefer not to tell.	1	1.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Age</b>	18 ~ 19	59	74.7
	20 ~ 21	18	22.8
	Over 22	1	1.3
	I prefer not to tell.	1	1.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Major</b>	English Language Education	15	19.0
	Others	60	75.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Duration of learning English</b>	Less than 10 years	29	36.7
	10 ~ 11 years	24	30.4
	12 years or more	26	32.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience Living/Studying in English-Speaking countries</b>	Yes	8	10.1
	No	71	89.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>English Skills</b>	Very Good	1	1.3
	Good	17	21.5
	Average	28	35.4
	Not good	29	36.7
	Poor	4	5.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>

## 7.2 Instrument

Questionnaires, which are among the most frequently employed data collection methods in quantitative research (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009), were adapted from several previous studies (Ahn & Kang, 2017; Gu & So, 2015; Lee & Hsieh, 2018; Sung, 2016; Takahashi, 2017) and recreated by the researcher. Some questionnaire items were adapted from interview questions used in the studies of Sadeghpour and Sharifian (2017) and Young and Walsh (2010), and recreated. In addition to closed-ended questions which consisted of multiple choice questions and Likert-scale questions, open-ended questions were included in order to elicit more spontaneous, detailed responses from participants and to complement closed-ended questions that could sometimes bias participants' answers due to the presence of predetermined answer alternatives (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009; Peterson, 2000).

The questionnaires consisted of three sections. The first specified the purpose and procedures of the study, ensured anonymity of the survey, and asked for consent to participation in the study. The second section asked participants about their background information such as gender, age, length of time teaching or learning English, and experience of studying or living in English-speaking countries. The third section, which was the main part of the questionnaire, asked varieties of English that participants had learned, taught, and been exposed to, their understanding of the notion of WEs, and their attitudes towards incorporating more diverse WEs in English language education in Korea.

More specifically, the teacher questionnaire asked (a) which varieties of English the teachers had learned, were currently exposed to, and were teaching (i.e., Questions 1, 5, and 6), (b) what knowledge they had about WEs (i.e., Questions 2, 3, and 4), and after providing an explanation of WEs with sample speeches (i.e., Question 4), (c) how important they thought it was to include more diverse Englishes in English listening/speaking education and tests (i.e., Questions 7 and 8), and (d) whether they would like to change anything in their teaching practices with regard to WEs (i.e., Question 9). Some questions (i.e.,

Questions 7, 8, and 9) asked participants to further specify their reasons for their choices; for instance, after marking whether or not they were willing to change their teaching practices regarding different varieties of English, the participants were required to specify their reasons for their choices. The questionnaire also included open-ended questions (i.e., Questions 2 and 3) asking participants to describe whose language they believed English was and what they thought of WEs, all of which were intended to investigate participants' understanding of WEs (see Appendix 1).

Similarly, the student questionnaire asked (a) which varieties of English the students had learned, were currently exposed to, and had been taught in school (i.e., Questions 1, 5, and 6), (b) what knowledge they had about WEs (i.e., Questions 2, 3, and 4), and after providing an explanation of WEs with sample speeches (i.e., Question 4), (c) how important they thought it was to include different varieties of English in English listening/speaking learning and tests (i.e., Questions 7 and 8) and (d) whether they would like to change anything in their learning practices with regard to WEs (i.e., Question 9). Like teacher participants, they were required to specify their reasons for some of their choices, and write their opinions about ownership of the English language and the notion of WEs (see Appendix 2). Both the teachers and the students were allowed to add further comments, if any, in the space provided at the end of the questionnaires (i.e., Question 10).

Questions 1, 4, 5, and 6 included sample speeches representing different varieties of English (i.e., American English, British English, and WEs including American and British Englishes), among which respondents marked their choices. It should be noted that labels of American English and British English were replaced by Sample 1 and Sample 2 in the questionnaires in order to prevent participants from being biased or confused by the use of the terms although they may be used in this paper for ease of discussion.

Questions 1, 5, and 6 were designed to examine varieties of English participants' had learned, been exposed to, and taught/been taught at school, and questions 7, 8, and 9 were meant to explore participants' attitudes towards

including different WEs in English language education. Question 3, meanwhile, was designed to investigate participants' knowledge of WEs, and Question 4, providing key information on WEs, to further examine participants' understanding of WEs while helping them to answer the rest of the questions. Question 2 was intended to see participants' perceptions of the English language by asking them its ownership, which was also expected, although indirectly, to indicate their understanding of WEs. Finally, as there is a possibility that the questionnaires might limit participants' options, Question 10 was included in case participants have further comments to add regarding the topic of the study or the research method itself.

Since all participants were native speakers of Korean, the questions and directions in the questionnaires were written in the Korean language.

### **7.3 Procedure**

The study was conducted in four stages: audio-recording for speech samples, pilot study, participant recruitment, and questionnaire survey.

For the audio-recording, five English speakers who spoke different WEs (i.e., American English, British English, Chinese English, Finnish English, and Indian English) were selected and asked to participate in the research by reading a short news article excerpted from an English newspaper (see Appendix 3); take notice that WEs have been used in a much more limited sense in this study, only spoken language accents being addressed (see section 2.1). As English education in Korea is centered around mostly American English (Ahn & Kang, 2017), these speech samples may not have been something the Korean participants expected. The speech was audio-recorded with the informed consent, which was acquired prior to the recording.

As a pilot study, paper-based questionnaires, together with the speech samples, were informally taken by three English teachers and three university students in Korea to see how long it took and if the instructions were clear. Based on the results of the pilot study, 20 minutes were assigned to complete

the questionnaire although there was practically no time limit for the questionnaire. The paper-based questionnaires were later converted into online counterparts which included the speech samples, and distributed to colleagues and students of the researcher via e-mail: 17 English teachers and 18 college freshmen in Korea. Through the method of snowball sampling, a total of 130 participants (i.e., 51 teachers and 79 students) were recruited and participated in the online survey on a voluntary basis.

#### 7.4 Reliability

As the main interest of this study was exploring participants' attitudes towards incorporating diverse WEs in English language education, it was important to make sure that the questionnaire items (i.e., questions 7, 8, and 9) designed to measure the construct (i.e., attitudes to the inclusion of diverse WEs in English language education) were actually measuring the same construct. Accordingly, Cronbach's alphas were computed first to evaluate the internal consistency between the two items (i.e., questions 7 and 8) (Lee & Hsieh, 2018); Question 9 was removed because it was a *Yes/No* question while questions 7 and 8 were the Likert-scale questions. The reliability was satisfactory as the Cronbach alpha coefficients were .88 for the teacher group and .79 for the student group. Second, the correlation of participants' answers to Question 9 with those to questions 7 and 8 were investigated using Point-biserial correlation coefficient; the test was run including only the *Yes/No* answers and not the *I don't know* answers. For the teacher group, there were a medium, negative correlation between answers to Question 9 and answers to Question 7 ( $r_{pb} = -.403$ ,  $n = 45$ ,  $p = .006$ ) and a large, negative correlation between answers to Question 9 and answers to Question 8 ( $r_{pb} = -.538$ ,  $n = 45$ ,  $p = .000$ ), with the response choice of *Yes* to Question 9 associated with more supportive answers to questions 7 and 8; take notice that the choice of *Yes* to Question 9 was coded as 1, while *No* was coded as 2. Similarly, for the student group, there were a large, negative correlation between answers to Question 9 and answers to Question 7 ( $r_{pb} = -.575$ ,  $n = 79$ ,

$p=.000$ ) and a medium, negative correlation between answers to Question 9 and answers to Question 8 ( $r_{pb} = -.391$ ,  $n = 79$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Therefore, it may be fair to say that the three questionnaire items were measuring the same construct (i.e., attitudes towards including diverse WEs in English language education).

## **7.5 Ethical Solutions**

As mentioned in the procedure section, the informed consent was taken from the first group of the participants (i.e., the English speakers) before audio-recording, with the promise that their personal identity would not be revealed and audio-files would be deleted on completion of the study. The online questionnaires, which included the speech samples recoded by the speakers, were only accessible by those who received the survey link from the researcher. Moreover, the questionnaires have been kept private with the audio files deleted after the survey was over, so that anyone except the researcher cannot access them.

Consent was also asked from the Korean participants (i.e., the teachers and the students) before they participated in the online survey. As seen in the instrument section, the participants' responses were collected so as to preserve anonymity without their names on the questionnaires (see also Appendices 1 and 2).

All participants were provided with the information about the purpose and procedures of the study before they agreed to participate in the study.

## **7.6 Analysis**

Two different approaches were adopted to analyze responses to the research questions in the questionnaires (Gu & So, 2015). For the closed-ended questions, the total frequency of each response category for each group was counted and analyzed through SPSS (Gu & So, 2015; Sung, 2016; Takahashi, 2017). When there was a need to compare the two groups (i.e., the teacher group and the student group), an independent-sample t-test was employed to determine

whether the two groups significantly differed (Lee & Hsieh, 2018): whether the two groups significantly differed (a) in their attitudes towards including diverse WEs in English teaching/learning and (b) in their attitudes towards including diverse WEs in English tests. A Chi-square test was used when the variables were categorical: whether or not the participants would like to change their teaching/learning practices with regards to WEs. Responses to the open-ended questions, on the contrary, were analyzed by using the thematic coding process used by Gu and So (2015) in their study; all responses made by the participants in the Korean language were translated into English by the researcher first, and then coded and classified by the themes of the responses.

The following demonstrate how participants' answers to the open-ended questions were coded and categorized.

1. Sample answers to Question 2 (i.e., *In your opinion, whose language English is? Please explain whose language you think English is in 1-2 sentences.*) provided by the teacher participants:

“전 세계가 함께 공유하는 언어”

“전 세계인이 사용하는 언어”

“영어는 세계 공통어인 만큼 전 세계 시민의 언어”

“전 세계인이 공용으로 사용하기로 합의되었기에 세계의 언어”

“전 세계의 언어”

Translation in English by the researcher:

“A language that the whole world shares”

“A language that people all around the world use”

“English is a language of global citizens as it is a global language.”

“English is a global language as people around the world agreed to use English for common use.”

“A language of the world”

Categorization by the researcher:

‘A language shared by people around the world/ A global language’

2. Sample answers to Question 7 (i.e., *How important do you think it is for high school students to know/study about different varieties of English when listening to speech and practicing speaking? Please mark one choice and specify your reason based on your high school experience.*) provided by the student participants:

“주로 한 가지 종류의 영어로만 교육을 받다 보니 실제로 다른 종류의 영어를 접했을 때 처음에 거리감이 있었고 알아듣기 어려울 때도 있었다.”

“영어를 꽤 오래 배워 온 저도 미국식 영어만 접했던 지라 처음 영국식 영어를 접했을 때 알아듣기가 힘들었습니다. 그리고 가끔 뉴스에서 발음이 조금 특이한 동남아 식 영어를 들었을 때에도 이질감을 느꼈습니다.”

“대학에 와서 다양한 종류의 영어를 구사하는 사람들과 만나게 되었을 때, 그들의 이야기를 듣고 이해하는 것이 마냥 수월하지만은 않았기 때문입니다.”

“우리가 배우는 ‘미국식’ 영어를 사용하는 사람만 만나는 것이 아니기 때문에 의사소통을 위해서는 다양한 억양의 영어를 접해야 한다고 생각한다. 영어를 사용하지 않은 나라를 갔을 때도 영어를 사용해서 말하는데 억양의 차이로 의사소통에 어려움을 느낀 경험이 있기 때문이다.”

