



Korean Elementary Pre-service Teachers' Experience of Learning and Using English and Attitudes towards World Englishes^{*}

Kiwan Sung

Kyung Hee University

This study investigates 135 Korean elementary preservice English teachers' (KEPETs) experience of learning and using English and their attitudes on World Englishes (WEes). They completed 52 7-Likert type items with 4 open-ended questions. The 10 KEPETs were also interviewed in a semi-structure manner. The ANOVA and independent t-tests of the survey data showed that the majority of these KEPETs predominantly learned and used American English and had limited experience in WEes. However, among the key findings of this study, the KEPETs in the survey appeared to fully understand the importance of exposing their learners to WEes and had willingness to teach them despite their lack of knowledge and skills on how to teach them. Similarly, the open-ended and interview data analyzed through either key word counts or the selection of recurring comments or issues revealed that several KEPETs were still entrenched in teaching only SE in class despite their positive attitude towards WEes and willingness to teach them in future. Accordingly, this paper calls for an immediate inclusion of WEes in elementary English teacher education given that raising young learners' awareness on WEes at an early stage can have a resounding impact on their attitudes towards WEes in future.

Keywords: World Englishes, preservice English teachers, language attitudes, teacher education

Introduction

Despite the caveat of disregarding accents or pronunciation in defining what 'standard' English (SE) is (e.g., Hughes & Trudgill, 1996; Smith & Nelson, 1985; Trudgill & Hannah, 2002), many EFL teachers and learners consider one's 'native-like' pronunciation important for TL proficiency (Kubota, 2001; Lee, Mo, Lee, & Sung, 2013; Lindemann, 2003). However, the use of terms such as 'standard' or 'native' is not correct and even misleading since such a view is hyperreal and does not have substance in reality. In ELT in Korea, the preference over SE and 'native' speakers of English incorrigibly continues due to the history of English teaching influenced by the U.S. and other English speaking countries (Sung, 2002). Such preference is well-documented in Korea as English is dubbed in many different denominations such as a global or international language, a common language or lingua franca, or language of business, international relations, and cultural transactions (e.g., Ko & Kim, 2015; No, 2005; Park, 2017). However, exposing or teaching only SE or English used in a few selected countries to young learners is not ideal in that they may form prejudice against those who use different English or even think that these speakers are

^{*} This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2016S1A5A2A01024364).

inferior to those who are from English speaking countries. As a matter of fact, most of these EFL learners will meet more ‘non-native’ speakers of English with different pronunciation in this globalized world. More seriously, in the EFL context where both studying English for tests and limited exposure to TL are everyday realities, teaching or forcing them to acquire native-like fluency is non-sense as it is an unachievable dream for many EFL learners (Jenkins, 2005, 2009; Seidlhofer, 2001, 2011).

In the field of ELT in Korea, despite the admonition to debunk the concepts of SE and acknowledgement of WEes in general, there is serious lack in the research and discussion on how new understandings of the existence and use of different types of English should be dealt with. This is more so in case of teaching young learners in elementary contexts in Korea as there is not enough research on how WEes should be reflected in teaching (Ko & Kim 2015). Accordingly, this study examines KEPETs’ experience of learning and using English and their attitudes towards teaching diverse English. Then, important practical suggestions for both teaching of and research on WEes are made as an effort to change the terrain of current English teaching, which is predominantly based on the ideology of SE or AE dominant in ELT in Korea.

Literature Review

As frequently cited, Kachru (1985) suggested a model of the Concentric Circle of English to classify English used in the world and such a pluralistic view of English is termed as World Englishes (WEes) since then. His classification of the countries into three circles, the Inner Circle (IC), Outer Circle (OC), and Expanding Circle (EC) depending on whether English is used as a mother tongue, second, or foreign language, respectively, has become a catalyst for other models such as McArthur’s (1987) the Circle of World English and Modiano’s (1999) model of English. However, these models are somewhat limited in that, for example, Kachru (1985) still places the English speaking countries at the center while McArthur (1987) puts World Standard English as if there is still one correct standard in English. On the other hand, Schneider (2003) suggests a five-stage Dynamic Model, which consists of Foundation — Exonormative Stabilization — Nativization — Endonormative Stabilization — Differentiation depending on how English has been developed in a specific region. His model explains the trajectory of how one type of English has been changing in a historical timeline due to colonization, trade, or other internal and external contacts with outsiders. However, Buschfeld and Kautzsch (2016) argues that not all the countries or peoples fit into this model because some countries have little experience of colonization compared to others. Instead, they view that English is changing because of ever-increasing influence from technology, media, and international transaction nowadays as in, for instance, Namibia, Singapore, Netherlands, and many other EC countries with no experience of colonization. Therefore, Buschfeld and Kautzsch (2016) propose the Extra- and Intra-territorial Forces Model based on Schneider’s model (2016) and claim that the people in these countries use English in their own ways rather than referring to an exonormative model of English of the colonizers.

In line with the term, WEes, scholars (e.g., Graddol, 2006; Schneider, 2003; Yano, 2001) use terms such as New Englishes (NEes), regional, or localized Englishes. Such terms are used as a way to counter the view of SE or native-like pronunciation as a norm, which is rather an ideal than a reality given that most learners can’t acquire such unrealistic and non-existing norms (Derwing & Munro, 2009; Field, 2005). Accordingly, from the standpoint of WEes, what matters is both intelligibility and comprehensibility in communication, which allows variations in pronunciation or language forms as explained in theories such as lingua franca core/non-core (Jenkins, 2005, 2007, 2009; Seidlhofer, 2011), English users’ diverse linguistic and cultural identities (Lippi-Green, 1997; Rooy, 2009), endonormative uses of English as a localized practice (Pennycook, 2007, 2010), and translanguaging practices of users of English for their own needs in a particular community (Canagarajah, 2010).

Since the emergence of the concept of WEes, there has been much research on diverse English in journals in ELT in the world (e.g., *English World-Wide*, *World Englishes*, *English Today*, or *Asian*

Englishes). Similarly, there have been an increasing number of studies on teachers' or learners' attitudes towards English as a global language (EGL), international language (EIL), or WEes mostly in college and some in secondary educational context in Korea (e.g., Choi, 2007; Choi, 2011; Kang & Lee, 2012; Lee, et al., 2013; K. Song, 2011a, 2011b, 2015; Sung, 2008; Tokumoto & Shibata, 2011; Yoon, 2007). For example, Ahn (2014) reports that the high school teachers who participated in her study were not sure of whether to include WEes or Korean English (KE) in their class though they agreed to the existence of diverse English in the world. Shim (2015)'s survey also showed that, though the 78 secondary English teachers were receptive of WEes, they worried over the lack of appropriate materials and evaluation tools. In addition, she reported that the young teachers in their 20s and 30s with study abroad experience had a high level of preference toward native speakers of English.

Compared to research on WEes in secondary and tertiary educational context, there is a limited number of works in the elementary context. Lee (2010) surveyed 1,327 in-service elementary English teachers using a nine-item survey and semi-structured interviews with 23 teachers. She reported that more than 85% of the teachers favored AE and lopsidedly selected the U.S., Canada, Britain, and Australia while excluding New Zealand or South Africa from the 14 countries listed when they were asked which country they thought of when hearing 'native English speakers.' She reported that such a view was due to the 'strange accent and pronunciation' of these speakers and it was also true of non-native speakers of English against whom these teachers maintained negative attitudes. That is, these teachers viewed AE as a default and norm-bound language though three teachers interviewed cared less about their own difference in accent or pronunciation while acknowledging they could not be like native speakers. In fact, citing the importance of English for international communication, these teachers acknowledged the existence and use of diverse English in the world.

No (2005) summarized key changes according in the English language as an international language and compared some differences in AE and British English (BE). She suggested that despite all the variety in English, AE should continue to be the target form in the elementary context as it is literally impossible to teach different varieties for beginning or young learners and there is variation in pronunciation among teachers and it is difficult to set criteria for understandable pronunciation in English as the curriculum directs.

