

Korean English Speakers' Perceptions of East-Asian English Speakers' Pronunciation

Ji Young Lee

Kyung Hee University, Korea

Su Kyoung Mo

Kyung Hee University, Korea

So Hee Lee

Kyung Hee University, Korea

Kiwan Sung*

Kyung Hee University, Korea

This study investigates how Korean English speakers (KESs) perceive East-Asian English speakers (EAESs) in view of World Englishes (WE). Two surveys were used to examine KESs' awareness of WE and their perceptions of six EAESs from China, Japan, and Korea. One hundred and ninety-three college students participated in this study and 23 interviewees were randomly selected for rounds of interviews to triangulate the survey data. The results showed that there were statistically significant differences in the four categories: (1) belief in learning pronunciation; (2) views of Inner Circle (IC) speakers; (3) preference for interaction with IC English speakers; and (4) willingness to communicate (WTC) with Outer Circle (OC)/ Expanding Circle (EC) speakers through MANOVA. According to the combined results of *t*-tests, there were also 31 statistically significant

* Kiwan Sung: Corresponding author (kiwansung@khu.ac.kr)

differences in KESs' perceptions between the high and low groups in all the WE categories except for the interaction with IC English speakers depending on the levels of their awareness of WE. The KESs in this study manifested cognitive ambivalence which means the participants felt dissonance in their feelings between valuing non-native accents and yearning for native-like pronunciation. Lastly, this study discusses some important factors related to identities and ownerships of English as WE speakers along with some suggestions for further research on WE.

Keywords: World Englishes (WE), pronunciation, Korean English speakers (KESs), East-Asian English speakers (EAESs), language awareness, Standard English (SE)

INTRODUCTION

When communicating with foreigners using English, the difference in pronunciation becomes an immediate social marker. Many EFL students, for example, often consider those who have native-like pronunciation to be highly proficient resulting in a masking effect of one's language abilities. However, given the rather accepted view of the challenges of approximating native speakers' variety of English after puberty (Brown, 2007), some researchers argue against the unrealistic goal of forcing EFL learners to acquire Standard English (SE), such as American English (AE) or British English (BE) (Jenkins, 2009). That is, with the changing role of English as a global/international language, one's English is viewed more in terms of intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability (Smith & Bisazza, 1982; Smith, 1992; Y. Kachru, 2008) than in terms of conforming to native speaker norms. In fact, native speakers' norms are vague and controversial (He & Zhang, 2010; Widdowson, 2003). Specifically, given the unprecedented spread and use of English at present by non-native speakers of English, the notion of nativeness or SE being desirable is eroding fast.

For the last two decades, the concept of World Englishes (WE; Kachru & Nelson, 1996) has been promoted to value particular varieties of English

spoken by people in non-English speaking countries. Similarly, though controversial, Jenkins (2007) also suggested the concept of Lingua Franca Core (LFC) to specify the extent of acceptability of pronunciation by non-native English speakers.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Standard English (SE) and Teaching Pronunciation

SE is generally defined as “a dialect normally used in writing” (Hughes & Trudgill, 1996, p. 35) and the spoken language heard on media or from the educated people in society or as a variety of English which is concerned with mostly grammar and vocabulary (Trudgill & Hannah, 2002) but not pronunciation (Trudgill, 1984). Therefore, SE usually refers to 'the grammar and the core vocabulary' (Stevens, 1985) used by the educated. It is, however, neither the whole of English nor does it include pronunciation. Though considered most prestigious and understandable by people, SE is a minority variety of which the most important aspects are its spelling, vocabulary and grammar (Crystal, 2003). In fact, in defining SE, the speakers' level of education matters rather than one particular type of English such as the British Received Pronunciation or General American English (McArthur, 2002). In short, unlike the common belief of many EFL teachers and learners, pronunciation is not an important factor in distinguishing a standard variety from a nonstandard one. It is a socially constructed marker which attributes the idea of acceptability to the exo-normative norms of the highly educated middle class, which is rather false and hegemonic (Phillipson, 2010).