“고등학교 영어교육을 통해 듣기와 말하기 실력은 향상되었지만 영어로 대화하는 법은 배우지 못했다고 생각한다. 게다가 다양한 종류의 영어를 접하지 못하다 보니 이러한 영어를 구사하는 사람들과 의사소통 할 수 없게 되었다. 그렇기 때문에 다양한 종류의 영어를 도입시키는 것이 옳다고 생각한다.”

Translation in English by the researcher:

“Since I had been taught only one variety of English, I felt distance and had a hard time when I encountered different varieties of English.”

“Although I have learned English for a long time, I found difficult with understanding British English when I first encountered it because I had learned mostly American English. And I also felt distance when I sometimes got to hear Southeast Asian English on news channel, whose accents sounded somewhat different.”

“It’s because when I met people speaking different varieties of English in university, it was not always easy for me to listen to and understand what they talked about.”

“Because we don’t just meet people who speak ‘American English,’ I think we need to be exposed to diverse Englishes with diverse accents. This is because I had difficulty in communicating in English due to different accents when I visited a country whose primary language was not English.”  
“I think my English listening and speaking skills have improved through high school English education, but I think I didn’t learn how to communicate in English. Besides, because I had not been exposed to different varieties of English, now I can’t communicate with people who speak those Englishes. So I think it is right to include more diverse Englishes.”

Categorization by the researcher:

‘Because I have experienced difficulties not being able to understand and communicate with people speaking different varieties of English’

## 8 RESULTS

The research questions for this study were: (a) What knowledge do Korean teachers and students have about WEs?, (b) Which varieties of English have Korean teachers and students learned, taught, and been exposed to?, and (c) What are the attitudes of Korean teachers and students towards incorporating more diverse WEs in English language education?

### 8.1 Knowledge of WEs

As shown in Table 3, most participants in the student group (i.e., 91.1 per cent) responded that they were not acquainted with the notion of WEs, whereas more than half of the teacher participants (i.e., 60.8 per cent) said they were. A Chi-square test for independence was conducted to determine whether there was a difference between the teachers and the students on whether they knew what WEs meant or not. The test indicated significant association between the two variables (whether they were teachers or students and whether they knew what WEs meant or not),  $\chi^2(1, n = 130) = 37.92, p = .00$ , which implies that more teachers than the students knew the notion of WEs (see Table 4).

TABLE 3 Responses to Question 3 (*Do you know what world Englishes mean?*)

		<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Teachers</b>	Yes	31	60.8
	No	20	39.2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Students</b>	Yes	7	8.9
	No	72	91.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>

TABLE 4 Comparison of Knowledge of WEs

			Teachers/Students (T/S)		
			Teachers	Students	Total
<b>Knowing/Not Knowing (K/NK)</b>	<b>Knowing</b>	Count	31	7	38
		% within K/NK	81.6%	18.4%	100%
		% within T/S	60.8%	8.9%	29.2%
	<b>Not Knowing</b>	Count	20	72	92
		% within K/NK	21.7%	78.3%	100%
		% within T/S	39.2%	91.1%	70.8%
<b>Total</b>		Count	51	79	130
		% within K/NK	39.2%	60.8%	100%
		% within T/S	100%	100%	100%

Analysis of the responses to the open-ended question (i.e., Question 2), however, seems to tell a different story (see Table 5). Most of the participants (i.e., 88.2 per cent of the teachers and 59.5 per cent of the students) wrote that English was a language used by people around the world or simply a global language, which might suggest that they actually had a good understanding of WEs; they just did not know the term “World Englishes.”

TABLE 5 Responses to Question 2 (*In your opinion, whose language English is?*)

		N	Percent
<b>Teachers</b>	A language shared by people around the world/ A global language	45	88.2
	A language of people who speak it as a mother tongue	2	3.9
	The language of the UK	2	3.9
	The language of the UK and the US	1	2.0
	A language of major countries	1	2.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Students</b>	A language shared by people around the world/ A global language	47	59.5
	A language of people who speak it as a mother tongue	5	6.4
	The language of the UK	10	12.7
	The language of the US	9	11.4
	The language of the UK and the US	5	6.4
	A mainstream language	1	1.3
	<i>I don't know.</i>	2	2.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>

A similar tendency was observed in responses to Question 4; when given definition of WEs that has been shared by literature, 82.4 per cent of the teachers and 38 per cent of the students said that they were familiar with the concept described (see Table 6). Comparing these numbers to those for Question 3 (i.e., 60.8 per cent and 8.9 per cent, respectively) (see Table 3), it can be said that the participants, especially the teacher group, had some knowledge of WEs even though they might not be able to give a clear definition of them.

TABLE 6 Responses to Question 4 (*Is this description similar to your definition of world Englishes? Is this concept new to you or not?*)

		N	Percent
<b>Teachers</b>	This concept is <b>new</b> to me.	9	17.6
	This concept is <b>not new</b> to me.	42	82.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Students</b>	This concept is <b>new</b> to me.	49	62.0
	This concept is <b>not new</b> to me.	30	38.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>

## 8.2 Varieties of English Used

### 8.2.1 Varieties of English that Had Been Learned

A considerable number of participants responded that they had learned American English and/or British English (see Table 7). In more detail, 80.4 per cent of the teachers and 64.6 per cent of the students said that they had learned American English, while 5.9 per cent and 7.6 per cent of each group responded that they had learned British English. The proportion of those who told that they had learned both American English and British English were two per cent and 11.4 per cent, respectively.

TABLE 7 Responses to Question 1 (*Which variety of English have you learned?*)

		N	Percent
<b>Teachers</b>	American English (AmE)	41	80.4
	British English (BrE)	3	5.9
	AmE and BrE	1	2.0
	English other than AmE and BrE	4	7.8
	AmE and English other than AmE and BrE	1	2.0
	<i>I don't know/remember.</i>	1	2.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>

TABLE 7 Responses to Question 1 (*Which variety of English have you learned?*)

		N	Percent
<b>Students</b>	AmE	51	64.6
	BrE	6	7.6
	AmE and BrE	9	11.4
	English other than AmE and BrE	3	3.8
	BrE and <i>I don't know/remember.</i>	1	1.3
	<i>I don't know/remember.</i>	9	11.4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>

One of the most remarkable findings about the student group was that *I don't know/remember* was the second highest marked choice following American English, which might suggest that the students had been less conscious of English varieties that had been used than the teachers, none of whom chose the response option of *I don't know/remember*. The students might not have paid enough attention to spoken forms of English to identify different English varieties perhaps because they had learned English mostly for academic purposes, focusing on grammatical rules and sentence translations (Cho, 2004; Moodie & Nam, 2016). They may have learned and been exposed to one variety of English most of the time—most likely American English (Ahn, 2015; Ahn & Kang, 2017; Fayzrakhmanova, 2016; Kirkpatrick, 2006; Lee & Hsieh, 2018; Song, 2013)—thereby never having a chance to think which varieties of English they had learned. Or perhaps, they were just less interested in the subject of the study than the teachers as indicated by the frequent appearance of *I don't know* in the students' answers.

### 8.2.2 Varieties of English that Had Taught/Been Taught in School

Similar results were found regarding varieties of English that had taught/been taught in school. As seen in Table 8, in terms of teaching materials, the majority of the teachers (i.e., 90.1 per cent) said that they had been teaching American English and/or British English and over 60 per cent said that they had been teaching American English, although there seemed to be more diversity in their oral performance in class. More than 65 per cent of the students also responded that they had been taught American English and/or British English, and about half of the students said they had learned American English in school.

TABLE 8 Responses to Question 6 (*Which variety of English are you teaching?/ Which variety of English have you been taught in school?*)

			N	Percent
<b>Teachers</b>	<b>In terms of teaching materials</b>	AmE	32	62.7
		BrE	2	3.9
		AmE and BrE	12	23.5
		World Englishes (WEs)	5	9.8
		<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
	<b>In terms of the language teachers use</b>	AmE	31	60.8
		BrE	2	3.9
		AmE and BrE	7	13.7
		WEs	6	11.8
		AmE and WEs	2	3.9
		AmE and others	1	2.0
		AmE, BrE and WEs	1	2.0
		BrE and others	1	2.0
		<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
	<b>Students</b>	AmE	39	49.4
BrE		4	5.1	
AmE and BrE		9	11.4	
WEs		3	3.8	
AmE and WEs		7	8.9	
AmE, BrE and WEs		2	2.5	
<i>I don't know.</i>		14	17.7	
BrE and <i>I don't know</i>		1	1.3	
Total		79	100	

Among the student participants, *I don't know* was again the second highest marked choice following American English. The fact that more students responded with *I don't know* to the question asking English use in school could be translated that the students had been even less conscious of English varieties used in school, concentrating more on written forms of English as language learning in school tends to be more formal and goal-oriented (Cho, 2004; Moodie & Nam, 2016). It may also have resulted from dominant use of one variety of English (i.e., American English) in class as noted in the previous section.

### 8.2.3 Varieties of English that the Participants Were Exposed to

With regard to varieties of English to which the teachers and students were exposed, it appeared that the participants in both groups were exposed to more diverse Englishes than just American English and British English although it still tended to be American English and/or British English that many participants were exposed to (see Table 9).

TABLE 9 Responses to Question 5 (*Which variety of English are you mostly exposed to?*)

		N	Percent
<b>Teachers</b>	AmE	19	37.3
	BrE	1	2.0
	AmE and BrE	7	13.7
	WEs	10	19.6
	AmE and WEs	2	3.9
	BrE and WEs	1	2.0
	AmE, BrE and WEs	9	17.6
	AmE and others	1	2.0
	WEs and <i>I don't know.</i>	1	2.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Students</b>	AmE	28	35.4
	BrE	4	5.1
	AmE and BrE	8	10.1
	WEs	4	5.1
	AmE and WEs	11	13.9
	AmE, BrE and WEs	8	10.1
	<i>I don't know.</i>	14	17.7
	AmE and <i>I don't know.</i>	1	1.3
	BrE and <i>I don't know.</i>	1	1.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>

About half of the participants (i.e., 53 per cent and 50.6 per cent of each group) said they were exposed to American English and/or British English, about two thirds of whom were only exposed to American English. The other half responded that they were exposed to more than one variety of English or chose the response choice of *I don't know*. Apparently, the greater diversity of Englishes here seems to stem from the question itself as it includes a wider variety of contexts such as music, movies, TV shows, and social media, not

limited to instructional contexts (Grau, 2009; Matsuda, 2003; Mukminatien, 2012; Phan, 2018); considering that the word “mostly” was included in the question, which made the participants focus on some varieties and not everything, the exposure might have been even more diverse. *I don't know* was again the second highest marked choice among the student participants (see Table 9).

### 8.3 Attitudes towards Including Diverse WEs in English Education

#### 8.3.1 Attitudes towards Including Diverse WEs in English Teaching/Learning

As indicated in Table 10, both the teachers and students appeared to have rather positive attitudes towards incorporating more diverse WEs in English teaching/learning. More specifically, about 82 per cent of the teachers and 72 per cent of the students thought that it was extremely important or somewhat important to include more varying WEs in English listening and speaking education.