Ko and Kim (2015) report a case study in which an elementary inservice teacher went through the change in her view on the EIL, from ignorance to awareness and change in practice. Based on a final assignment report of a course taught by Ko, the study reports how a female teacher became aware of EIL and went through conflicting phases of sense-making. For example, though agreeing to the view of EIL and to the use of one's own English in his/her own way, she wrote she had no choice but to teach AE. However, she was hesitant in learning different pronunciation by herself since she should be a model to her students or teaching it to her children though she acknowledged the importance of exposing her students to diverse pronunciation and projected a far future where diverse English is accepted and used as in the concept of English as a common language. Ko also agreed to this teacher's view of teaching AE because it is what is required in the society and can be done by the teacher. However, she distinguished the difference between what to be taught and what to be known to children and argued that teachers should inform existence of diverse English to learners. In these three studies reviewed above, whether it be SE, EIL, or WEes, it appears that one's accent and/or pronunciation take the prime concern, though one's accent or pronunciation is not a factor in deciding whether or not a language is a standard or not. In addition, the insistence of teaching AE only due to the difficulty of exposing diverse variety or lack of teachers' English ability is literally tantamount to maintaining the status quo of current teaching practice as it is contradictory to think of teach one form of TL while it is generally agreed that exposing learners to diverse culture is important. Language is part of culture after all.

Given the lack of research on WEes in elementary English teaching context, and more so for preservice teachers, in Korea, this study examines KEPETs' experience of learning and using English and their attitudes toward teaching WEes along with their views on advantages, difficulties, and supports in teaching WEes in the classroom as presented below.

1. What are KEPETs’ English learning experience and use of English?
2. What are KEPETs’ attitudes toward WEes and teaching them in the future?
3. What are KEPETs’ views on advantages, difficulties, and necessary supports in teaching WEes in the future?

Methods

Subjects¹

The 135 KEPETs (29 male, 106 female) participated in this study. Among them, there were 37 freshmen, 42 sophomores, 22 juniors, 34 seniors who completed the survey. These KEPETs were studying at 6 different universities in 6 major cities in Korea. Out of the only 33 KEPETs (24.4%) with overseas or study-abroad experiences, the majority of them (n = 29, 87.87%) went to English speaking countries such as the U.S. (17), Canada (4), Australia (3), New Zealand (3), and the U.K. (2), while the two KEPETs went to the Philippines. There was only one student who went to China and India, respectively. The 21 KEPETs went abroad for more than one year, the 7 KEPETs stayed for about two years or more, and the four KEPETs stayed fewer than 8 months in the host countries. Among 135 KEPETs, 59 of them (43.7%) had taken official English tests such as the Test of English as an International Communication (TOEIC), the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), the Test of English Proficiency developed by Seoul National University (TEPS), the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), etc. Given that it was very competitive to enter a university of elementary education in Korea, the KEPETs’ language proficiency test scores were rather high.

In addition to the survey, the 10 KEPETs (8 female and 2 male) were selected based on their professors’ recommendation and each KEPET was interviewed for 25-35 minutes on the phone in a semi-structured format, mainly due to the long distance problem of meeting them face-to-face. As in Table 1, all the interviewees attended colleges of elementary education located in large cities or near. Their English ability was on the high end as the scores of the eight interviewees show below. One KEPET could not provide her score because she had taken it long ago while another said she did not take any test before. The study abroad experiences of these KEPETs were rather limited in that only four went to English speaking countries no more than 10 months as exchange students or for short-term language or cultural experience in such countries as the U.S., Canada, New Zealand, or Australia. All other KEPETs also said they had travelled to some Asian or European countries for a short period. All the interviews were done in Korean to allow the KEPETs to express their thoughts on questions exactly and fully. Lastly, ID numbers were assigned to each interviewee to ensure anonymity of their identity.

TABLE 1
Demographic Information of KEPET Interviewees

ID	Year	Gender	Test score	Study-abroad
E-1	Junior	F	TOEIC (840)	n/a
E-2	Sophomore	F	TOEIC (970)	U. S.
E-3	Junior	F	TOEIC (above 800)	n/a
E-4	Sophomore	F	n/a	n/a
E-5	Junior	F	TOEIC (no score)	Canada
E-6	Junior	F	TOEIC (750)	New Zealand
E-7	Senior	F	TOEIC (850)	Australia (volunteer)
E-8	Senior	F	TOEIC (895)	n/a
E-9	Senior	M	TOEIC (950)	n/a
E-10	Senior	M	TOEIC (905)	n/a

¹ This study is part of a large scale research and utilizes the data analysis methods used in Sung (2018) with the survey and interview data relevant to the elementary English teaching context in Korea.

Instruments

Survey²

The survey for this study was developed based on relevant literature and previous studies in secondary and college settings (e.g., Ahn, 2014; Choi, 2007; Lee, et al., 2013; Shim, 2015; Tokumoto & Shibata, 2011) as there was not enough research in the elementary context. After adapting the items based on previous literature and studies while some questions are constructed by the researcher, the survey was, first, pilot tested for the reliability. Then, the researcher added some items, changes wordings, or deleted the items to raise the reliability of the survey, which was Cronbach Alpha of .850 in the end. The survey consisted of 52 7 likert-type items in three sections; 12 questions on KEPETs' prior learning experience of English, 20 questions on their views of using diverse English, and 20 questions on their attitudes toward WEes. In addition, four open-ended questions were given to the respondents to examine their experience of learning and using English and attitude towards teaching WEes in a detailed manner. Due to long distance of each university located across the country, the surveys were collected online with the help of the KEPETs' professors in charge of the programs.

Interview

After the preliminary analysis of the survey responses, the semi-structured interviews were done to either confirm or seek further clarification on their replies on WEes and possibilities of teaching them after their acquisition of the teacher certificate. The guiding questions for the focus group interviews included 1) their views on types of English used as a common language or most used in the world, used by self, recommended by the ENC, and taught in school, 2) whether they were aware of WEes before the survey, 3) their awareness of and attitude toward accepting WEes, 4) their extent of using English with the peoples from the OC or EC countries and their thoughts on such experiences, 5) their views on allowing the peoples from the OC or EC countries to teach English in elementary or secondary schools, and 6) their thoughts on teaching WEes in their future classrooms in terms of positive and negative aspects along with the supports necessary when they want to teach WEes in class.

Data Analysis

The 52 survey items were first grouped into different categories according to similar themes for further analysis or were analyzed individually in case the item did not belong to a particular category. Table 2 shows the categories made after grouping relevant items that were used in the final analysis.

First, according to the variable types and number of groups related to research questions, statistical analyses such as descriptive or inferential statistics (i.e., ANOVA, independent t-tests) were done using SPSS22 (cf. only the results with statistically significant differences are reported due to the page limit). Second, as for the four open-ended questions, the responses were read multiple times and coded according to the respondents' written answers on questions such as types of English they thought they used or experiences, and views of allowing those from the OC and EC to teach in Korea, and their attitudes towards teaching WEes in future in terms of positive and negative aspects and supports needed. Then, the interview data was first transcribed by both the researcher and a research assistant and member-checked by sending them to each KEPET to check the accuracy of the talk or to provide an opportunity to revise or add what they said during the interviews. Then, the researcher read all the transcripts multiple times to find recurring ideas or issues in their replies and to compare and select recurring themes or issues to identify some (in)consistent patterns in their replies. Lastly, as for the direct quotes, as a way to ensure accuracy of representing the KEPETs' views, a back-to-back translation and check-up method was used

² Contact the author to acquire the actual survey as it could not be included here due to the page limitation.

by asking two experts in the field to read sample parts of English, translate them into Korean, and compare with the original interview data in Korean. This process ensured the accuracy of representing the KEPETs' replied for the questions and allowed the researcher to revise some words or expressions accordingly.