Intelligibility, Comprehensibility and Interpretability

In ELT, one of the two Englishes, American or British, however, has been promoted as prime while other forms of English have been ignored. For example, some varieties of Asian English in India, Hong Kong and China were

either treated as non-standard or often excluded in research or in teaching (Jenkins, 2009). Accordingly, researchers have regarded the notion of SE as problematic, at best, and proposed that there are three levels of understanding in communication depending on intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability of discourses (Smith, 1992; Smith & Bisazza, 1982). Smith and Nelson (1985) explain that intelligibility refers to lexical-level recognition, comprehensibility is about understanding sentence-level meaning in context, and interpretability is the ability to see the embedded meaning rather than the literal one. Munro and Derwing (1995) define intelligibility as to whether or not the intended message of a speaker is acknowledged by a listener as the base for comprehensibility, which refers to how easy it is to understand a speaker.

In an EFL context, teachers typically aim at teaching native like pronunciation while being mindful of intelligibility of the pronunciation in communication (Levis, 2005a). However, it is well noted that students' acquisition of native-like accents usually turns out to be impossible for most learners to achieve. Therefore, it is suggested that ELT should espouse the *intelligibility and/or comprehensibility* principle (Levis, 2005b; Smith & Nelson, 1985). That is, EFL learners can be intelligible though their foreign accents are noticeable. Such a view emphasizes the perceptions of listeners rather than the productions of speakers (Field, 2005). Thus, some research focused on the measurement of comprehensibility between native speakers of English (NSEs) and non-native speakers of English (NNSEs). These research studies utilized different speech data such as listening to the recorded NNSEs' answering-machine messages with a given text (Lindemann, 2003), the recorded NSEs' lectures differentiated by accent (Scales, Wennerstrom, Richard, & Wu, 2006), the recorded NSEs' speeches differentiated by nationality (Matsuura, Chiba, & Fujieda, 1999), and the recorded NNSE-NSE conversations (Kirkpatrick, Deterding, & Wong, 2008). Munro and Derwing (1995) also assert that there is no clear connection between accents and listeners' intelligibility or comprehensibility. In sum, non-native accents or pronunciation should not be used to judge NNSEs as faulty or even lacking in communication abilities. As a matter of fact, accentedness is less important for

successful communication than intelligibility or comprehensibility. As Kubota (2001) claims, it may be that “in human interaction, both the listener and speaker should share responsibilities so communication takes place” (p. 48).

World Englishes (WE) and Lingua Franca Core (LFC)

Kachru and Smith (1985) and Kachru (1992, 2005) view the privileged Englishes of dominant countries, such as the U.S., or the U.K. as having been identified with the residents of particular places. They explained that these Englishes are also dialects but people often perceive what they identify as a ‘dialect’ used by the less-educated or as being a provincial language because of the power relationship that exists between SE and dialects. Thus, they proposed the concept of WE to account for historical, political, and sociocultural aspects of the English language. Kachru (1985, 1992) originally classified users of English into three concentric circles based on their regions and the status of their dialect of English: the Inner Circle (IC), which have ownership of English, the Outer Circle (OC), which refers to postcolonial communities using English as a second language for intra-national purposes, and the Expanding Circle (EC), which includes all the other communities using English primarily for international purposes. Several issues, however, were raised about this classification by Canagarajah (2010). First, the people in the IC should at least have receptive skills in WE in order to interact with those from the OC or EC. Second, people in the EC may use English not only for an extra-community relationship but also for functioning within their own borders. Third, the people in the EC are also unconsciously developing new norms instead of looking up to Englishes used in the IC and/or OC. Finally, English is used more in multinational contexts by multilingual speakers than in a homogenous context by monolingual speakers. Therefore, a call is made for the re-conceptualization of WE. For example, McArthur’s classification of World English (1987) has no one at the center circle as Kachru’s (1985). Similarly, there have been various terms to name different types of English such as New Englishes (NE: Graddol, 2006), regional Englishes, World Standard English or World Standard Spoken

English (Crystal, 2003), and 'lingua franca' (Knapp & Meierkord, 2002; Seidlhofer, 2001). Jenkins (2005a, 2005b) also suggests a concept of 'lingua franca core' to explain that the OC and the EC English speakers manifest their own rules of grammar and pronunciation and also establish their own identities through the use of different varieties of English. Similarly, Yano (2001) also argues the use of NE is closely related to speakers' identity and ownership. For example, many Singaporeans with native-like linguistic competence and proficiency consider themselves as owners of English.