TABLE 10 Responses to Question 7 (*How important do you think it is to include more diverse Englishes in English listening and speaking education?/ How important do you think it is for high school students to know/study about different varieties of English when listening to speech and practicing speaking?*)

		N	Percent
<b>Teachers</b>	Extremely important (5)	26	51.0
	Somewhat important (4)	16	31.4
	Neutral (3)	6	11.8
	Not very important (2)	2	3.9
	Not important at all (1)	1	2.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Students</b>	Extremely important (5)	27	34.2
	Somewhat important (4)	30	38.0
	Neutral (3)	10	12.7
	Not very important (2)	9	11.4
	Not important at all (1)	3	3.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>

As mentioned earlier in the instrument section, for some of the questions, participants were further asked to specify their reasons for their choices. All the answers given by the participants were grouped into 'supportive' and 'skeptical' first, and then categorized by the themes of the responses so that they were compared with the answers to close-ended questions. As indicated in Table 11, one of the most frequently mentioned reasons why it was important to include more diverse WEs in English teaching/learning was 'to be able to communicate and interact with varying people all around the world who speak different varieties of English': shared by 47.1 per cent of the teachers and 24.1 per cent of the students. The second most talked-about reason by the teacher group was increased use of English by non-native speakers (i.e., shared by 17.6 per cent of the teachers), while the student group cited their experience of having trouble communicating in different varieties of English (i.e., shared by 12.7 per cent of the students) and their needs to improve English conversation skills (i.e., shared by 12.7 per cent of the students) as the reasons.

There were less prominent but not any less important answers as well (see Table 11). For example, three teachers responded that more diverse WEs needed to be included to help students realize American English was not the only English, one of them saying, "Considering the reality of school education, although it is not easy to deal with every aspect of WEs, I think it is important to provide students with opportunities to be exposed to a variety of Englishes to correct the mistaken idea that American English is the only, best English." Two teachers also claimed that communicative skills were more important than native-like pronunciation as one teacher wrote, "The primary function of a language is communication. Thus, being able to communicate well with others is more important than having native-like pronunciation." Moreover, some students mentioned educational diversity and language identity as demonstrated in the following comments made by two students:

"With the development of Internet and transportation, we will experience the wider world. However, if we only learn the English that we learn now and become complacent, saying that 'This is how to learn English,' we will not be able to make a practical

application of what we learn, and we might lose the flexibility in our learning. I think by learning diverse WEs spoken in different countries, we will be able to look at the world from a broader perspective.”

“I think we need to learn different varieties of English so that each variety can maintain its own identity.”

TABLE 11 Open-ended Answers to Question 7 (*How important do you think it is to include more diverse Englishes in English listening and speaking education? Please mark one choice and specify your reason./ How important do you think it is for high school students to know/study about different varieties of English when listening to speech and practicing speaking? Please mark one choice and specify your reason based on your high school experience.*)

			N	Percent	
<b>Teachers</b>	<b>Supportive</b>	To be able to communicate and interact with varying people all around the world who speak different varieties of English	24	47.1	
		Because [the use of English by non-native speakers / interaction with non-native speakers] is increasing	9	17.6	
		Because English is a common language of the world	3	5.9	
		To help students realize American English is not the only English	3	5.9	
		Because communicative skills are more important than native-like pronunciation	2	3.9	
	<b>Skeptical</b>	Learning one variety of English is more efficient. If you are fluent in one variety of English, you don't have any major difficulties understanding others.	7	13.7	
		Because it may introduce more distractions in English education: increased burden of learning and confusion in education	2	3.9	
		I don't think introduction of WEs is necessary for school classes.	1	2.0	
	<b>Total</b>			<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
	<b>Students</b>	<b>Supportive</b>	To be able to communicate and interact with varying people from all around the world who speak different varieties of English	19	24.1
Because I have experienced difficulties not being able to understand and communicate with people speaking different varieties of English			10	12.7	
To help students have more confidence in their English/ To improve English conversation skills			10	12.7	
Because [the use of English by non-native speakers / interaction with non-native speakers] is increasing			5	6.3	
Because English is a common language of the world			5	6.3	
Because WEs are important			5	6.3	
To guarantee educational diversity			2	2.5	

TABLE 11 Open-ended Answers to Question 7

			N	Percent
<b>Students</b>	<b>Supportive</b>	To help students look at the world from a broader perspective	1	1.3
		To help each English variety to maintain its identity	1	1.3
		Because national standardized tests like the College Scholastic Aptitude Test already includes different varieties of English	1	1.3
		I don't know.	5	6.3
	<b>Skeptical</b>	Because it may introduce more distractions in English learning: increased burden of learning and confusion in learning	5	6.3
		Because learning Standard English will be more useful	4	5.1
		I don't think introduction of WEs is necessary for school classes.	3	3.8
		Because whatever we learn at school is not useful in real life.	1	1.3
		Only those who will use English frequently in the future should learn WEs.	1	1.3
		I can rely on other resources such as body language.	1	1.3
		<b>Total</b>		<b>79</b>

For skeptical opinions, 'Learning one variety of English/ standard English is more efficient/useful' was mentioned most (i.e., shared by 13.7 per cent of the teachers and 5.1 per cent of the students), followed by 'Teaching/Learning diverse WEs may introduce more distractions in English education/learning' (i.e., shared by 3.9 per cent of the teachers and 6.3 per cent of the students).

Interestingly, more participants appeared to be skeptical of WEs in their open-ended answers. In the Likert-scale question, the percentage of the participants who responded skeptically on the issue of including multiple WEs in English language education (i.e., the respondents who marked the choices of *Not very important* or *Not important at all*) was 5.9 per cent and 15.2 per cent for each group (see Table 10). However, these figures increased to 19.6 per cent and 19.1 per cent in the analysis of the open-ended answers, which may suggest that the response option of *Neutral* was more of *Not very important* rather than *Somewhat important* to many respondents; take notice that among the participants who marked *Neutral* to the Likert-scale question (i.e., six teachers and 10 students), all the teachers and three students responded skeptically in

their open-ended answers, while two students provided supportive answers and five students took a neutral attitude by saying 'I don't know' (see Tables 10 and 11).

An independent samples t-test was further conducted to compare the two groups. Although the intervals along the Likert scale might not be equal to one another (e.g., Participant A's 2 might not be equal to Participant B's 2.), the scale from 1 to 5 was treated as an interval-level scale, as t-tests have robustness, meaning that they are tolerant of data violating the underlysing assumptions to some degree when the number of participants is large enough (Coolican, 2014; Howell, 2009); note that a sample size of 30 is considered by many as the minimum number of participants for a study based on statistical analysis (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007), while this study involved 51 participants for the teacher group and 79 for the student group. The independent samples t-test indicated that there was a significant difference between the two groups in their attitudes towards incorporating more diverse Englishes in English teaching/learning, the teachers being more positive than the students ( $t(128)=2.00, p=.05, d=.36$ ) (see Table 12).

TABLE 12 Comparison of Attitudes towards Incorporating Diverse WEs in Teaching/Learning

	N	Mean	SD
Teachers	51	4.25	.96
Students	79	3.87	1.13

This result sounds reasonable given that students are more likely to be affected by any change in the educational system, thus less willing to accept a change unless they are given sufficient information on it. In fact, as mentioned above, the most talked-about reason by the students why it was not important to include diverse WEs in English learning was 'because it may introduce more distractions in English learning such as increased burden of learning and confusion in learning' (see Table 11).

### 8.3.2 Attitudes towards Including Diverse WEs in English Tests

As in English teaching/learning, participants' overall responses to the inclusion of varying WEs in English tests were positive; approximately 73 per cent of the teachers and 60 per cent of the students thought it was important to include different WEs in English listening and speaking tests (see Table 13).

TABLE 13 Responses to Question 8 (*How important do you think it is to include different varieties of English in English listening and speaking tests?/ How important do you think it is to include different varieties of English in English listening and speaking tests administered to high school students?*)

		N	Percent
<b>Teachers</b>	Extremely important (5)	18	35.3
	Somewhat important (4)	19	37.3
	Neutral (3)	9	17.6
	Not very important (2)	4	7.8
	Not important at all (1)	1	2.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Students</b>	Extremely important (5)	22	27.8
	Somewhat important (4)	25	31.6
	Neutral (3)	17	21.5
	Not very important (2)	14	17.7
	Not important at all (1)	1	1.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>

When asked to specify their reasons, more than a third of the teachers (i.e., 35.3 per cent) responded that 'because tests should be able to reflect the real world where different varieties of English were used.' The next most cited reasons by the teachers were 'to help improve students' English abilities by exposing them to diverse WEs' (i.e., shared by 15.7 per cent of the teachers) and 'because WEs can be included in education only after they show up on tests' (i.e., shared by 13.7 percent of the teachers) (see Table 14).

TABLE 14 Open-ended Answers to Question 8 (*How important do you think it is to include different varieties of English in English listening and speaking tests? Please mark one choice and specify your reason./ How important do you think it is to include different varieties of English in English listening and speaking tests administered to high school students? Please mark one choice and specify your reason.*)

			N	Percent	
<b>Teachers</b>	<b>Supportive</b>	Because tests should be able to reflect the real world, where different varieties of English are used	18	35.3	
		To help improve students' English abilities by exposing them to diverse WEs	8	15.7	
		Because WEs can be included in education only after they show up on tests	7	13.7	
		As different varieties of English have been already included in many standardized tests, school exams should be able to reflect this trend.	2	3.9	
		To help students deepen their understanding of WEs	2	3.9	
		To properly gauge students' English abilities as English is not just a language of a certain country	1	2.0	
		To help students realize that there is no good or bad pronunciation in English	1	2.0	
		<b>Skeptical</b>	Learning one variety of English is more efficient. If you are fluent in one variety of English, you don't have any major difficulties understanding others.	5	9.8
	Because it may introduce more distractions in English education: increased burden of learning and confusion in education	3	5.9		
	Because it is difficult to set criteria for evaluation	2	3.9		
	Because it is practically impossible to teach different varieties of English at school	1	2.0		
	I don't think introduction of WEs is necessary for school classes.	1	2.0		
	<b>Total</b>		<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>	
	<b>Students</b>	<b>Supportive</b>	Because WEs can be included in education only after they show up on tests	11	13.9
			Because tests should be able to reflect the real world, where different varieties of English are used	11	13.9
To be able to communicate and interact with varying people from all around the world who speak different varieties of English			10	12.7	
To improve English conversation skills			5	6.3	
Because WEs are important			5	6.3	
Because I have experienced difficulties not being able to understand and communicate with people speaking different varieties of English			2	2.5	
To properly gauge students' English abilities			1	1.3	
Because English has become important			1	1.3	
For the future			1	1.3	

TABLE 14 Open-ended Answers to Question 8

			N	Percent
Students	Supportive	Testing is not important. Teaching English through more various activities is more important.	2	2.5
		I don't know.	8	10.1
	Skeptical	Because it may introduce more distractions in English learning; increased burden of learning and confusion in learning	10	12.7
		Because students who are not good at English or less interested in English would be at a disadvantage	2	2.5
		Because learning Standard English will be more useful	2	2.5
		Because whatever we are taught/ tested at school is not useful in real life.	2	2.5
		Because it is difficult to set criteria for evaluation	1	1.3
		As Korean English education is centered on American English, we should first start with including more British English, then WEs later.	1	1.3
		I don't how know WEs can be reflected in speaking tests.	1	1.3
		Although WEs are important in our real life, I don't think they are necessary in tests.	1	1.3
		Only those who will use English frequently in the future should learn WEs.	1	1.3
		I can rely on other resources such as body language.	1	1.3
		<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>

Similarly, the most talked-about reasons by the students were 'because WEs can be included in education only after they show up on tests' (i.e., shared by 13.9 per cent of the students) and 'because tests should be able to reflect the real world, where different varieties of English are used' (i.e., shared by 13.9 per cent of the students), followed by 'to be able to communicate and interact with varying people from all around the world who speak different varieties of English' (i.e., shared by 12.7 per cent of the students) (see Table 14).