TABLE 2
Categories of Survey Items Grouped

Category	Items	Item No.
English Learning Experiences	Study Experience in WEes	I-Q2, 3, 4, 5
	Agreement in SE	I-Q6, 7
	Study Experience in SE	I-Q8, 9
	Learning English Used in OC/EC	I-Q10, 11
Views of English Use	Communicative Ability with EC/OC Speakers	II-Q2, 12
	Priority of Communication Using English	II-Q4, 20
	Preference of SE & NSEs	II-Q7, 8, 9, 10
	SE Influence in Job Seeking	II-Q13, 14
Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future	Preference of Teaching SE	III-Q1, 2, 4, 6
	Willingness to Teach WEes	III-Q5, 7, 14
	Willingness to Use Materials for WEes	III-Q9, 10, 11, 12

Results

Results of Survey Analysis

Differences in KEPETs' experiences and attitudes by years at college

Table 3 below shows the descriptive statistics of the survey data according to their college years.

TABLE 3
Descriptive Statistics of Survey Items by Year

Category	Items	Year	n	m	s.d.
Views of English Use	IC as ECL	Freshmen	37	4.08	1.588
		Sophomores	43	4.70	1.66
		Juniors	22	5.45	1.50
		Seniors	33	4.27	1.82
		Total	135	4.55	1.70
Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future	Need of Teacher Training to Teach WEes	Freshmen	37	5.51	1.39
		Sophomores	43	4.70	1.47
		Juniors	22	5.41	1.53
		Seniors	33	4.72	1.55
		Total	135	5.04	1.51
	Willingness to Use Materials for WEes	Freshmen	37	20.57	5.58
		Sophomores	43	17.14	5.68
		Juniors	22	20.00	6.09
		Seniors	33	17.33	5.99
		Total	135	18.59	5.95

In Table 4, the ANOVA results revealed that there was no statistical difference in the subjects' English learning experience while, in the Views of English Use, there was a statistically significant difference ($F(3, 131) = 3.593, p = .015$). That is, the Tukey post-hoc test showed that there was a statistically difference in that the juniors agreed more on the view of English used by IC speakers as a common

language compared to the first year KEPETs. As for the category of Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future, there were two statistically significant differences, on the Need of Teacher Training to Teach WEes ($F(3, 131) = 2.984, p = .034$) and on the willingness of using diverse materials for WEes ($F(3, 131) = 3.279, p = .023$). The Tukey post hoc tests showed that, for both items, the freshmen agreed more than the sophomore KEPETs.

TABLE 4
Results of One-way ANOVA Analysis of Survey Items by Years

Category	Items	Group	ssm	df	ms	F	Sig.
Views of English Use	IC as ECL	Between Groups	29.611	3	9.870	3.593	.015
		Within Groups	359.827	131	2.747		
		Total	389.437	134			
Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future	Need of Teacher Training to Teach WEes	Between Groups	19.557	3	6.519	2.984	.034
		Within Groups	286.177	131	2.185		
		Total	305.733	134			
	Willingness to Use Materials for WEes	Between Groups	331.015	3	110.338	3.279	.023
		Within Groups	4407.577	131	33.646		
		Total	4738.593	134			

Results of survey analysis based on the KEPETs' self-rated English ability

Given that the KEPETs in this study were from different regions in Korea it was not feasible to directly evaluate their current levels of English abilities. More than half of them had no English proficiency test scores such as TOEIC, TOEFL, or IELTS, either. Thus, they were asked to rate their English abilities on the scale of 1 (extremely poor) to 7 (excellent). Then, their self-rated abilities were collapsed into the two groups (Low: 1-4, High: 5-7) because of the uneven or smaller numbers in their replies. No one rated his or her level as 1 (extremely poor) while 6 KEPETs marked 2 (very poor) and 9 KEPETs checked 3 (poor). As a result, there were 55 KEPETs (40.7%) in the low group and 80 KEPETs (59.3%) in the high group.

Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics of the survey items based on the KEPETs' self-rated English ability, and Table 6 shows results of the independent t-tests based the respondents' self-rated English ability.

First, in the category of English Learning Experience, there were two statistical difference; Study Experience in SE ($df = 133, t = -2.860, p = .005$) and Learning English Used in OC and EC ($df = 133, t = -4.697, p = .000$). Second, regarding the Views of English Use, there were statistically significant differences in 5 items; The high group said they had better Communicative Ability with IC Speakers ($df = 133, t = -6.953, p = .000$) and OC Speakers ($df = 133, t = -5.050, p = .000$). However, the high group also agreed more to the statements on the Similarity of their English to SE ($df = 133, t = -2.301, p = .023$), Priority of Communication Using English ($df = 133, t = -3.259, p = .001$). On the contrary, they also preferred SE and NSEs when teaching and learning English at a statistically significant level ($df = 133, t = -2.223, p = .028$).

Third, concerning the Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future, the high group agreed more in the nine items at a statistically significant level than the low group. The KEPETs in the high group agreed more that one could teach English in school as long as they are fluent regardless of country origin ($df = 133, t = -3.534, p = .001$). Relatedly, they also agreed more to the ownership of English belonged to its users ($df = 133, t = -3.558, p = .001$) and had the Willingness to Teach WEes ($df = 133, t = -4.032, p = .000$) and agreed to the statement regarding the Need of Exposure to English used in OC ($df = 133, t = -3.220, p = .002$). The KEPETs in the high group agreed more to the Willingness to Diverse Materials for WEes ($df = 133, t = -2.448, p = .016$). The KEPETs in the high group also replied more positively to the Helpfulness of WEes for Learners ($df = 133, t = -3.966, p = .000$). However, they said they should learn more about WEes if possible ($df = 133, t = -4.028, p = .000$) and need a different curriculum to teach WEes ($df = 133, t = -4.007, p = .000$), teacher training programs ($df = 133, t = -3.963, p = .000$), and different evaluation methods for WEes ($df = 133, t = -4.530, p = .000$).

TABLE 5
Descriptive Statistics of Survey Items by Self-rated English Ability

Category	Items	Group	n	m	s.d.	
English learning Experience	Study Experience in SE	Low	55	8.29	.98	
		High	80	8.90	1.36	
	Learning English Used in OC and EC	Low	55	6.85	2.32	
		High	80	8.99	2.76	
Views of English Use	Communicative Ability with IC Speakers	Low	55	3.67	1.22	
		High	80	5.16	1.23	
	Communicative Ability with OC Speakers	Low	55	7.69	2.18	
		High	80	9.75	2.42	
	Similarity of Own English with SE	Low	55	4.15	1.31	
		High	80	4.71	1.49	
	Priority of Communication Using English	Low	55	9.69	2.17	
		High	80	10.84	1.89	
	Preferences of SE and NSEs	Low	55	20.73	4.37	
		High	80	22.43	4.36	
	Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future	No Country Origin for Fluent Users	Low	55	4.87	1.54
			High	80	5.73	1.25
Recognition of Ownership of English Users		Low	55	5.20	1.31	
		High	80	5.95	1.12	
Willingness of Teaching WEes if Possible		Low	55	14.64	2.97	
		High	80	16.69	2.86	
Willingness to Use Materials for WEes		Low	55	17.11	5.14	
		High	80	19.61	6.27	
Need of More Learning on WEes		Low	55	5.38	1.43	
		High	80	6.21	.96	
Helpfulness of WEes for Learners		Low	55	4.75	1.34	
		High	80	5.63	1.22	
Curricular Need of WEes	Low	55	4.13	1.38		
	High	80	5.14	1.48		
Need of Teacher Training to Teach WEes	Low	55	4.45	1.45		
	High	80	5.45	1.42		
Evaluation Need for WEes	Low	55	4.25	1.51		
	High	80	5.38	1.34		

TABLE 6
Results of Independent t-tests of Survey Items by Self-rated English Ability

Category	Items	t	df	p
English Learning Experience	Study Experience in SE	-2.860	133	.005
	Learning English Used in OC and EC	-4.697	133	.000
Views of English Use	Communicative Ability with IC Speakers	-6.953	133	.000
	Communicative Ability with OC speakers	-5.050	133	.000
	Similarity of Own English with SE	-2.301	133	.023
	Priority of Communication Using English	-3.259	133	.001
	Preferences of SE and NSEs	-2.223	133	.028
Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future	No Country Origin for Fluent Users	-3.534	133	.001
	Recognition of Ownership of English Users	-3.558	133	.001
	Willingness of Teaching WEes	-4.032	133	.000
	Willingness to Use Materials for WEes	-2.448	133	.016
	Need of More Learning on WEes if Possible	-4.028	133	.000
	Helpfulness of WEes for Learners	-3.966	133	.000
	Curricular Need of WEes	-4.007	133	.000
	Need of Teacher Training to Teach WEes	-3.963	133	.000
	Evaluation Need for WEes	-4.530	133	.000

Results of survey analysis based on the KEPETs' English test-taking experience

Table 7 shows the descriptive statistics on the survey items based on the KEPETs' experience in taking official English proficiency tests. There were 59 KEPETs who took such tests while 76 did not.