Berns (2005) claims that even though the studies on Englishes in the OC were acceptable in the early stage, there has been only a passing reference on development of EC Englishes in general. Worse yet, English proficiency tests, such as IELTS and TOEFL, or course books which have been published to teach SE in ESL contexts are used in EFL countries regardless of the original purposes or contextual differences in using those tests or materials (Moore, 2007). However, such practices may ignore the legitimacy of learner language and their ethnic and cultural identities. Accordingly, Berns (2005) argues that research on the EC Englishes should be in line with the development of new theoretical perspectives on WE and consider various groups in different regions in order to appreciate their collective achievements. Such an effort seems extremely important in dislocating the tension as in the dichotomy of NSE vs. NNSE or SE vs. non-standard dialects.

In ELT, some work has been done on relationships between NNEs' perceptions or attitudes toward their L2 and listening comprehension. Major, Fitzmaurice, Bunta, and Balasubramanian (2002) assert that "positive attitudes increase comprehension whereas negative attitudes decrease comprehension" (p.187). Jordan (2010) also conducted an empirical study on attitudes toward a Japanese actor's English pronunciation and those of a British and an American actor using an online questionnaire. The results reveal that respondents considered the former was more comprehensible and achievable but less attractive than and even inferior to the latter. Sifakis and Sougari (2005) showed that Greek teachers also had double-consciousness in that, while saying that communication is the primary goal for their students, they still held a

strong “norm-bound perspective and focus on teaching standard NS pronunciation models” (p. 480). Thus, Sifakis and Sougari (2005) concluded that teachers in Greece should be aware of English as an international language (EIL) and its implications and eventually be familiar with varieties of English through teacher training programs. Yoon (2007) also asserts that non-native teachers usually show ‘double consciousness’ by espousing more favorable attitudes toward NSE teachers due to the lack of awareness of WE. Nativeness, however, is more of an ideological notion of viewing Received Pronunciation (R.P.) or AE as standard or NSEs who typically belong to an educated middle class as model speakers. In short, the standard and non-accented language is part of an abstract ‘myth’ and an idealized perceptual construction (Lippi-Green, 1997).

Accordingly, given the long-lasting view of native-like pronunciation as a key marker of proficiency and EFL teacher and learner preference to native-like pronunciation, this study examines how Korean English speakers (KESs) view East-Asian English speakers (EAESs). This paper also discusses some pedagogical implications for pronunciation teaching by espousing a broader view of developing learner identities and ownership of Englishes instead of blindly accepting the reified notion of nativeness. Accordingly, the following research questions are posed:

1. What are KESs’ awareness of varieties of English (e.g., SE, WE) and their roles and speakers of particular varieties?
2. How do KESs’ levels of awareness differ depending on their self-rated English proficiency?
3. How do KESs’ perceptions of EAESs (Korean, Chinese and Japanese) differ depending on the levels of their awareness of WE?

METHOD

Participants

KESs at three different universities were chosen through a convenient

sampling, which means that they were all from the classes taught by the researchers.

The survey data on WE were initially collected from 233 participants; however, the data from 193 participants (98 males, 95 females) were used after removing the ones with missing data in the surveys. The age of the participants ranged from 19 to 30 years old ($N=190$, 98.4%, no response: $N=3$, 1.6%) and among them 135 respondents (69.9%) were 20 years old. The mean age of the respondents was 20.42 years.