The more marginal answers were 'to help students deepen their understanding of WEs,' 'to help students realize that there is no good or bad pronunciation,' and 'because I have experienced difficulties not being able to communicate with people speaking different varieties of English.' Some participants, pointing out changes in standardized tests (e.g., TOEFL and TOEIC), also argued that more diverse WEs needed to be incorporated in school exams to properly gauge students' English abilities as English was not just a language of a specific country (see Table 14).

On the contrary, about 10 per cent of the teachers cited efficiency of learning one variety of English as the reason why they thought it was not important to include different WEs in English tests. Possible distractions in English education and difficulty in setting criteria for evaluation were other reasons mentioned by some teachers (i.e., shared by 5.9 per cent and 3.9 per cent of the teachers, respectively). The most talked-about skeptical response by the students was distractions in English learning such as increased burden of learning and confusion in learning (i.e., shared by 12.7 per cent of the students). About 10 per cent of the students responded to this question by answering 'I don't know.' In addition, two participants (i.e., one teacher and one student) wrote that WEs were not necessarily needed for school classes/exams, and two teachers and one student mentioned the difficulty of setting criteria for evaluation when trying to incorporate different varieties of English in tests. Three participants (i.e., one teacher and two students) went even further and pointed to very real limits of English education in Korea, saying that 'It is practically impossible to teach different varieties of English at school' and 'Whatever we learn at school is unlikely to be used in real life' (see Table 14).

An independent samples t-test to compare the two groups was conducted, with the Likert scale from 1 to 5 treated as an interval-level scale. As shown in Table 15, there was no significant difference between the two groups in their attitudes towards including diverse WEs in English tests ( $t(128) = 1.50, p = .14$ ).

TABLE 15 Comparison of Attitudes towards Incorporating Diverse WEs in English Tests

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
<b>Teachers</b>	51	3.96	1.02
<b>Students</b>	79	3.67	1.11

A paired-samples t-test was further conducted to compare the participants' attitudes to the inclusion of varying WEs in teaching/learning and testing contexts. For the teachers, there was a significant difference in the scores for teaching ( $M= 4.25$ ,  $SD= .96$ ) and testing ( $M= 3.96$ ,  $SD= 1.02$ ) contexts:  $t(50)= 3.27$ ,  $p= .002$ . However, there was no significant difference in the scores for learning ( $M= 3.87$ ,  $SD= 1.13$ ) and testing ( $M= 3.67$ ,  $SD= 1.11$ ) contexts for the student group ( $t(78)= 1.95$ ,  $p= .055$ ), which seems reasonable considering that the students' attitudes to including various WEs in learning were significantly less positive than the teachers' counterparts (see Table 12). These results suggest that both the teachers and the students may have felt defensive about any change in tests (e.g., inclusion of multiple WEs in English tests), which might explain why there was no significant difference between the two groups in their attitudes towards incorporating diverse WEs in English tests.

These less supportive attitudes towards WEs in testing contexts become more noticeable with the descriptive analysis. Compared to their responses to the inclusion of WEs in English teaching/learning, more participants responded skeptically on the inclusion of WEs in English tests (i.e., 9.8 per cent of the teachers and 19 per cent of the students (see Tables 10 and 13). These figures increased to 23.6 and 28 in the analysis of the open-ended answers (see Table 14), which makes it clearer that to some of the participants in this study, *Neutral* was perceived as *Not very important* rather than *Somewhat important*; note that among the participants who marked *Neutral* to the Likert-scale question (i.e., nine teachers and 17 students), seven teachers and seven students responded skeptically in their open-ended answers, whereas two teachers provided supportive answers and 10 students took a neutral attitude by answering, for example, 'I don't know' (see Tables 13 and 14). This less supportive attitude to WEs in testing contexts might be attributed to the fact that tests directly affect school grades and college entrance in Korea. The students and teachers in this study, thus, might have thought the influence of embracing more diverse WEs in English tests more seriously, expressing concerns about it.

### 8.3.3 Willingness to Change Teaching/Learning Practices regarding WEs

Asked whether they would like to change anything in their teaching or learning practices with regard to WEs, most of the participants responded *yes*: 72.5 per cent of the teachers and 70.9 per cent of the students. It should be noted that this was the only question to which some teachers chose the response choice of *I don't know* (see Table 16).

TABLE 16 Responses to Question 9 (*Would you like to change anything in your teaching/learning practice with regard to English varieties?*)

		N	Percent
<b>Teachers</b>	Yes	37	72.5
	No	8	15.7
	<i>I don't know.</i>	6	11.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Students</b>	Yes	56	70.9
	No	23	29.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>

A Chi-square test for independence indicated no significant association between the two variables (i.e., whether they are teachers or students and whether they would like to change their teaching/learning practices or not),  $\chi^2(1, n = 124) = 1.41, p = .24$ ; for better comparability, the test was run including only the *Yes/No* answers and not the *I don't know* answers as no students marked the choice of *I don't know* (see Table 17).

TABLE 17 Comparison of Willingness to Change Teaching/Learning Practices

			Teachers/Students (T/S)		
			Teachers	Students	Total
<b>Willingness to Change (WTC)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Count	37	56	93
		% within WTC	39.8%	60.2%	100%
		% within T/S	82.2%	70.9%	75%
	<b>No</b>	Count	8	23	31
		% within WTC	25.8%	74.2%	100%
		% within T/S	17.8%	29.1%	25%
<b>Total</b>		Count	45	79	124
		% within WTC	36.3%	63.7%	100%
		% within T/S	100%	100%	100%

When asked why, many teachers specified their reasons in relation to their students. In more detail, 25.5 percent of the teachers responded that they wanted to help their students understand and speak different varieties of English, 19.6 per cent saying that they would like to help students understand that English was a global language having different varieties. Some wrote that they would like to change their teaching practices to reflect the real world in which different varieties of English were spoken (i.e., 13.7 per cent of the teachers), while others expressed reservations about changing their teaching practices, mentioning the need for teacher education regarding WEs (i.e., 11.8 per cent of the teachers).

Considering that the response choice of *I don't know* by the teacher group was found only in this question, it can be argued that some of the teachers were taking a more careful approach on changing their teaching practices. This is to say, unlike the previous questions (i.e., questions 7 and 8) which allowed the teachers to put some distance between themselves and the questions, this question might have been thought more directly related to their career as it addressed a change in their teaching practices. Accordingly, to some teachers, answering either *yes* or *no* without due consideration might have looked risky (see Table 18).

TABLE 18 Open-ended Answers to Question 9 (*Would you like to change anything in your teaching/learning practice with regard to English varieties? Please mark one choice and specify your reason.*)

			N	Percent
Teachers	Supportive	To help improve students' English abilities by exposing them to diverse WEs/ To help students understand and speak different varieties of English	13	25.5
		To help students understand that English is a global language having different varieties	10	19.6
		To reflect the real world, where different varieties of English are spoken	7	13.7
		To become a better language teacher and help students change	2	3.9
		I'm already trying to teach WEs and keep doing it.	2	3.9
		As the educational system changes, teachers should be able to change their teaching practice as well.	2	3.9

TABLE 18 Open-ended Answers to Question 9

			N	Percent	
Teachers	Supportive	To help students overcome psychological burdens that they should speak correct English	1	2.0	
		<i>I don't know.</i>	6	11.8	
		- I understand the importance of WEs but I don't know how to include them in my teaching.	(3)		
			- I don't know much about WEs and I think I need to learn more about them.	(3)	
	Skeptical	Because teaching WEs may introduce more distractions in English education: increased burden of learning and confusion in education	2	3.9	
		If you are fluent in one variety of English, you don't have any major difficulties understanding others.	2	3.9	
		As most English textbooks in Korea adopt American English as Standard English, I don't think I can change anything on my own.	1	2.0	
		I'm not sure I can teach WEs. I think teacher education is needed.	1	2.0	
		I don't think WEs can be introduced to classrooms in Korea, where students of different English abilities are put together.	1	2.0	
		Even though we can explain to students that there are different varieties of English, I don't think we have to change our teaching practice just because of that.	1	2.0	
		<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>	
		Students	Supportive	I had learned English mostly for academic purposes at school, relying on cramming and memorization, and now I want to learn more practical English.	17
To be able to communicate and interact with varying people from all around the world	10			12.7	
Because I have experienced difficulties not being able to understand and communicate with people speaking different varieties of English	6			7.6	
If it helps improve my English, I would like to change my learning practice.	5			6.3	
Because English is a common language of the world	4			5.1	
Because WEs are important	3			3.8	
Because I had learned only American English at school	2			2.5	
Because even the College Scholastic Aptitude Test in Korea includes more than one variety of English	1			1.3	
Because I can develop my language skills by learning diverse WEs	1			1.3	
To get broader educational opportunities	1			1.3	
Because I'm interested in learning different English accents	1			1.3	
Because I'm going to be an English interpreter	1			1.3	

TABLE 18 Open-ended Answers to Question 9

		N	Percent	
<b>Students</b>	I don't know.	10	12.7	
	<b>Skeptical</b>	Because WEs may introduce more distractions in English learning: increased burden of learning and confusion in learning	5	6.3
		It doesn't matter to me.	3	3.8
		Because learning Standard English/ American English will be more useful	3	3.8
		I don't see the necessity of learning WEs yet.	2	2.5
		I think it is too late/ difficult to change my learning practice.	2	2.5
		Because most English tests in Korea including TOEIC do not include WEs	1	1.3
		Because my English is not good to learn WEs	1	1.3
		<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>

The student group, on the other hand, specified their reasons mostly in connection with their past experience including school experience; 21.5 per cent of the students, emphasizing the fact that they had learned English only for academic purposes at school, said that they wanted to learn more practical English, while 7.6 per cent of the students talked about difficulties they experienced in communicating with people speaking different varieties of English. Other reasons that were frequently cited by the students were 'to communicate and interact with various people from other countries' (i.e., shared by 12.7 per cent of the students) and 'I don't know' (i.e., shared by 12.7 per cent of the students). The students also presented various opinions including 'to communicate and interact with varying people from all around the world,' 'because English is a common language of the world,' and 'because WEs are important' (see Table 18).

Interestingly, although no student marked the choice of *I don't know* to the closed-ended question, many students (i.e., 10 out of 79) responded to the open-ended question simply saying 'I don't know' (see Tables 16 and 18), which might imply that the student participants, compared to the teacher counterparts, were not interested to the topic of WEs or did not think much of it. This finding seems plausible given that most of the student participants (i.e., 81 per cent) were majoring in other fields except English (see Table 2) aside from the simple fact that they were "students." Indeed, some of the students continuously

answered with 'I don't know' to the questions requiring them to specify their reasons for their choices, and more students answered with 'I don't know' as questions went on: five students to Question 7, eight students to Question 8, and 10 students to Question 9 (see Tables 11, 14, and 18).