TABLE 7
Descriptive Statistics of Survey Items by Test-taking Experience

Category	Items	Test Taken	n	m	s.d.
English Learning Experience	Knowledge on WEes	No	76	2.74	1.27
		Yes	59	3.27	1.66
Views of English Use	Pride in KE	No	76	3.53	1.35
		Yes	59	3.00	1.45
Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future	Potential Problems in Teaching WEes	No	76	5.00	1.40
		Yes	59	5.64	1.39

The independent t-tests showed that there were 3 statistically significant differences between the KEPET test takers and test non-takers as in Table 8 below.

TABLE 8
Results of Independent t-tests of Survey Items by Test-taking Experience

Category	Items	t	df	p
English Learning Experience	Knowledge on WEes	-2.121	133	.036
Views of English Use	Pride in KE	2.174	133	.031
Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future	Potential Problems in Teaching WEes	-2.668	133	.009

First, in the category of English Learning Experiences, there was only one statistically significant difference ($df = 133, t = -2.121, p = .036$): Those who had taken English tests before ($m = 3.27$) replied that they had more knowledge on WEes than those who did not ($m = 2.74$). However, the means for both groups were rather on the disagreement side. Second, there was only one statistical difference in the category of Views of English Use. The KEPETs with no test-taking experience ($m = 3.53$) said they were more proud of Korean English than their counterpart ($m = 3.00$) at a statistically significant level ($df = 133, t = 2.174, p = .031$). However, it should be kept in mind that the means for both groups were also less than the mid-point of the 7 Likert scale. Lastly, in the category of Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future, there was a statistically significant difference in Potential Problems in Teaching WEes ($df = 133, t = -2.668, p = .009$). The test-taking group ($m = 5.64$) was also more positive on the idea of teaching WEes at school in future compared to the non-test-taking group ($m = 5.00$).

Results of survey analysis based on the KEPETs' study-abroad experience

As in Table 9, there were only 33 KEPETs who studied abroad at the time of this study. The descriptive statistics of the survey items based on the KEPETs' study-abroad experience are presented below.

TABLE 9
Results of Descriptive Statistics of Survey Items by Study-abroad Experience

Category	Items	Study-abroad	n	m	s.d.
Views of English Use	Communicative Ability with IC Speakers	No	102	4.25	1.34
		Yes	33	5.48	1.28
	Communicative Ability with OC Speakers	No	102	8.50	2.37
		Yes	33	10.18	2.63
	Priority of Communication Using English	No	102	10.14	2.07
		Yes	33	11.06	1.98
	Similarity of Own English with SE	No	102	4.32	1.42
		Yes	33	4.97	1.38
	OC English as Common Language	No	102	4.50	1.45
		Yes	33	5.15	1.20
Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future	Enhancing Pride in KE	No	102	4.22	1.37
		Yes	33	4.76	1.15
	Need of More Learning on WEes	No	102	5.66	1.31
		Yes	33	6.55	0.67
	Need of Teacher Training to Teach WEes	No	102	4.87	1.52
		Yes	33	5.58	1.37
	Evaluation Need for WEes	No	102	4.73	1.52
		Yes	33	5.52	1.33
	Willingness of Teaching WEes	No	102	15.54	3.21
		Yes	33	17.24	2.97

First, in the category of English Learning Experience, there was no statistically significant difference. Second, in the category of Views of English Use, there were five items with statistically significant differences. That is, those who had studied abroad agreed more on Communicative Ability with IC Speakers ($df = 133, t = -4.634, p < .000$), Communicative Ability with OC Speakers ($df = 133, t = -3.449, p = .001$), Priority of Communication Using English ($df = 133, t = -2.226, p = .028$), Similarity of Own English with SE ($df = 133, t = -2.293, p = .023$), and English in OC as Common Language ($df = 133, t = -2.337, p = .021$). Third, there were five statistically significant differences in the category of Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future. The KEPETs with study abroad experience agreed more Enhancing Pride in KE ($df = 133, t = -2.052, p = .042$), Need of More Learning on WEes ($df = 133, t = -3.740, p = .000$), Need of Teacher Training to Teach WEes ($df = 133, t = -2.364, p = .020$), Evaluation Need for WEes ($df = 133, t = -2.668, p = .009$), Willingness of Teaching WEes ($df = 133, t = -2.698, p = .008$).

TABLE 10
Results of Independent t-tests of Survey Items by Study-abroad Experience

Category	Items	t	d.f.	p
Views of English Use	Communicative Ability with IC Speakers	-4.634	133	.000
	Communicative Ability with OC Speakers	-3.449	133	.001
	Priority of Communication Using English	-2.226	133	.028
	Similarity of Own English with SE	-2.293	133	.023
	OC English as Common Language	-2.337	133	.021
Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future	Enhancing Pride in KE	-2.052	133	.042
	Need of More Learning on WEes	-3.740	133	.000
	Need of Teacher Training to Teach WEes	-2.364	133	.020
	Evaluation Need for WEes	-2.668	133	.009
	Willingness of Teaching WEes	-2.698	133	.008

Results of Analysis of Open-ended Questions and Interview Data

KEPETs' views on open-ended survey questions

(1) Types of English Learned and Used by Self

Concerning types of English they had used at the time of the survey, there were 48 replies (57.14%) which stated that they used AE while 14 replies (16.6%) indicated Korean English. Then, other replies were in the order of Textbook English (n = 8, 9.5%), SE (n = 7, 8.3%), and BE (n = 4, 4.76%). However, there were only two replies concerning World English(es) and only one referring to Practical English;

TABLE 11
KEPETs' Views of English Use by Self

Responses	n	Responses	n
American English	48	British English	4
Korean English	14	World English(es)	2
Textbook English	8	Practical English	1
Standard English	7		
Total		84	

(2) English Offered in the English National Curriculum

There were 44 replies (55.5%), which stated that the ENC promotes AE. There were also 16 replies (20.0%) which stated that the ENC is for the college entrance exams. In addition, there were some different replies mentioned three times or fewer such as SE, B, Grammar English, Korean English, etc. Interestingly, there was only one reply that the ENC recommends World English(es) as below;

TABLE 12
KEPETs' Views on Types of English in ENC

Responses	n	Responses	n
American English	44	English for communication	3
English for college entrance	16	Textbook English	3
Standard English	3	Korean English	2
British English	3	English for rote learning	2
Grammar English	3	World English(es)	1
Total		80	

(3) KEPETs' Attitude towards Teaching WEes

On the question of whether or not to teach WEes, 41 replies (42.70%) were positive while 16 replies (16.66%) were uncertain. However, 14 replies (14.58%) were on the negative side. There were also answers that teaching WEes in school would be difficult (n = 13, 13.54%) or confusing (n = 12, 12.5%);

Table 13
KEPETs' Responses on Teaching WEes in School

Responses	n	Responses	n
Positive	41	Negative	14
Middle of the road	16	Difficult	13
Negative	14	Confusing	12
Total	96		

(4) Advantages and Difficulties of Teaching WEes

As for advantages of teaching WEes, the two most frequent replies were providing Diverse perspectives on English (n = 35, 67.30%) and providing Diverse Cultural Experience (n = 10, 19.23%) to students. In addition, there were some infrequent replies such as diverse pronunciation (n = 3), more expertise in English (n = 2), and so on. Regarding difficulties in teaching WEes in school, the majority of replies (n = 41, 71.93%) was that it would cause confusion in teaching (n = 21, 36.8%) or confusion in pronunciation (n = 20, 35.1%). Other replies were degrading teachers' teaching expertise (n = 5), lack of its utility (n = 4), difficulty of teaching WEes under the existing curriculum (n = 3), limitation in communication (n = 2), and burden in learning (n = 2) as in Table below;