Instruments

Speech Samples

There were two speakers from China, Japan, and Korea, respectively. Each pair had differing proficiency levels (intermediate vs. low) according to the preliminary oral interviews and their self-rated proficiency levels. Five of these students were studying in undergraduate programs except C2, a Chinese studying in a graduate program at one of the universities. Five of the speakers had no study abroad experiences in an English speaking country except for J2 (Japanese female) who had spent one month in an English speaking country. The demographic information of the speakers is as follows:

TABLE 1
Information of Sample Listening Data

Speaker	Gender	Age	Nationality	Major	Proficiency level
C1	F	25	Chinese	English	Low
C2	F	24	Chinese	Korean	Intermediate
J1	F	35	Japanese	Korean	Low
J2	F	23	Japanese	Korean	Intermediate
K1	M	27	Korean	English	Low
K2	F	23	Korean	English	Intermediate

The six EAESs were prompted with a color picture which depicts three people in a subway daydreaming of imaginary situations, such as winning a

lottery, traveling in space, and becoming a fashion model. Then, they were given around two minutes to think about the situation and asked to describe the picture for approximately three minutes. The EAESs were encouraged to be creative in describing the picture. The duration of each description ranged from 1.44 minutes to 3.03 minutes. The data was not changed at all for the sound quality or comprehensibility to ensure the authenticity of the speeches recorded (See Appendix B from samples).

Survey

First, KESs' levels of awareness on WE were measured using 26 7-likert type questions (See Appendix A) based on Yoon's study (2007), Jenkins' work (2005b), and Kubota's research (2001). More specifically, this survey provided in bilingual format (English and Korean) measured KESs' extent of agreement or disagreement with the statements on language learning, beliefs about English and its speakers, and the ownership of English. There were also demographic questions along with three open-ended questions on their views on SE, their own pronunciation, and the use of English.

Second, this study utilized Kubota's questionnaire (2001), which examined the quality, understandability, and traits of EAESs, and the listener's desire to communicate with them. Similar to Kubota's study on 17 students' opinions on six speakers who talked about the education systems in their home countries, this study used the 30-item comprehension check list to measure the characteristics and quality of the speech data, which was randomized for the participants to listen to. However, in this study, the Likert scale was reduced to 7 points instead of the 9 points in Kubota's survey. Despite this change, the reliabilities of the survey were as high as Kubota's; Cronbach's $\alpha=.952$ (C1), $\alpha=.939$ (C2), $\alpha=.913$ (J1), $\alpha=.956$ (J2), $\alpha=.959$ (K1), and $\alpha=.959$ (K2)

Focus Group Interviews

Semi-structured interviews using the nine questions developed with reference to Scales, Wennerstrom, Richard and Wu (2006) were performed in

this study (See Appendix C). The 23 interviewees were randomly selected in each school; seven students from G university (5 males, 2 females), eight from K university (5 males, 3 females), and eight from W university (5 males, 3 females).

Procedure

All four researchers collaborated on data collection after having had a few meetings to review the specific protocol for data collection before going into the classes they taught to collect the data. As for the two survey questionnaires, all the researchers went into collect the data by explaining the purposes of the surveys and asking the respondents to answer all the items as honestly as possible. As for the interviews, three researchers did the interviews by, first, asking about the interviewees' background information, such as age and their experiences of learning English. Then, each researcher made sure to ask nine questions prepared along with some supplementary and confirmation questions on the topics and also to provide opportunities to less talkative participants during the interviews. The focus group interviews were performed either in a group of three or four participants and lasted for about 40 to 60 minutes. All the interviews were tape-recorded for further analysis while each researcher took notes for important topics or themes introspectively during the interviews.