For skeptical opinions, as seen in Table 18, 'because teaching/learning WEs may introduce more distractions in English education/learning' was mentioned most both by the teachers (i.e., 3.9 per cent) and by the students (i.e., 6.3 per cent). Some teachers pointed out the limit of what a teacher could do for himself/herself (e.g., English textbooks based on American English and large classes where students of different English abilities are put together) and maintained that they needed teacher education on WEs in order to be able to apply the WEs approach to their teaching. Some students even expressed impotent feelings as English learners, saying that 'It is too late/difficult to change my learning practice now' or 'My English is too bad to learn WEs.'

## 9 DISCUSSION

### 9.1 Knowledge of WEs

To summarize the research results, first, most of the teachers in this study seemed to understand the concept of WEs pretty well, showing a better understanding of WEs than the student counterparts. Not only did more than half of the teachers (i.e., 31 out of 51 teachers) respond they knew what WEs meant, but their definitions appeared to include key ideas needed to define WEs (see Table 3); when asked to describe WEs, 61.3 per cent of the respondents (i.e., 19 out of 31) said that WEs were different varieties of English used by different people in different parts of the world, and about 32 per cent (i.e., 10 out of 31) answered that the term WEs connoted English being a common language of the world for global communication as follows:

*"As the term 'standard English' has become history and now we are living in a world where a wide range of pronunciations, intonations, modified meanings of words, Singlish, Chinglish, and Konglish are respected as English, we are using the term WEs."*

*"WEs mean Englishes that people around the world use as a means of communication. In this concept of WEs, different accents in different countries are all acceptable and the only important thing is intelligibility."*

The rest two (i.e., two out of 31) responded that WEs meant "Englishes used in the countries other than the UK and the US, which have been modified depending on the use in each country" and "Englishes learned and used in non-English speaking countries to communicate with other countries," respectively, each of which seemed close to the narrow definition of WEs as discussed earlier in this paper (see section 3).

Both the teachers and the students appeared to know more about WEs than they thought they did; although only about 61 per cent and nine per cent of each group said they knew what WEs meant in the close-ended question (i.e., Question 3), the analysis of the answers to the open-ended question (i.e., Question 2) and another close-ended question (i.e., Question 4) revealed that

many of the participants actually had a good understanding of WEs even though they were not conscious of their knowledge and could not explicitly explain the term of WEs (see Tables 3, 5, and 6). For instance, to the question asking whose language they thought English was, one teacher replied, “English belongs to anyone who speaks it for any purpose,” which was what the WEs approach says, although she answered with *No* to the question asking if she knew what WEs meant. In a similar way, one student who responded that she did not know about WEs said, “I think English is a language of people all around the world. That’s because nowadays many people use English without regard to nationality.” Indeed, much of research has reported that “people can learn without consciously knowing” (Fu, Bin, Dienes, Fu & Gao, 2013, p. 33), implying that there is a certain kind of knowledge that can be acquired without awareness and cannot be explicitly verbalized, in contrast with more conscious, verbalizable, and explicit forms of knowledge (Fu et al., 2013; Gutiérrez, 2012; Ksiazkiewicz, 2013; Suzuki & DeKeyser, 2017). In the case of this study, considering that about 88 per cent of the teachers and 60 per cent of the students thought English was a global language, and about 82 per cent and 38 per cent of each group said they were familiar with the definition of WEs shared by literature, it can be said that a larger number of the participants knew what WEs meant although they were not aware of knowing that (see Tables 5 and 6).

This finding appears to correspond with the previous research finding that teachers and learners of English, particularly learners, often do not have a clear idea of WEs (see section 6); the fact that less participants responded they knew what WEs meant than suggested in their open-ended answers is likely to mean that in many cases, the respondents’ understanding of WEs was superficial or unclear. However, this same result can also mean that many of the participants, in practice, had a good grasp of WEs although some of them were not able to give a clear definition of them. Then, it may be the case that as in this study, if given an awareness-raising tool that can facilitate people’s thinking,

participants are able to provide further information on their understanding of the subject discussed.

It may also be noteworthy to mention here that there was a view shared by some participants that English belonged to specific countries, mostly the UK and the US (see Table 5); two teachers (i.e., 3.9 per cent of the teachers) and five students (i.e., 6.4 per cent of the students) responded that English was the language of people who spoke it as a mother tongue, three teachers (i.e., 5.9 per cent of the teachers) and as many as 24 students (i.e., 30.4 per cent of the students) saying that English was the language of the UK and/or the US. While the notions of EIL and WEs seem to be accepted by most of the participants, there still exists a tendency, among some of the participants in this study, to see native speakers as the authority of the English language, as native speaker models insist (see section 4.1).

## 9.2 English Use

Another result of this study was that the majority of the participants reported that they had learned, taught/been taught in school, and been exposed to American and/or British Englishes even though they were exposed to more diverse WEs than just the two varieties (see Tables 7, 8, and 9). The use of American English was especially high, which accords with the finding of previous research on English education in Korea that English language learning and teaching in Korea is based on the native speaker model, American (or sometimes British) being considered as the standard with a prestigious status (see section 5); in both groups, American English was the highest marked response choice to all the questions asking their English use and exposure.

Another interesting finding was that among the student group, *I don't know/remember* was the second highest marked choice following American English, whereas none of the teachers chose it as a response option (see Tables 7, 8, and 9). This result seems to support the claim that students are unlikely to think about the language they are learning unless they are encouraged to do so

(Hartley as cited in Yang, 2013), and thus need to be helped to reflect on their language use and enhance their language awareness, that is consciousness of and sensitivity to different forms and functions of the language (Carter, 2003; Yang, 2013). Then, it might be possible that some of the students in this study had not thought about their language (i.e., English in this case) for various reasons (e.g., perception of English as an academic subject rather than a “language” and major exposure to one variety of English), and were not able to identify which varieties of English they had learned, been taught in school, and/or been exposed to. Or, they might just not have been interested in the topic of this study, WEs.

### **9.3 Inclusion of WEs in Teaching/Learning and Tests**

Most participants appeared to be open to the idea of including diverse WEs in English teaching and learning, which is not in line with the previous research finding that English teachers and learners, although they support the general concept of WEs and their use for informal, communicational purposes, tend to be less positive about the use of WEs in a more instructional setting (see section 6). Narrowing down the research to that of Korean participants, this result seems to concur with Ahn and Kang’s finding (2017) that Korean students were positive about Korean accent English, showing a similar level of desire to communicate with non-native speakers as with native speakers, which contradicts the finding of much research on Korean teachers’ or learners’ perceptions of WEs (e.g., Ahn, 2015; Lee & Hsieh, 2018; Lee & Warren Green, 2016). In other words, the majority of the participants in this study, contrary to the reality of English education in Korea relying on native speaker models (see section 5), appear to support diversity in English for their teaching or learning, moving towards the WEs approach (see section 4.2).

Many participants in this study responded that more diverse WEs needed to be included in English teaching/learning to be able to communicate with various people speaking different varieties of English including non-native

speakers. In the case of the students, they also regarded the need for improving their English conversation skills, some of them citing their experience of not being able to communicate in diverse WEs (see Table 11). While most of the participants took a practical approach to the question, answering based on their experience and/or current situation, there were not many, but some who approached the question from a more critical WEs perspective, rejecting native speaker models. Three teachers, for instance, referred to the need to help students realize American English was not the only English, and two students explained the inclusion of WEs in relation to educational diversity (see Table 11).

Participants' supportive attitudes towards WEs were also found in their comments on testing contexts. Many participants said it was important to incorporate different WEs in English listening and speaking tests because tests should be able to reflect the real world where diverse WEs were used and because WEs could be reflected in teaching/learning only after they showed up on tests; 'to help improve students' English abilities by exposing them to diverse WEs' and 'to communicate and interact with people around the world who speak different varieties of English' were also much mentioned by the teachers and the students, respectively (see Table 14). Although there do not seem to be many studies on the use of WEs particularly focusing on school exams, this result appears to challenge the previous research finding that teachers and students are often against the inclusion of different varieties of English in tests (Gu & So, 2015; Hamid, 2014).

While there are multiple reasons, this seemingly different result might be explained in terms of the specific context of Korea. As described in the section 5, English language education in Korea is characterized by exam-oriented lessons focusing on grammar and reading and preference for American English, which means less opportunity for students to be exposed to and learn different varieties of English 'spoken' by different people. Accordingly, the participants in this study may have expressed their needs to teach/learn more practical Englishes that were actually used and spoken in real life, or WEs. Indeed, a

considerable number of participants used the words such as ‘communication,’ ‘conversation skills,’ ‘interaction,’ ‘real world,’ and ‘tests’ in order to answer the questions asking why they thought it was important to include diverse WEs in English teaching/learning and tests (see Tables 11 and 14). For instance, one teacher expressed her desire to teach more diverse WEs through changes in the present examination system by saying that “In our educational system where evaluation is considered important, if tests start including more diverse WEs, students are willing to learn and study various Englishes.” Similarly, one student responded that “Although English listening is being taught at school, I don’t think English speaking is considered important in our education. I think that is why many students, after graduating from high schools, attend private academies with native speakers of English to improve their English speaking skills. So I think we should provide students with more opportunities to learn by introducing a wider English education with more diverse WEs and help them have more confidence in their English.”

Participants’ positive attitudes to the inclusion of different WEs might also be attributable to the description of WEs with speech samples provided in the questionnaires in this study. This is to say, the description of WEs and their speech samples may have helped the participants understand what WEs meant, realize their importance, and have a positive impression of them; note that all the speech samples of WEs were recorded by fluent speakers of English to avoid any misunderstanding or prejudice that WEs other than native varieties are difficult or strange that is often caused when speech samples are recorded by less fluent speakers.

However, there were also participants who were skeptical of the inclusion, and the proportion increased when the inclusion was related to tests (see Tables 10 and 13). Many of them thought learning one variety of English was more useful, and including multiple WEs could cause distraction and stress in English education in Korea (see Tables 11 and 14). Not surprisingly, they elaborated their reasons in connection with Korean education system as did

those who were in favor of WEs, as in the following comment, which was classified by the category of 'Learning one variety of English is more efficient':

"In the case of Korea, where English is not frequently used, it takes lots of time and effort to get used to American accents only. It is important to understand different English accents such as British English, Southeast Asian English, and Indian English. [.....] However, it will be a great pressure on students if they have to understand different varieties of English and even take exams based on them. We should understand that in the current English education system in Korea, the movement to respect diverse accents and diverse Englishes may end up studying and testing every detailed aspect of each variety of English. Even Americans cannot understand Australian English 100 per cent from the beginning. [.....] I think including diverse WEs in our education and trying to expose students to them can introduce more distractions in education. [.....] I doubt if it is necessary, for example, for textbooks to include American speakers, British speakers, and Australian speakers. I think being fluent in one variety of English is enough."

Apparently, to some of the participants including the teacher above, diversifying the English language seemed to mean more burden of and confusion in teaching/learning. It is, then, no wonder that more participants were skeptical about the inclusion of WEs in tests than in education in general, thinking the impact of it more seriously (see Tables 10 and 13). Some participants also responded that WEs, although they might be needed in the real world, were not necessarily needed in school contexts, and others mentioned the difficulty of setting criteria for evaluation and the limits of English education in Korea (see Table 14).