TABLE 14
KEPETs' Views on Advantages and Difficulties of Teaching WEes in Future

Advantages in Teaching WEes	n	Difficulties in WEes	n
Diverse perspectives on English	35	Cause of confusion in teaching	21
Diverse(multi) cultural experience	10	Confusion in pronunciation	20
Diverse pronunciation	3	Degradation of teaching	5
More expertise in teaching	2	Lack of utility	4
Efficient to teach	1	Difficulty of teaching under	3
Enhancing understandability	1	Limitation in communication	2
		Burden in learning	2
Total	52	Total	57

KEPETs' views in interview data

(1) KEPET Interviewees' Experiences of Learning and Using English

Nine out of ten interviewees said that they studied AE while one interviewee said she learned 'grammar English'. Some of them had a strong view that what they learned is a SE. When asked what kind of English is mostly used in the world, all ten interviewees said that it was AE while two also mentioned British English. Similarly, all the interviewees said they learned and had used AE though E-3 mentioned that her English is Korean English as below;

Researcher(R): What kind of English do you think is used most in the world?
 E3: The U.S...U.S.
 R: The U.S. English? Any other?
 E3: I think the U.S. or British English is used most, probably.
 R: Probably? So do you think the U.S. English is used most in the world?
 E3: Yes. I do.
 R: Then, what kind of English do you think you use?
 E3: Korean English.
 R: Korean English?
 E3: Yes.

Regarding the questions related to the existence of SE, eight interviewees agreed to it while one interviewee was unsure of its existence. However, one KEPET strongly disagreed with the existence of SE by saying there were no accurate criteria to decide whether or not one is more standard than the other. In addition, the five interviewees said English varieties used by OC or EC speakers can't be a standard due to the dominance of AE or BE, different features in their English, and particularities of using English in each country.

(2) KEPET Interviewees' Views on English Offered in ENC

All the interviewees except one also replied that the ENC of Korea endorsed teaching of AE though she

appeared to understand that it is not true as below:

R: Then, do you think that English taught in school now should American (U.S.) English or so-called standard English? Do you feel that such English is actually taught in school now?

E8: Yes.

R: Have you ever read the ENC?

E8: Yes. As I am preparing for the National Teacher Employment Exam...

R: Does the ENC explicitly recommend teaching of US English or standard English?

E8: No. Not explicitly...

R: Then, why do you think as you are now?

E8: in the process of actualizing the ENC, I am not sure whether or not the U.S. English is reflected in the entire curriculum...I have some doubt but...

E10, however, said, "we seek to teach English in our own way heavily focusing on grammar, which is a Korean style English." As a matter of fact, he was the only one interviewee who understood the direction of the ENC as in the following excerpt:

R: What kind of English is being promoted in the ENC?

E10: As it emphasizes culture and diversity, I think it promotes students to experience culture and language...The curriculum guides us to help students experience cultures from both English and non-English countries but the textbooks are too much skills-oriented...such as listening, reading, speaking, writing...there are too many skills-based periods in class...

R: Then when you teach students at elementary school, you mentioned before that we teach grammar English or English in our own way according to the ENC. Do you think teachers or people will not accept diverse types of English for communication?

E10: I think though grammar English or a Korean style English is taught, but when I student-teach or observe some others teach in class, the CLT model is used...

(3) KEPET Interviewees' Attitudes toward Diverse Speakers of English

Regarding whether or not they were cognizant of WEes before the survey, nine interviewees said that they had never heard of it but one said she heard of it before but she could not explain what it was;

R: Have you ever heard the term, "World Englishes" before the survey?

E5: No. I've never heard about it.

R: Never?

E5: No...

R: Uhm. You have learned about it, either?

E5: No...I thought there was only the U.S. English and learned it thinking that it was everything that all people use.

R: So do you mean that you learned the U.S. English thinking that it is commonly used by everybody?

E5: Yes. I've rarely experienced other types of English at language institutes, school, or other places. So I sort of thought I was learning only English used in the U.S. as a matter of course.

When the researcher explained what WEes are, the majority of them agreed to the existence of diverse English and commented that there are many different kinds of English are used in the world or that meaning or communication in using English should be a priority despite some mistakes in pronunciation or grammar;

R: Have you ever heard of the term, 'World Englishes' before the survey?

E10: No, never.

R: Now you know about them. What is your thought on these?

E10: I am positive about such terms.

R: What do you mean by 'positive'?

E10: I think we should not be 'too concerned' about using one type of English.

R: Do you think we can allow students to use different types of English?

E10: Yes. Yes.

As a matter of fact, though there were only 4 KEPET interviewees with study-abroad experiences, all the interviewees had previous experiences interacting with speakers from the OC or EC countries on campus or while travelling. They said they initially had some difficulties in talking to them due to different pronunciation but they became accustomed to it soon and could engage in communication with no major difficulty. When asked whether these foreign speakers of English could teach if they were proficient, eight interviewees said that it was possible despite varying degrees of concerns in doing so;

R: Then, what do you think of bring in teachers from the OC or EC countries?

E1: I mean...language is not so much about who uses it as how correctly it is used... So whether they come from English speaking countries or not, it is okay as long as they use it correctly. Koreans, Japanese, or...

R: You said, 'correctly', do you mean they have to speak a certain type of English such as American English or...?

E1: Ah...not really. I think there is no correct English...the U.S English is its own and British English is its own, too...

R: Then, what do you think of bring in teachers from the OC or EC countries?

E2: Ah...I mean...hmm...If they are good at English...that is...uh...I think I talked as if the U.S. English is like a standard in some sense...but if one is good at English when teaching it, she will know what to focus on or what to be careful about...so it doesn't matter...

R: It doesn't matter?

E2: Yes. I think it is possible for them to teach in school.

R: Then, what do you think of bring in teachers from the OC or EC countries?

E6: Um...I personally think it is okay...

R: I see...

E6: But considering the educational atmosphere now, some will be against it ((laugh)).

R: Against it? Why do you think they will...?

E6: Uh...I think...I...pronunciation or such superficial reasons...that is...what can I say...some preventions...such things exist...

R: Preventions? Who or what prevents...?

E6: Um...our society... ((a long pause.))

R: So do you think there are some stereotypes, right?

E6: Yes. There are stereotypes against them.

R: Do you think it is worth bringing in teachers from these countries and such policies are okay even though it may cause some confusion at first?

E7: Yes. But having only one teacher like this will be difficult...because his or her English is going to be considered 'only English' to learn...It is okay to bring them in but it should be to help them experience different English...

R: So do you think it is possible to bring them to elementary schools?

E7: Uh...not to teach their English...just to expose them to students...at first...

Unlike the other interviewees, one interviewee, however, disagreed to the idea of bring as exemplified below;

R: ... do you think those who come from the EC or OC countries what are really good at English can teach English in elementary school?

E4: I think not if they come from such countries.

R: Can you explain why not?

E4: For example, I think it is okay for Indian teachers teach English to the students but if a Thai teacher teach English, it is kind of less convincing, to be honest. Because English is not used officially there...

Teaching WEes in future: Attitudes, advantages, difficulties, and supports

(1) Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future

The following shows the interviewees’ responses regarding their willingness to teach WEes in future.

TABLE 15
Results of KEPET Interviews on Attitude toward Teaching WEes

Question	Responses
Willingness of teaching WEes	-Exposure needed in secondary school -Explicit teaching of WEes after deciding right proportion per each grade but may not be taught in reality -Priority of overcoming preconceptions against it -More concerns than a full endorsement -Have to accept and teach WEes despite difficulties in pronunciation,

The 6 KEPET interviewees agreed or said that they would make an effort to include it. However, the two said they would only focus on and teach S.E. However, the other KEPETs said they would do so if teaching WEes is required by the ENC or in taking exams as follows;

E7: For students, I think it may be more possible for upper grades in high or middle school and I seriously think it will cause some confusion to the lower graders or elementary students who do not know language well ... And I think there should be more discussion on how this will practically be included in the curriculum. It is because language is really tied to culture ... diverse expressions in English ... without overall understanding of culture, I do not think it is meaningful only to learn language in different ways ... I think a curricular manual which includes all of these seems necessary...