Data Analysis

The 26 questions regarding KESs' Awareness on WE were grouped into 10 categories as follows;

- 1) Beliefs in learning pronunciation (Q3-5)
- 2) Beliefs about studying abroad (Q2, 16)
- 3) Beliefs about English for social mobility (Q9, 15)
- 4) Views of IC speakers (Q6-8, 17)
- 5) Acceptance of WE (Q1, 10, 11)
- 6) Attitude toward SE (Q12-14)
- 7) Interaction with IC English speakers (Q18, 19, 21)

- 8) WTC with OC/EC speakers (Q20, 22)
- 9) IC speaker ownership of English (Q23)
- 10) OC/EC speaker ownership of English (Q24-26)

These categories were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, *t*-tests and MANOVA to compare the differences in the participants' perceptions depending on their levels of awareness on WE. The reliability of the KES awareness of WE survey was Cronbach's $\alpha=.754$. As for the Kubota's four categories in her comprehension checklist (2001), 1) the quality (Q1-8), 2) understandability (Q9-13), 3) traits of the speaker (Q14-24), and 4) the respondent's desire to communicate with the speaker (Q25-30) were used as dependent variables in measuring the group differences of KESs' perceptions of the six EAESs. Finally, when analyzing the survey data for the KESs' perceptions and awareness, this study extrapolates from Smith and Nelson's (1985) definitions of intelligibility and comprehensibility, which are operationalized as understandability in both lexical-level recognition and sentence-level meaning of the speech.

Lastly, the focus group interviews were read extensively and transcribed for the segments which shed important light regarding KESs' awareness of WE and their perceptions of EAESs. Then, the researchers identified and selected the recurring phrases and themes in the data. These were eventually coded according by their themes and frequencies for a better understanding of the data.

RESULTS

KESs' Awareness of WE

Though the researchers initially intended to collect the participants' scores from standardized tests (e.g., IELTS, TOEFL), only 27 respondents (14%) had taken such tests. Therefore, they were asked to self-rate their English proficiency because it was unfeasible to proctor a standardized test for the study (see Table 2):

TABLE 2
Korean Participants' Self-Rated English Proficiency

English ability	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	Very Good 7
<i>N</i>	7	29	47	71	29	1	1
%	3.6	15.0	24.4	36.8	15.0	.5	.5
Total	185 (95.9) ^a						

Note. ^a8 respondents (4.1%) did not answer this item.

TABLE 3
Descriptive Statistics of Items on the KES Survey on WE (N=185)

Category	Question	M	SD
Belief in learning pronunciation	Q3	3.44	1.30
	Q4	2.75	1.11
	Q5	4.78	1.57
Belief in studying English abroad	Q16	4.78	1.35
Views of IC English speakers	Q17	5.69	1.14
Acceptance of WE	Q10	4.82	1.43
	Q11	3.47	1.28
Attitude toward SE	Q13	4.87	1.43
	Q14	4.52	1.44
Interaction with IC English speakers	Q18	5.32	1.28
IC speaker ownership of English	Q23	2.96	1.51
OC/EC speaker ownership of English	Q24	5.05	1.20
	Q25	4.81	1.32
	Q26	5.02	1.50

Among the questions on the KESs' awareness on WE, the following categories and items of which the means were either above 4.5 or below 3.5 are presented (see Table 3). The neutral score was 4.0 on the 7-point Likert scale.

In order to present the descriptive data with more clarity, we have condensed the data into disagreement, neutral, and agreement categories. As in Table 4, regarding the belief in learning pronunciation, the respondents were on the negative side on changing their own pronunciation and acquiring native-like fluency (Q3: $N=106$, 55%, $M=3.44$; Q4: $N=154$, 79.8%, $M=2.75$). However, they strongly believed that they should learn native-like pronunciation (Q5: $N=124$, 64.3%, $M=4.78$). Even though the KES respondents appeared neutral on the question of English as a tool for social mobility (Q9: $M=3.62$, Q15: $M=4.08$), 121 respondents (63.7%) thought positively about studying in English speaking countries to acquire a high English proficiency (Q16: $M=4.78$). Furthermore, 145 respondents (75.2%) wished to have an IC English speaker as a friend (Q18: $M=5.32$).