It should be noted that the student group, despite their positive responses in general, was less supportive about including diverse WEs in English education than the teacher group, which was also reported by several previous studies (see Table 12). In Takahashi's study (2017), for example, Japanese high school students, compared to teachers, were less open to embracing non-native varieties of English in course books. Likewise, test takers in the study of Gu and So (2015) were "more resistant to the idea of diversifying the spoken language in the test input" (p. 21) than English teachers, score users, and language testing professionals, especially in the case of the input being from the Outer- or

Expanding- Circle. One possible explanation for this result might be students' perceived impact of the inclusion of WEs on their learning and test scores (Gu and So, 2015). In other words, the students, likely to be affected the most by any change in education, may have thought about potential damage and unpredictable consequences that the inclusion of WEs could cause for them.

Another interesting finding was that the participants' overall responses seemed less supportive in the analysis of the open-ended answers than did they look in the analysis of the close-ended answers (see Tables 10 and 11; also see Tables 13 and 14). That means, many of the participants who chose *Neutral* in the Likert-scale provided somewhat skeptical responses to the open-ended questions, which suggests that the response option of *Neutral* was more of *Not very important* rather than *Somewhat important* to many respondents; among the participants who marked *Neutral* in the Likert-scale (i.e., 16 participants for Question 7 and 26 participants for Question 8), those who adopted a position somewhere between 'Somewhat important' and 'Not very important' in the open-ended answers were only five and 10, respectively. For instance, two students who marked the choice of *Neutral* in the Likert-scale, showed rather skeptical attitudes to the inclusion in their open-ended answers as follows:

"Although it would be good to listen to different varieties of English, time is short even for mastering American and British Englishes."

"I think learning English as WEs will increase the amount of learning."

Obviously, these open-ended answers should tell more about the participants, beyond what the statistical data can tell. In other words, the seemingly positive figures seen in the Tables might not be that positive as they appear; take notice that the mean scores of the participants' perceived importance of the inclusion of diverse WEs in English teaching/learning were 4.25 (i.e., the teachers' mean score) and 3.87 (i.e., the students' mean score), while those of the two groups regarding English tests were 3.96 and 3.67, respectively (see Tables 12 and 15). As seen in this case, any figure will have to be interpreted with consideration of

what the figures actually mean, and here lies the importance of open-ended answers in this study.

#### 9.4 Teaching/Learning Practices regarding WEs

In respect of teaching/learning practices, the majority of the participants said that they were willing to change their teaching/learning practices with regard to WEs (i.e., about 73 per cent of the teachers and 71 per cent of the students) although some of them were resistant to any change (see Table 16). Many teachers referred to the need to help students get used to various WEs while helping them understand that English had different varieties (see Table 18). For example, one teacher said she wanted to change her teaching practice because “If students are only accustomed to so-called standard American, British, and Australian Englishes, they may wrongly believe that Indian English is not English when they later go out into the world. As one of the important goals of education is training global citizens for the future, I think it is right to expose our students to more diverse Englishes.” The other comments also seemed to be made based on a sense of mission about the teaching profession as is evident in the following comments, which were classified by the category of ‘to become a better language teacher and help students change’:

“I think students change as much teachers try.”

“In order to develop professionalism as a language teacher, I think I should study more and teach students.”

The students, on the other hand, specified their reasons in relation to their personal experience such as experience of taking English classes at school and experience of talking to foreigners in different English varieties as follows:

“Until high school, maybe because I had studied English, only focusing on its theoretical aspects, I did not feel interested in English that much. Besides, as I advanced through school, [.....] I was not confident about English speaking although I had studied English for 12 years. However, if I could study English, learning different ways that different

English speakers communicate and their unique languages, I think I should be able to feel interested in English easily, and that's why I want to change my learning practice."

For skeptical responses, 'Teaching/Learning WEs may introduce more distractions in English education' was mentioned most both by the teachers and by the students. The participants presented other varying reasons why they would rather not change their teaching/learning practices, such as 'because most English textbooks in Korea adopt American English as Standard English,' 'because I'm not sure I can teach WEs without enough education on them,' 'because it is too late/difficult to change my learning practice,' and 'because my English is too bad to learn WEs' (see Table 18).

## 9.5 'I don't Know' Responses

One of the remarkable findings of this study was the high frequency of 'I don't know' in the students' open-ended answers, as opposed to the teacher group who further elaborated 'why they didn't know' whether to change their teaching practices with regard to English varieties; this was the only question where the response choice of *I don't know* was found among the teachers.

'I don't know' responses to survey questions can mean lack of knowledge, experience, or preference needed to articulate one's opinions, and resulting indecision or uncertainty about the topic discussed (Luskin & Bullock, 2011; Sanchez & Morchio, 1992). In this case, however, the students' 'I don't know' is more likely to reflect "an insufficient motivation to invoke the effort needed to provide a valid response" to the questions (Ellis, Ferrer, Taber, & Klein, 2018, p. 395), given that some students continuously said 'I don't know' to the questions requiring them to specify their reasons and that more students answered with 'I don't know' as questions went on: five students to Question 7, eight students to Question 8, and 10 students to Question 9. In fact, regarding Question 9 (i.e., *Would you like to change anything in your learning practice with regard to English varieties? Please mark one choice and specify your reason based on your high school experience.*), even though no student checked *I don't know* to the closed-ended

item, as many as 10 students wrote 'I don't know' to the open-ended item (see Tables 16 and 18). Besides, in the case of Question 8 (i.e., *How important do you think it is to include different varieties of English in English listening and speaking tests administered to high school students? Please mark one choice and specify your reason based on your high school experience.*), two students wrote that 'Testing is not important. Teaching English through more various activities is more important,' which suggests that to them, the inclusion of WEs was of less concern than whether English classes involve interesting activities or not (see Table 14). Similarly, regarding Question 9, three students said that they did not care which English to study; clearly, 'which English' was a less important topic to those students, whose priority was 'to improve their English abilities' (see Table 18).

'I don't know' responses found among the teacher group, on the contrary, may mean indecision or uncertainty about the topic asked (Ellis, Ferrer, Taber, & Klein, 2018; Luskin & Bullock, 2011; Sanchez & Morchio, 1992); the teachers who took a 'I don't know' position in the open-ended answers not only selected *I don't know* to the closed-ended item but also elaborated 'why they didn't know' in their open-ended answers unlike the student counterparts who simply wrote 'I don't know' as their open-ended answers without any elaboration (see Tables 16 and 18). The teachers' 'I don't know,' therefore, might be interpreted that they wanted to take a more careful approach on changing their teaching practices because they thought it was more directly related to their career, thus not a question anyone could easily answer with *yes* or *no* as indicated in the following comments:

"I have wanted to teach English as a practical language not as an academic study, but as I haven't studied WEs myself well, I'm not sure how to approach WEs and I fear to apply it to my teaching. That's why I ticked *I don't know* above."

## 9.6 Further Comments

Although not mentioned in the results section, the participants were asked to leave further comments, if they had any, at the end of the questionnaires, and six teachers and four students left their thoughts. Most of them stressed the necessity of changes in English education towards WEs, one teacher referring to another need for teacher training programs, as follows:

“I think students should be encouraged to speak English with their own accents, and native-like pronunciation should be no criterion of one’s English proficiency.”

“Because we are going to use WEs mostly to communicate with other non-native speakers, I think we need to escape from English education that is based on English used in major world powers.”

“I, as an English teacher myself, have studied mostly American English and haven’t had enough opportunities to be exposed to and learn more diverse WEs. I wish there were programs for English teachers teaching how to teach WEs.”

Two teachers, meanwhile, expressed doubts about the need to include diverse WEs in English education, arguing that there should be English education teaching the basic and standard of the English language as one could easily learn different WEs once he or she was fluent in one variety of English. Interestingly, one of the teachers compared English from the Inner Circle —by her definition, standard English— to standard Korean, and Englishes from the Outer and Expanding Circles to dialects in Korean, preferring native Englishes to WEs as an instructional model.

## 9.7 Summary

In brief, the findings of the present study, overall, suggest that (a) most of the Korean teachers and over half of the students had some knowledge of WEs although they did not necessarily give a clear definition of them, (b) the participants had mostly learned, taught/been taught in school, and been exposed to American English, and (c) they were in general positive about incorporating different WEs in English teaching/learning and tests, willing to change their teaching/learning practices, although some of them were less open to the inclusion of WEs and hesitant to change their teaching/learning practices. Comparing the two groups, the teachers showed a better understanding of WEs than the students, and were more open to the inclusion than the student counterparts.

## 9.8 Implications for Pedagogy

The findings of the current study have some implications for pedagogy. First, although the participants, in general, appeared to understand the notion of WEs to some extent, there seems to be a need to provide more information on WEs for Korean teachers and students, especially for students. In fact, only 60.8 per cent of the teachers and 8.9 per cent of the students said that they knew what WEs meant even though further analysis pointed towards the possibility of more participants having implicit knowledge of WEs. In other words, more information on WEs that is widely shared by research literature (e.g., the fact that there exist different varieties of English spoken all over the world and that English is more used by non-native speakers than by native speakers) may also need to be shared by the important stakeholders in education (i.e., teachers and students) before they could make any educational choice regarding WEs. Additionally, teachers, those who want to learn more about WEs in particular, will need to be provided with proper support in the form of teacher education programs or workshops, as stated by two teachers in this study.

Second, the present study suggests that English education in Korea might need to diversify the language, reflecting voices from teachers and students; note that the majority of the participants in this study, who had learned, taught, and been exposed to mainly American English, thought it was important to include varying WEs in English teaching/learning and tests and would like to change their teaching/learning practices concerning WEs. However, a cautious approach may be required, along with more discussion about the issue of embracing different WEs, considering that some teachers and students may oppose the inclusion of WEs, worrying about increased burden of learning or confusion in education it can create.

Finally, and most importantly, English education in Korea needs to be changed from 'teaching/learning English as an academic subject' to 'teaching/learning English as a practical language' as pointed out by many participants in the current study. Although testing is an important part of education in Korea, many of the participants in this study, particularly the students, expressed their desire to learn English, escaping from exam-oriented lessons, in a more communicative way, referring to their past experience of having trouble communicating in different varieties of English. Incorporating diverse WEs, while paying more attention to spoken forms of the language, then, might be one way to help them.

## **9.9 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Studies**

The present study has some limitations that should be acknowledged. Although this study tried to overcome limitations of the instrument (i.e., questionnaire) by including open-ended questions, it is unlikely that the data collected through the questionnaires tell the whole story of the participants' perceptions of WEs. For example, for the students who continuously provided 'I don't know' answers, it was difficult to figure out what they meant by 'I don't know' and what their reasons for their choices were. Therefore, further research which can present more spontaneous and detailed data through interview, observation,

and other methods, needs to be conducted and compared to the findings of this study.

The current study is also limited in terms of sample size. Although the total participants in this study were 130, less than 100 represented each group. Furthermore, in terms of backgrounds, the participants were skewed in one direction. For instance, most of the teachers were female, were working in a city, and had experience of living in English-speaking countries, while most of the students were female, having no experience of living or studying in English-speaking countries. A further study which has a larger number of participants and investigates differences within a group (e.g., differences within the teacher group across gender, age, and teaching experience), therefore, should be conducted.

Third, college freshmen were chosen as student participants in this study as they could answer the questions after completing secondary education while having some distance from which to reflect on previous experiences. Although this choice served the purpose of this study, including more students ranging from 7th graders to college seniors may have helped make the findings more plausible. Thus, further research will need to be carried out on students of different ages in Korea.