There were also some concerns of teaching WEes though the necessity of doing so is acknowledged as below;

E8: I agree with (teaching WEes), but as I told you if we teach too much of it, there will be confusion ... It may be good if students can experience diverse culture but students may be more receptive to it later just by letting them know there are some different varieties in English pronunciation ...

E2: I was able to understand British English but not Australian English when I took TOEIC. So I think it is necessary to expose students to different English ... but I do not know because I think it is necessary to learn diverse pronunciation but I wonder whether or not it should be done in middle or high school ... because it is somehow ... though different people use English but it is based on English from the English speaking countries ... so learning should

be based on such English ... I think ...

(2) Advantages of Teaching WEes

When asked about some advantages of teaching WES, the KEPET interviewees's most frequent responses were "Experiencing diverse Englishes (3)". There were other responses such as enhancing student understanding of diverse English in link with culture, developing better ability to cope with different situations, enjoying communicating with others from different countries, and, interesting, feeling less stress of teaching one type of English on the part of the teacher. The following excerpts shows some of these views;

E5: I think children can feel happy as they can talk to foreigners and get meaning across well who are other than Americans or English. Such an advantage of being able to communicate ... the happiness of communicating with them. You know such feeling, little by little, you realize you are communicating with this person, linguistically, having such feeling is an advantage, which is better than feeling frustrated with being unable to communicate...

E3: Uh ... Yes. I think it will be good, really good ... Yes. My English learnt in Korea is not bad but after I used it abroad I realized that we just ask students to use American white people's English well and we emphasize this always. But this is not so anymore and when children meet those teachers who are from non-English speaking countries but speak English well or other fluent speakers ... I think they may naturally think that you do not have to have native like pronunciation or speak like them all the time...

The following excerpt shows rather a unique view of teaching WEes as an advantage for teachers who have to deal with those who had been abroad and were more fluent in English in class;

E9: The advantage (of teaching WEes) is, one doesn't have to learn English in a uniform manner. I mean, when my friends or in-service teachers are in class, they have many different dilemmas. It is because if there are students who have been abroad, those students are better in terms of pronunciation and so on ... so teaching them with one type of pronunciation...especially when the U.S. English is considered as a standard as in our country, teachers may feel stressful ... so it is better to inform students of the existence of a variety of English in the world. Also if educational policies move toward such a direction, teachers may feel less burden, I think.

(3) Difficulties in Teaching WEes

As for the KEPET interviewees' views on potential disadvantages or difficulties of teaching WEes in class, there were quite a few responses such as inaccuracy of rules or pronunciation in WEes, lack of training programs or materials, teachers' and students' lack of familiarity and experience in WEes, the necessity of teachers' self-study on WEes and adequate teaching methods for WEes, extra-burden of teaching and learning for both teachers and students, and the view of teaching WEes as time-consuming. For example, E1 expressed the potential confusion in pronunciation in teaching WEes while also worrying about teachers' lack of knowledge on differences in different types of English and, thus, the difficulty of teaching diverse English appropriately;

R: What kinds of difficulty do you think there are in teaching WEes in future?

E1: It will take more time for students to acquire language because there will be some differences in pronunciation in the same word and all of such elements should be taught, which may cause some confusion...

R: Any more difficulty or shortcoming in teaching it?

E1: I think teachers will feel difficulty in studying ... as they should know all the differences in order to teach...

R: Are you saying teachers will have difficulty in preparing to teach?

E1: Taking time may not matter and it takes a long time to acquire language ... but when they have only studied the U.S. English and now they have to know the British English ... so such will take much time ... I have some doubt whether a teacher will teach it after knowing or understanding it fully ... s/he may just scratch the surface...

One of the big concerns in teaching WEes was the teacher’s lack of knowledge and experience in WEes as two KEPETs shared below;

E4: It may be so as there is a difference between when someone learns a language and when s/he has to teach it ... There are difficulties, I think ... We all learn the U.S. English basically so when we have to teach subtle differences in accents between the British English and the U.S. English, we need to newly learn about the former, which will pose some difficulties for us ... to learn such new and different things ... but I think we should accept the fact that we should endure learning it to some extent...

E8: Realistically, I can’t cover all the varieties of WEes. And even though I know some, I won’t be sure whether I know them correctly or am not going to be knowledgeable of all those ... so that will be a biggest problem.

Another unique view was that teaching WEes may not be good for elementary English learners but rather in college as shown below;

R: You said earlier that you had difficulty in communicating with those who came from non-English speaking countries. Thus we can sort of predict that many will have such a difficulty and can’t we teach about such differences early?

E4: Then, there will be too much to learn for children ... it may be okay to teach such differences in high school but for elementary school children...

R: Do you mean it is okay to teach WEes in high school but not in elementary school? How about in college??

E4: I think it will be okay to learning about it in college.

(4) Supports needed in teaching WEes

Table 16 below is the interviewees’ views of supports necessary if they are going to include WEes in their future classroom;

TABLE 16
Results of Interviews on Supports Needed in Teaching WEes

Question	Answers
Supports needed in teaching WEes	-Teaching materials or guideline (8) -Teacher training or workshop (5) -Teacher experience & knowledge -Hiring teachers from diverse countries -Solid curriculum -Discussion needed to how to include WEes -Contacts with diverse English speakers -Linking with culture from different countries -Specific levels to cover WEes

As in the excerpt below, E6 suggested that there should be some discussion on the scope of including WEes for elementary English learners and on how it should be integrated in culture;

R: As a matter of fact, when we teach WEes, what kinds of support would like to have from the government or educational office?

E6: As for the student I think teaching WEes is a bit more possible for upper grades or middle school students. I really think teaching WEes cause confusion for those who just start to learning language or those elementary children ... So I think there should be more discussion on how practically this should be implemented in the curriculum. This is because language is closely related to culture, the way English is used in a diverse manner ... I do not think learning a language without considering comprehensive understanding of culture is meaningless ... So I think we need a curricular manual which include these factors...

E9 mentioned guidelines for specific extent of teaching in listening and speaking with helpful materials;

R: As a matter of fact, when we teach WEes, what kinds of support would like to have from the government or educational office?

E9: If I have to teach WEes, I think I need to know to what extent I have to teach it even though I know listening and speaking are mainly taught while reading and writing are covered. As a matter of fact, I do not think I can have students listen to all the different pronunciation in teaching WEes. Given this difficulty in reality, I think it is more convenient to guide them to a certain extent regarding WEes and provide relevant materials.

Another KEPET emphasized the importance of offering ‘comprehensive training or workshop programs’ if they have to teach WEes in future and also suggested the employment of diverse foreign teachers as follows;

E10: Uh. If it is going to be taught ... it is true that one teacher usually covers all the classes but if teaching WEes is going to be encouraged at the national level by the Ministry of Education, I think it is better to provide comprehensive training or workshop programs on WEes for the teachers whose English levels are higher ... then I think they will learn better and have more willingness to teach it...

R: I see. Are there any more supports you can think of?

E10: Other than training or workshop programs, rather than one foreign teacher per school, if there are two or three per school, I think it is better to hire foreign teachers from diverse countries other than the one who speaks the U.S. English.

Discussion

According to the survey results, there are some key findings worthwhile to note. First, the ANOVA results showed that there was no statistical difference in the KEPETs’ English learning experience regardless of their college years. However, in the Views of English Use, the juniors viewed English used by IC speakers as a common language compared to the freshmen. In the Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future, the freshmen agreed more on the need of teacher training to teach WEes and the willingness of using diverse materials for WEes than sophomores, interestingly. Therefore, a further study is necessary to find out whether these differences truly occurred due to their years at college or it is just a random difference with the balanced number of subjects in each year in a more careful design.