Finally, it should be noted that WEs in this study were reduced only to spoken language accents although discussion on WEs is not restricted to accents. Therefore, further studies, which investigate WEs beyond spoken language accents, must be conducted.

## REFERENCES

- Abeywickrama, P. (2013). Why not non-native varieties of English as listening comprehension test input?. *RELC Journal*, 44(1), 59-74.
- Ahn, H. (2015). Awareness of and attitudes to Asian Englishes: A study of English teachers in South Korea. *Asian Englishes*, 17(2), 132-151.
- Ahn, S. Y., & Kang, H. S. (2017). South Korean university students' perceptions of different English varieties and their contribution to the learning of English as a foreign language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(8), 712-725.
- Árva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System*, 28(3), 355-372.
- Barnes, L. (2005). English as a global language: An African perspective. *Language Matters: Studies in the Languages of Southern Africa*, 36(2), 243-265.
- Brown, J. D. (2014). The future of world Englishes in language testing. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 11(1), 5-26.
- Byean, H. (2015). English, tracking, and neoliberalization of education in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(4), 867-882.
- Carter, R. (2003). Language awareness. *ELT Journal*, 57(1), 64-65.
- Chew, P. G. L. (2013). The use of Singlish in the teaching of Islam. *World Englishes*, 32(3), 380-394.
- Cho, B. E. (2004). Issues concerning Korean learners of English: English education in Korea and some common difficulties of Korean students. *The East Asian Learner*, 1(2), 31-36.
- Choi, L. J. (2016). Revisiting the issue of native speakerism: "I don't want to speak like a native speaker of English". *Language and Education*, 30(1), pp. 72-85.
- Cogo, A. (2012). English as a lingua franca: Concepts, use, and implications. *ELT journal*, 66(1), 97-105.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). London and New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209.
- Coolican, H. (2014). *Research methods and statistics in psychology* (6th ed.). London and New York: Psychology Press.

- Coşkun, A. (2013). Native speakers as teachers in Turkey: Non-native pre-service English teachers' reactions to a nation-wide project. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(29), 1-21.
- Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2005). Second language accent and pronunciation teaching: A research-based approach. *Tesol Quarterly*, 39(3), 379-397.
- Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (2018). Teaching of English as an international language in various contexts: Nothing is as practical as good Theory. *RELC Journal*, 49(1), 74-87.
- Dörnyei, Z. & Taguchi, T. (2009). Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing (2nd ed.). New York; London: Routledge.
- Dufva, H., Suni, M., Aro, M., & Salo, O. P. (2011). Languages as objects of learning: language learning as a case of multilingualism. *Apples-Journal of Applied Language Studies*. 5(1), 109-124.
- Ellis, E. M., Ferrer, R. A., Taber, J. M., & Klein, W. M. (2018). Relationship of “don't know” responses to cancer knowledge and belief questions with colorectal cancer screening behavior. *Health psychology: official journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological Association*, 37(4), 394-398.
- Fayzrakhmanova, Y. (2016). English in South Korea: Two sides of the same Coin. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 236, 168-173.
- Foley, J. A. (2007). English as a global language: My two satangs' worth. *RELC journal*, 38(1), 7-17.
- Fu, Q., Bin, G., Dienes, Z., Fu, X., & Gao, X. (2013). Learning without consciously knowing: evidence from event-related potentials in sequence learning. *Consciousness and cognition*, 22(1), 22-34.
- Gilmore, A. (2007). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. *Language teaching*, 40(2), 97-118.
- Grau, M. (2009). Worlds apart? English in German youth cultures and in educational settings. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 160-174.
- Gu, L., & So, Y. (2015). Voices from stakeholders: What makes an academic English test ‘international’?. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 18, 9-24.

- Gutiérrez, X. (2012). Implicit knowledge, explicit knowledge, and achievement in second language (L2) Spanish. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée*, 15(1), 20-41.
- Hamid, M. O. (2014). World Englishes in international proficiency tests. *World Englishes*, 33(2), 263-277.
- Hamid, M. O., & Baldauf Jr, R. B. (2013). Second language errors and features of world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 32(4), 476-494.
- Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, 60(4), p. 385.
- Howell, D. C. (2009). *Statistical methods for psychology* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Jayanti, F. G., & Norahmi, M. (2015). EFL: Revisiting ELT practices in Indonesia. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 4(1), 5-14.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 200-207.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H.G. Widdowson (Eds), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kang, O. (2015). Learners' perceptions toward pronunciation instruction in three circles of world Englishes. *TESOL Journal*, 6(1), pp. 59-80.
- Khodadady, E., & Shayesteh, S. (2016). Cultural and linguistic imperialism and the EIL movement: Evidence from a textbook analysis. *Issues in Educational Research*, 26(4), 604.
- Kim, E. Y., & Kim, H. O. (2018). *Seongin yeongeo-hakseupja-ui segye-yeongeo-e gwanhan insik-gwa yeongeo malhagi bulan* [Korean adult learners' perception towards world Englishes and its relation to speaking anxiety]. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 18(1), 99-118.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2006). Asian Englishes: Implications for English language teaching. *Asian Englishes*, 9(2), 4-19.
- Kobayashi, Y. (2011). Expanding-circle students learning 'standard English' in the outer-circle Asia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(3), 235-248.
- Korean Ministry of Education. (2015). *Yeongeo-gwa gyoyuk-gwajeong* [English curriculum]. *Korean Ministry of Education*, 2015(74) [14].
- Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2008). Age-related differences in the motivation of learning English as a foreign language: Attitudes, selves, and motivated learning behavior. *Language learning*, 58(2), 327-355.

- Ksiazkiewicz, A. (2013). Implicit political knowledge. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 46(3), 553-555.
- Kwon, J. H., & Lim, J. (2018). 2015 Gaejeong Gyoyuk-gwajeong-e ttareun godeung-hakgyo gongtong-yeongeogyogwaseo munhwa naeyong bunseok [An analysis of the topics and cultural contents in high school English textbooks under the national curriculum revised in 2015]. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 26(3), 117-137.
- Lee, J. S., & Hsieh, J. C. (2018). University students' perceptions of English as an international language (EIL) in Taiwan and South Korea. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1-14.
- Lee, K. Y., & Warren Green, R. (2016). The World Englishes paradigm: A study of Korean university students' perceptions and attitudes. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique*, 15(1), 155-168.
- Luskin, R. C., & Bullock, J. G. (2011). "Don't know" means "don't know": DK responses and the public's level of political knowledge. *The Journal of Politics*, 73(2), 547-557.
- Matsuda, A. (2003). Incorporating world Englishes in teaching English as an international language. *Tesol Quarterly*, 37(4), 719-729.
- McKay, S. L. (2018). English as an international language: What it is and what it means for pedagogy. *RELC Journal*, 49(1), 9-23.
- Moodie, I., & Nam, H. J. (2016). English language teaching research in South Korea: A review of recent studies (2009-2014). *Language Teaching*, 49(1), 63-98.
- Mukminatien, N. (2012). Accommodating world Englishes in developing EFL learners' oral communication. *TEFLIN Journal*, 23(2), 222-232.
- National Institute for International Education of the Ministry of Education, South Korea: Retrieved from <http://www.niied.go.kr/eng/main.do>
- Nguyen, T. T. T., & Hamid, M. O. (2016). Language attitudes, identity and L1 maintenance: A qualitative study of Vietnamese ethnic minority students. *System*, 61, 87-97.
- Orikasa, M. (2016). The intelligibility of varieties of English in Japan. *World Englishes*, 35(3), 355-371.
- Park, T. (2017). Yeonge deutgi-pyeongga-ui yeongguk-baleum sayong-e daehan gyosa uigeon josa yeongu [A study on secondary school teachers' opinions about including British pronunciation in English listening assessment]. *Secondary English Education*, 10(3), 3-21.

- Pennycook, A. (2008). English as a language always in translation. *European Journal of English Studies*, 12(1), 33-47.
- Peterson, R. A. (2000). *Constructing effective questionnaires*. Thousand Oaks, [Calif.]: SAGE.
- Phan, N. L. H. (2018). Implications of the changing status of English for instructional models of English: A study of Vietnamese ELT teachers' reflections. *TESOL Journal*, 9(2), 368-387.
- Richards, J. C., Schmidt, R., Kendricks, H., & Kim, Y. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London, UK: Pearson.
- Rivers, D. J. (2013). Idealized English teachers: The implicit influence of race in Japan. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 12(5), 321-339.
- Ruecker, T., & Ives, L. (2015). White native English speakers needed: The rhetorical construction of privilege in online teacher recruitment spaces. *TESOL quarterly*, 49(4), 733-756.
- Sadeghpour, M., & Sharifian, F. (2017). English language teachers' perceptions of world Englishes: The elephants in the room. *Asian Englishes*, 19(3), 242-258.
- Saito, A., & Hatoss, A. (2011). Does the ownership rest with us? Global English and the native speaker ideal among Japanese high school students. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 6(2), 108-125.
- Salazar, D. (2018, September 14). From 'abaca' to 'kilig': World English and the OED. Retrieved from <https://public.oed.com/blog/abaca-kilig-world-english-oed/>
- Sanchez, M. E., & Morchio, G. (1992). Probing "dont know" answers: Effects on survey estimates and variable relationships. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 56(4), 454-474.
- Schneider, E. W. (2003). Evolutionary patterns of New Englishes and the special case of Malaysian English. *Asian Englishes*, 6(2), 44-63.
- Schulzke, M. (2014). The prospects of global English as an inclusive language. *Globalizations*, 11(2), 225-238.
- Song, H. (2013). Deconstruction of cultural dominance in Korean EFL textbooks. *Intercultural Education*, 24(4), 382-390.
- Sowden, C. (2011). ELF on a mushroom: the overnight growth in English as a Lingua Franca. *ELT journal*, 66(1), 89-96.
- Sung, C. C. M. (2013). Learning English as an L2 in the global context: Changing English, changing motivation. *Changing English*, 20(4), 377-387.

- Sung, C. C. M. (2016). Exposure to multiple accents of English in the English language teaching classroom: From second language learners' perspectives. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 10*(3), 190-205.
- Suzuki, Y., & DeKeyser, R. (2017). The interface of explicit and implicit knowledge in a second language: Insights from individual differences in cognitive aptitudes. *Language Learning, 67*(4), 747-790.
- Takahashi, R. (2017). Attitudes of Japanese learners and teachers of English towards non-standard English in coursebooks. *Changing English, 24*(1), 42-52.
- Tan, Y. Y. (2017). Singlish: An illegitimate conception in Singapore's language policies?. *European Journal of Language Policy, 9*(1), 85-104.
- Wang, L. Y., & Lin, T. B. (2013). The representation of professionalism in native English-speaking teachers recruitment policies: A comparative study of Hong Kong, Japan, Korea and Taiwan. *English Teaching, 12*(3), 5.
- Wang, W. (2015). Teaching English as an international language in China: Investigating university teachers' and students' attitudes towards China English. *System, 53*, 60-72.
- Wong, R. (2018). Non-native EFL teachers' perception of English accent in teaching and learning: Any preference?. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 8*(2), 177-183.
- Yang, Y. F. (2013). Exploring students' language awareness through intercultural communication in computer-supported collaborative learning. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 16*(2), 325-342.
- Young, T. J., & Walsh, S. (2010). Which English? Whose English? An investigation of 'non-native' teachers' beliefs about target varieties. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 23*(2), 123-137.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1 Teacher Questionnaire

#### About the Study

The aim of this study is to investigate Korean teachers' and students' perceptions of different varieties of English. This study helps you to think about what the English language is, together with what could be done to improve the English language education in South Korea. You will be asked to mark one or more choices and/or write a short answer to each question.

#### Confidentiality

Participation in the research is voluntary. Filling in this questionnaire, you agree to participate in the research. Research data is handled and used in a confidential manner. This survey is anonymous: we do not collect any data that would identify you.

#### About the Questionnaire

- This questionnaire should take approximately 10 to 20 minutes to complete.
- Most questions can be answered by marking the one most appropriate answer.
- If you have any questions or would like more information about the questionnaire or the study, you can contact me Kum Young Chang: \*\*\*\*\*@\*\*\*.\*\* or \*\*\*\*\*@\*\*\*\*\*.\*\*.
- You can also contact my supervisor University Teacher Tamás Péter Szabó: \*\*\*\*\*.\*.\*\*\*\*\*@\*\*\*.\*\*.

**Thank you for your participation!**

By ticking this checkbox, I give my consent to my participation in the above mentioned research.

### < Background Information >

1. Please mark your gender.

- Male
- Female
- I prefer not to tell.

2. How old are you?

- Under 30
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- Over 59
- I prefer not to tell.

3. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

- Less than 5 years
- 5-14 years
- 15-24 years
- 25 years or more

4. Have you studied/lived in English-speaking countries?

- Yes
- No

If *yes*, how long? \_\_\_\_\_

And where did you live? \_\_\_\_\_

5. Which school level do you teach?

- Kindergarten
- Primary school
- Middle school
- General high school
- Vocational high school

6. Do you work in the city or the country?

- City
- Country

### < Research Questions >

1. Which variety of English did you learn when you were a student? Please listen to each sample speech of different varieties of English, and mark your choice. *You can mark more than one choice.*

- Sample 1 (*Please listen to a sample speech by clicking this.*)
- Sample 2 (*Please listen to a sample speech by clicking this.*)
- Not featured in either Sample 1 or Sample 2
- I don't know/don't remember.*

2. In your opinion, whose language English is? Please explain whose language you think English is in 1-2 sentences.

\_\_\_\_\_.

3. Do you know what "World Englishes" mean? If *yes*, please describe what it is in 1-2 sentences.

- Yes. World Englishes mean \_\_\_\_\_.
- No

4. Some people say that “World Englishes” can include all varieties of English spoken around the world: not only Englishes of the countries where English is spoken as a first language (e.g., Australia, United Kingdom, and the United States) but also Englishes of the countries where English is one of several official languages (e.g., India, Malaysia, and Singapore) and of the countries where English is used as a foreign language (e.g., Brazil, China, and South Korea).

*The following audio file includes examples of World Englishes. Please listen to sample speeches of World Englishes by clicking this.*

Is this description similar to your definition of World Englishes? Is this concept new to you or not?

This concept is new to me.

This concept is not new to me.

*\* Source of the sample text in the audio samples:*

Reynolds, G. (2018, September 5). The best sport for a longer life? Try tennis. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com>

5. Which variety of English are you mostly exposed to currently? *You can mark more than one choice.*

English featured in Sample 1 *(You can listen to the sample speech one more time if you want.)*

English featured in Sample 2 *(You can listen to the sample speech one more time if you want.)*

World Englishes *(You can listen to the sample speeches one more time if you want.)*

Others *(Please specify.)*

*I don't know.*

6-1. In terms of teaching materials (e.g., textbooks, teaching materials for listening and/or speaking activities, etc.), which variety of English are you teaching? *You can mark more than one choice.*

- English featured in Sample 1 (*You can listen to the sample speech one more time if you want.*)
- English featured in Sample 2 (*You can listen to the sample speech one more time if you want.*)
- World Englishes (*You can listen to the sample speeches one more time if you want.*)
- Others (*Please specify.*)
- I don't know.*

6-2. In terms of the language you use as a teacher, which variety of English are you teaching? *You can mark more than one choice.*

- English featured in Sample 1 (*You can listen to the sample speech one more time if you want.*)
- English featured in Sample 2 (*You can listen to the sample speech one more time if you want.*)
- World Englishes (*You can listen to the sample speeches one more time if you want.*)
- Others (*Please specify.*)
- I don't know.*

7. As the English language grows in the world, it is creating new dialects called 'Englishes,' which include American English, British English, Indian English, Italian English, and several other 'Englishes' as mentioned above. In fact, English nowadays is more used by non-native speakers than by native speakers. Moreover, the majority of interaction in English by non-native speakers is with other non-native speakers than with native-speakers, and this proportion is expected to increase.

How important do you think it is to include more diverse Englishes in English listening and speaking education? *Please mark one choice and specify your reason.*

Extremely important	Somewhat important	Neutral	Not very important	Not important at all
(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
<input type="checkbox"/>				

Reason for your choice: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. How important do you think it is to include different varieties of English in English listening and speaking tests? *Please mark one choice and specify your reason.*

Extremely important	Somewhat important	Neutral	Not very important	Not important at all
(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
<input type="checkbox"/>				

Reason for your choice: \_\_\_\_\_.

9. Would you like to change anything in your teaching practice with regard to English varieties? *Please mark one choice and specify your reason.*

- Yes
- No
- I don't know.*

Reason for your choice: \_\_\_\_\_.

10. If you have further comments to add, please feel free to write them in the space provided below.

Further comments: \_\_\_\_\_.

**This is the end of the questionnaire.**  
**Thank you for your participation!**

## Appendix 2 Student Questionnaire

### About the Study

The aim of this study is to investigate Korean teachers' and students' perceptions of different varieties of English. This study helps you to think about what the English language is, together with what could be done to improve the English language education in South Korea. You will be asked to mark one or more choices and/or write a short answer to each question.

### Confidentiality

Participation in the research is voluntary. Filling in this questionnaire, you agree to participate in the research. Research data is handled and used in a confidential manner. This survey is anonymous: we do not collect any data that would identify you.

### About the Questionnaire

- This questionnaire should take approximately 10 to 20 minutes to complete.
- Most questions can be answered by marking the one most appropriate answer.
- If you have any questions or would like more information about the questionnaire or the study, you can contact me Kum Young Chang: \*\*\*\*\*@\*\*\*.\*\* or \*\*\*\*\*@\*\*\*\*\*.\*\*\*.
- You can also contact my supervisor University Teacher Tamás Péter Szabó: \*\*\*\*\*.\*.\*\*\*\*\*@\*\*\*.\*\*.

**Thank you for your participation!**

**By ticking this checkbox, I give my consent to my participation in the above mentioned research.**

**< Background Information >**

1. Please mark your gender.

- Male
- Female
- I prefer not to tell.

2. How old are you?

- 18-19
- 20-21
- Over 22
- I prefer not to tell.

3. What year are you in?

- 1<sup>st</sup> year
- 2<sup>nd</sup> year
- 3<sup>rd</sup> year
- 4<sup>th</sup> year

4. What is your major?

- English language
- Education
- Others

5. How long have you studied English?

- Less than 10 years
- 10 -11 years
- 12 years or more

6. Have you studied/lived in English-speaking countries?

- Yes
- No

If *yes*, how long? \_\_\_\_\_

And where did you live? \_\_\_\_\_

7. What do you think of your English skills? *Please mark one choice.*

- |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Very good (5)            | Good (4)                 | Average (3)              | Not good (2)             | Poor (1)                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |

### < Research Questions >

1. Which variety of English have you learned? Please listen to each sample speech of different varieties of English, and mark your choice. *You can mark more than one choice.*

- Sample 1 (*Please listen to a sample speech by clicking this.*)
- Sample 2 (*Please listen to a sample speech by clicking this.*)
- Not featured in either Sample 1 or Sample 2
- I don't know/don't remember.*

2. In your opinion, whose language English is? Please explain whose language you think English is in 1-2 sentences.

\_\_\_\_\_.

3. Do you know what “World Englishes” mean? If *yes*, please describe what it is in 1-2 sentences.

- Yes. World Englishes mean \_\_\_\_\_.
- No

4. Some people say that “World Englishes” can include all varieties of English spoken around the world: not only Englishes of the countries where English is spoken as a first language (e.g., Australia, United Kingdom, and the United States) but also Englishes of the countries where English is one of several official languages (e.g., India, Malaysia, and Singapore) and of the countries where English is used as a foreign language (e.g., Brazil, China, and South Korea).

*The following audio file includes examples of World Englishes. Please listen to sample speeches of World Englishes by clicking this.*

Is this description similar to your definition of World Englishes? Is this concept new to you or not?

- This concept is new to me.
- This concept is not new to me.

\* Source of the sample text in the audio samples:

Reynolds, G. (2018, September 5). The best sport for a longer life? Try tennis. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com>

5. Which variety of English are you mostly exposed to currently? *You can mark more than one choice.*

- English featured in Sample 1 (*You can listen to the sample speech one more time if you want.*)
- English featured in Sample 2 (*You can listen to the sample speech one more time if you want.*)
- World Englishes (*You can listen to the sample speeches one more time if you want.*)
- Others (*Please specify.*)
- I don't know.

6. Which variety of English have you been taught in school? *Please mark one choice **based on your high school experience**. You can mark more than one choice.*

- English featured in Sample 1 (*You can listen to the sample speech one more time if you want.*)
- English featured in Sample 2 (*You can listen to the sample speech one more time if you want.*)
- World Englishes (*You can listen to the sample speeches one more time if you want.*)
- Others (*Please specify.*)
- I don't know.*

7. As the English language grows in the world, it is creating new dialects called 'Englishes,' which include American English, British English, Indian English, Italian English, and several other 'Englishes' as mentioned above. In fact, English nowadays is more used by non-native speakers than by native speakers. Moreover, the majority of interaction in English by non-native speakers is with other non-native speakers than with native-speakers, and this proportion is expected to increase.

How important do you think it is for high school students to know/study about different varieties of English when listening to speech and practicing speaking? *Please mark one choice and specify your reason **based on your high school experience**.*

Extremely important	Somewhat important	Neutral	Not very important	Not important at all
(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
<input type="checkbox"/>				

Reason for your choice: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. How important do you think it is to include different varieties of English in English listening and speaking tests **administered to high school students**? Please mark one choice and specify your reason *based on your high school experience*.

Extremely important	Somewhat important	Neutral	Not very important	Not important at all
(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
<input type="checkbox"/>				

Reason for your choice: \_\_\_\_\_.

9. Would you like to change anything in your learning practice with regard to English varieties? Please mark one choice and specify your reason *based on your high school experience*.

- Yes
- No
- I don't know.*

Reason for your choice: \_\_\_\_\_.

10. If you have further comments to add, please feel free to write them in the space provided below.

Further comments: \_\_\_\_\_.

**This is the end of the questionnaire.**  
**Thank you for your participation!**

### **Appendix 3 A News Article Used for Audio-Recording**

Reynolds, G. (2018, September 5). The best sport for a longer life? Try tennis. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com>

*Playing tennis and other sports that are social might add years to your life, according to a new epidemiological study of Danish men and women. The study found that adults who reported frequently participating in tennis or other racket and team sports lived longer than people who were sedentary. But they also lived longer than people who took part in reliably healthy but often solitary activities such as jogging, swimming and cycling [.....]*