Second, when KEPETs’ English Learning Experience were examined based on their self-rated English ability, the KEPETs in high group appeared to have more study experience in SE and learned more about

the English used in OC and EC than their counterparts. Accordingly, the KEPETs in the high group said they had better ability to communicate with IC and OC speakers, which makes sense given their levels of English. However, there are some conflicting views among the KEPETs in the high group. They thought their English was similar to SE and had the view of preferring English Used by IC speakers, which attests how limited KEPETs' English learning experience was and their view in SE. They were also receptive of WEes for communication and agreed that one's ownership of English should be acknowledged without his/her nationality and that one's English could be a standard as long as one can communicate with it. As for the KEPETs' Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future, the KEPETs in the high group were also receptive of teaching WEes in school and exposing learners to such variety, which would help them communicate better with others. They also agreed to allowing those from regardless of their country origin and had more willingness to use diverse materials in teaching WEes. In a similar vein, the KEPETs in the high group agreed more to the needs of learning more about WEes, a different curriculum, teacher training programs, and different evaluation methods for WEes.

Third, when the KEPETs' experience of taking English proficiency tests, though there were statistically significant differences in Knowledge on WEes and Pride in KE, such results should be interpreted cautiously as their means were lower than the mid-point of the 7-Likert type scale. Thus, it may be worthwhile to further examine why the KEPET test non-takers replied that they were more proud of KE. In addition, as in the category of Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future, both the test takers and non-test takers worried over potential problems in teaching WEes, though the test-taking group was more concerned with potential difficulties in teaching WEes at school.

Lastly, according to the KEPETs' study-abroad experience, there was no statistically significant difference in their English Learning Experience while there were five items with statically significant differences for Views of English Use and Attitudes toward Teaching WEes in Future, respectively. Similar to the KEPETs in high self-rated English proficiency group, the KEPETs with study-abroad experience thought that their English was more like SE though they had more experience of learning or using English from the IC and OC countries. Interestingly, however, whether the KEPETs studied abroad or not, they appeared to agree to the importance of enhancing pride on KE as their replies were above the mid-point of the 7 Likert type scale. This finding appears actually somewhat contradictory given that their response in the Pride in KE in using English were below the midpoint (study abroad: $m = 3.40$, no study abroad: $m = 2.97$). However, those who studied abroad also less agreed to the view of Teaching Only SE in School ($m = 2.48$) compared to those with no study-abroad experience ($m = 3.34$). In sum, it is obvious that the KEPETs in this study were receptive of teaching WEes regardless of their years in college, English ability, English proficient test-taking experiences, and study abroad experience.

The results from both the open-ended question and the interviews show that nine out of ten KEPET interviewees said that they studied AE, similar to teachers in Ko and Kim' (2015) study, except one who said 'grammar English'. Some said that they learned is a standard English and while two also mentioned British English. Furthermore, all ten KEPET interviewees except one said that the ENC of Korea also endorsed teaching of AE though one male student appeared to understand the direction of the ENC, which is to teach English for communication. As a matter of fact, the ENC of Korea does not explicitly mention what types of English to be taught other than acknowledging the importance of diverse linguistic and cultural diversity in the curriculum. Furthermore, it is also interesting to find out that some replies stated that the ENC direct to teach English for college entrance, revealing how English is mobilized as a tool for high-stake testing in Korea. As for teaching WEes, the open-ended question showed that the positive or negative replies were almost equal, which is somewhat different compared to the analysis of the survey items and the interview results. Among the positive responses on teaching WEes, the most frequent one was providing 'diverse perspectives in English' for students and the next one was providing 'diverse cultural experience' by teaching WEes. However, they also views that teaching Wes would cause confusion, especially, in pronunciation, which seems to indicate that these KEPETs also think of pronunciation as a key in deciding what is SE or which English should be taught in school.

Regarding the awareness of WEes, except one KEPET, no one heard about the term before the study though she could not explain what it was. Therefore, these KEPETs' learning or understanding of diverse English is quite limited though, upon the explanation of what WEes are, the KEPET interviewees agreed with the concepts as reiterated importance of communication and meaning and users' right to use their own English. Concerning the employment of English speakers from the non-English speaking countries, 6 KEPETs agreed while there was one with disagreement from each group. However, there were concerns such as negative perceptions on them by students or society. Despite some degree of open-mindedness of accepting WEes or English speakers from the non-English speaking countries, the belief in the existence of SE among them was obvious.

When asked whether they were willing to teach WEes in future, all except one agreed and said that exposure to such variety will help students better communicate with others. However, three KEPETs expressed that it may be appropriate to include them in elementary school as children are beginners in learning English. Another KEPETs teaching WEes should be done after Explicit teaching of WEes after deciding right proportion per each grade but still believe that they may not be taught in reality.

Despite the benefit of helping students experience diverse English found from the open-ended question and interview data, the KEPETs listed quite a few difficulties and limitations of teaching WEes in class such as lack of own experience and abilities in teaching diverse pronunciation, training programs, and teaching materials, more time need to cover WEes and increase of work for both teachers and students, learners' unfamiliarity and confusion due to exposure to diverse English, and so on. Accordingly, they also suggested some helpful ideas or supports needed in teaching WEes. More specifically, the two most frequent suggestions were providing appropriate teaching materials such as audio or video or information on diverse English and teacher training or workshops. Only one KEPET suggested hiring foreign teachers from diverse countries. Accordingly, these concerns and suggestions appear quite legitimate given these KEPETs' lack of learning or experiencing WEes despite their willingness to incorporate them in their teaching as many theorists and researchers call for the inclusion diverse English for decades.

Conclusion

In this study, the KEPETs in the survey appeared to fully understand the importance of exposing their learners to WEes despite their limited experience of learning only AE and the lack of knowledge and skills on how to teach them. According to the results of analyses of open-ended items and interview data, the majority of the KEPETs had a very limited experience in term of learning about WEes in school and very few mentioned the BE or other types of English though the KEPETs in the high self-rated English ability group and those who had taken English proficiency tests attested that there had better communication ability with English speakers from the IC and OC. Similarly, a few interviewees said they experienced different types of English in listening tests in school or in other exams. The results of this study are similar to Lee's (2010) study in that their prior experience of learning only AE, the long lasting view of the superiority of SE, and, more importantly and seriously, their lack of learning or experiencing WEes in or outside school compelled them to be hesitant in fully committing teaching WEes in future while worrying about potential problems and difficulties in teaching WEes in class in future. What is mindboggling from these results is that the KEPETs in this study predominantly thought that SE is AE (but not Canadian English as no one mentioned this) and very rarely mentioned the BE or other types of English. Such distorted view may be due to Korea's historical tie with the U.S. or due to the subjects' lack of awareness on WEes as only very few KEPET said they heard about the term in the survey or interviews. Accordingly, in order to debunk the myth of SE and dominance of AE in the ELT in Korea and help both teachers and learners to be more aware of and use diverse English with English speakers from both non-English-speaking and English speaking countries, this study suggests the followings;

First, raising KEPETs' awareness on the existence of WEes is urgent and important for KEPETs as their learning on this topic is very limited as the results in this study showed. However, such change

should not be done by merely informing the existence of diverse English through typical instruction or lectures. As a matter of fact, it is surprising to find out that the KEPETs in this study were almost ignorant of WEes, which are also included in major textbooks or reference books in ELT. Therefore, it is incumbent upon faculty or instructors at teachers' college of elementary education to cover the topics or offer an introductory course(s) related to WEes so that KEPETs are fully informed of the diversity of English in the world. In doing so, KEPETs can debunk the assumption of using SE by themselves or teaching of 'non-existing' SE in class and eradicate the myopic perspective on language, culture, and the world, for their own and learner's sake, and espouse multilingual and multicultural attitude toward diverse speakers of English as the ENC guides.

Second, a majority of survey respondents and the interviewees said that it is important to teach or at least expose their learners to WEes as it will help their students communicate better with diverse speakers of English in future. However, they were also unsure of how to teach them due to the lack of experience of learning WEes. Therefore, as they suggested, helpful curricular, instructional, and evaluation guidance related to WEes should be provided as soon as possible. Such an effort is critical at this moment given the dominant assumption of teaching the AE or an SE, to say the least, as many preservice or inservice teachers think in Korea. In other words, if there is no opportunity to teach or learn WEes for preservice teachers, it is almost incorrigible to do it at a later stage as attested by secondary in-service and preservice teachers in the studies (e.g., Ahn, 2014; Lee, 2010; Sung, 2018).

Third, though urgent and clearly necessary to include WEes immediately in elementary English teaching, as one interviewee suggested, exposure to such a variety of English should be done in a gradual manner in elementary school given that elementary English learners are young and just start to learn English so that both KEPETs and their learners in future do not feel extra difficulty and confusion in learning diverse English.

Fourth, as suggested in another study (Sung, 2018), no explicit testing or evaluation should be done for early levels of learners while some aural and oral input can be used in materials as elementary learners move up to upper grades. One of the specific ways is to help English teachers to use available resources such as spoken corpus data or website such as *International Dialects of English Archive* (<http://www.dialectsarchive.com>) or *International Corpus of English* (<http://ice-corpora.net/ice/>). As a matter of facts, such data and resources are now more easily accessible to both teachers and learners as new technology such as voice recognition, artificial intelligence or virtual reality is being more utilized in language education.

Finally, WEes is more than just pronunciation or accents as most teachers and general public think. One may argue that young learners cannot tune into many linguistic differences in WEes and should teach just one type of English such as SE or AE in Korea (No, 2005), which is a very problematic contestation. That is, who gets to decide whether or not a particular type of English is appropriate while others are not by ignoring the fact that language teaching and learning are interconnected with how people think and act in a particular culture and context. Furthermore, what rationale is there when a great majority of EFL teachers are not so called 'native' to TL but speakers of diverse forms of English? Therefore, instead of upholding the self-defeating idea of teaching SE or AE only in school, policy makers, curricular experts, and English teachers in ELT should engage in curricular and instructional change to reflect specific linguistic and discursive features of TL regardless of grades or levels of English. For example, English practitioners can integrate a different variety of English in culture teaching class as culture is integral part of language learning (Sung, 2018). That is, instead of teaching culture in view of comparing limited cultural artifacts, behaviors, or events to essentialize one's culture over others, KEPETs can expose early learners of English to different types of English so that they can understand that one's English is no better than others' as no one's culture is better than others.' Such open-minded practice will certainly lead to concrete, innovative ways of prioritizing English users' sociocultural contexts in different cultures rather than a particular form of English.

From the research perspective, though this study was done as a large-scale project as noted earlier, some more interviews with more participants as well as diverse subjects from different countries will

reveal more interesting and in-depth findings as they are different not only due to historical, regional, or educational backgrounds but also due to their particular identity as users of their own variety of English. Another important direction of research should focus on developing practical curricular, instructional, and evaluation guidelines or models to actually help both preservice and inservice teachers to engage in real practices of including WEes in their class instead of merely classifying types of English or differences of such English in the regions as reviewed earlier. In other word, current research or theoretical work on WEes has garnered enough attention in the ELT field and left some resounding impacts on academia for decades but, at this stage, there is more urgency for ‘what’ and ‘how’ to include them in ELT given that ‘why’ to do so has gained enough momentum so far.

The Authors

Kiwan Sung is Professor at Dept. of British-American Language & Culture and served as former president of the Korea Association of Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning. He was also co-editor of AsiaTEFL Book Series and edited two books, *Secondary School English Education in Asia: From Policy to Practice* (Routledge) in 2015 and *Conditions for English Language Teaching and Learning in Asia* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing) in 2014. He also co-edited a book, *Critical ELT Practices in Asia* (Sense), in 2012 and has published research articles in such areas as SLA, multimedia-assisted language teaching, and critical pedagogy.

School of Global Communication
College of Foreign Languages & Literature
Kyung Hee University
Yongin, Gyeonggido, Korea, 17801
Tel: +82 2012274
Mobile: + 82 1048539397
Email: kiwansung@khu.ac.kr

References

- Ahn, H. (2014). Teachers’ attitudes towards Korean English in South Korea, *World Englishes*, 33(2), 195-222.
- Buschfeld, S., & Kautzsch, A. (2016). Towards an integrated approach to postcolonial and non-postcolonial Englishes. *World Englishes*, 36(1), 104-126
- Canagarajah, S. (2010). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Choi, K. (2007). Study on students’ attitude towards World Englishes and non-native English teachers. *English Teaching*, 62(4), 47-68.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next*. London: The British Council.
- Hughes, A., & Trudgill, P. (1996). *English accents and dialects: An introduction to social and regional varieties of English in the British Isles*. London: Arnold.
- Jenkins, J. (2005). Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: The role of teacher attitudes and identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 535-543.
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). *World Englishes*. New York: Routledge.
- 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. 11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching*, 25(1), 1-

14.

- Kang, S., & Lee, S. (2012). A survey of Korean English teachers' perceptions and attitudes about the common features of English as a lingua franca: Focusing on the lexical and grammatical features. *Korean Journal of English Language & Linguistics* 12(3), 379-401
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English as an Asian lingua franca: The lingua franca approach and implications for language education policy. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(1), 121-140.
- Ko, K., & Kim, S. (2015). English education in the framework of English as a global language and its implications on primary English education. *The Journal of Mirae English Language and Literature*, 20(1), 353-384.
- Kubota, R. (2001). Teaching world Englishes to native speakers of English in the USA. *World Englishes*, 20 (1), 47-64.
- Lee, J. (2010). Korean elementary school teachers' attitudes toward the English language. *English Language Teaching*, 22(4), 25-51.
- Lee, J. Y., Mo, S. K., Lee, S. H., & Sung, K. W. (2013). Korean English speakers' perceptions of East-Asian English speakers' pronunciation, *The Journal of ASIA TEFL*, 10 (4), 1-40.
- Lindemann, S. (2003). Koreans, Chinese or Indians? Attitudes and ideologies about non-native English speakers in the United States. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(3), 348-364.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent*. New York: Routledge.
- McArthur, A. (1987). The English languages? *English Today*, 11, 9-13.
- Modiano, M. (1999). Standard English(es) and educational practices for the world's lingua franca. *English Today*, 15(4), 3-13.
- No, G. (2005). English as an international language and implications for elementary English teaching. *Korean Journal of Elementary Education*, 16(1), 431-448.
- Park, T. (2017). A study on secondary school teachers' opinions about including British pronunciation in English listening assessment. *Secondary English Education*, 10(3), 3-21.
- Schneider, E. W. (2003). The dynamics of new Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language*, 79(2), 233-281.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 133-158.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca: A complete introduction to the theoretical nature and practical implications of English used as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shim, Y. (2015). Korean EFL teachers' perceptions of World Englishes. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics* 31(1), 149-172.
- Smith, L. E., & Nelson, C. L. (1985). International intelligibility of English: Directions and resources. *World Englishes*, 4(3), 333-342.
- Song, K. (2011a). English as an international and global language: Language attitudes & pedagogical implications. *The New Korean Journal of English Language and Literature*, 53(1), 233-254.
- Song, K. (2011b). University students' language attitudes toward global society English: Teaching World Englishes. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 11, 497-519.
- Song, K. (2015). Language awareness and attitudes toward standard English and standard Korean among Korean university students: Language education and sociolinguistic perspectives. *Journal of Language Sciences*, 22(1), 71-93.
- Sung, K. W. (2002). Critical theory and pedagogy: Remapping English teaching in Korea. *English Teaching*, 57(2), 65-89.
- Sung, K. W. (2018). Secondary pre-service English teachers' perceptions of learning and use of diverse English and willingness to teach World Englishes. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 34(3), 267-301.
- Tokumoto, M., & Shibata, M. (2011). Asian varieties of English: Attitudes towards pronunciation. *World Englishes*, 30(3), 392-408.

- Trudgill, P., & Hannah, J. (2002). *International English: A guide to the varieties of standard English*. London: Arnold.
- Yano, Y. (2001). World Englishes in 2000 and beyond. *World Englishes*, 20(2), 119-131.
- Yoon, H. (2007). Pre-service teachers' perceptions of world Englishes: Implications for teacher training. *Studies in English Language and Literature*, 49(1), 171-190.