TABLE 4
KESs' Belief in Pronunciation, Social Mobility, and Interaction with IC Speakers

	Belief in learning pronunciation (Q3-5)			Social mobility (Q16)	Interaction with IC (Q18)
Disagree	106(55.0)	154(79.8)	39(20.2)	38(19.6)	18(9.3)
Neutral	49(25.4)	27(14.0)	30(15.5)	34(17.6)	30(15.5)
Agree	38(19.6)	12(6.2)	124(64.3)	121(63.7)	145(75.2)

Table 5 presents KESs' views on WE, SE, and the ownership of English. First, 124 respondents (64.2%) said it was acceptable to have non-native pronunciation as long as one could communicate (Q10: $M=4.82$). Only 31 students (16.1%) said they were proud of their Korean accents (Q11: $M=3.47$). However, 130 respondents (67.4%) said they were more familiar with AE (Q13: $M=4.87$). 95 respondents (54.4%) said they viewed AE or BE as standard (Q14: $M=4.52$). Similarly, the majority of these respondents ($N=168$, 87%) said

they were envious of Koreans with native-like pronunciation (Q17: $M=5.69$). No one strongly disagreed with this question. Second, while more than half of the respondents considered AE or SE as a standard, only 26 respondents (13.5%) agreed that English belongs to IC English speakers. 127 respondents (65.8%) actually disagreed with such a statement (Q23: $M=2.96$). The respondents agreed that English also belongs to fluent bilingual speakers (Q24: $M=4.81$), to OC English speakers (Q25: $M=5.05$) or nobody because it is a common international language (Q26: $M=5.02$):

TABLE 5
KESs' Responses on WE, SE, and Ownership of English

	Acceptance of WE (Q10-11)		Familiarity with AE (Q13)	AE/BE as standard (Q14)	Envy of native pronunciation (Q17)	IC speaker ownership (Q23)	OC/EC speaker ownership (Q24-26)		
Disagree	36 (18.7)	95 (49.2)	30 (15.5)	45 (23.4)	7 (3.7)	127 (65.8)	16 (8.3)	29 (15.1)	26 (13.5)
Neutral	33 (17.1)	67 (34.7)	33 (17.1)	43 (22.3)	18 (9.3)	40 (20.7)	43 (22.3)	45 (23.3)	37 (19.2)
Agree	124 (64.2)	31 (16.1)	130 (67.4)	95 (54.4)	168 (87.0)	26 (13.5)	134 (69.4)	119 (61.6)	130 (67.4)

KESs' Self-rated English Proficiency and Awareness of WE

The participants were guided to rate their English proficiency as honestly as possible. Even though standardized exam scores from tests such as TOEFL or IELTS could have been used, many participants had never taken such tests. It was also impossible for our research group to force them to take such tests as we were fully aware of ongoing controversies regarding how well these tests measure one's real proficiency and how such tests wield hegemonic power in ELT (Shohamy, 2001).

Based on the respondents' self-rated English proficiency, the participants (n=185) they were assigned to three levels (High=31, Mid=71, Low=83). In

order to account for the differences between KSEs' proficiency and awareness of WE, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted. MANOVA tests (see Table 6) showed that there were statistically significant differences in the four categories: Belief in learning pronunciation [Q 3-5; $F(2, 182)=6.00, p<.05$], Views of IC speakers [Q 6-8, 17; $F(2, 182)=7.44, p<.05$], Preference for interaction with IC English speakers [Q18, 19, 21; $F(2, 182)=7.54, p<.05$], and WTC with OC/EC speakers [Q20, 22; $F(2, 182)=6.94, p<.05$].

TABLE 6
Results of Descriptive Statistics and MANOVA Tests of Between Subjects Effects

Source	WE Category (Dependent Variable)	Group	M	SD	Type III SS	df	MS	F	p
Group	Belief in learning pronunciation	High	11.26	2.52	84.97	2	42.48	6.00	.003**
		Mid	11.69	2.64					
		Low	10.23	2.73					
		Total	10.96	2.73					
	Views on IC speakers	High	16.81	3.38	259.86	2	129.93	7.44	.001**
		Mid	18.66	4.40					
		Low	16.08	4.24					
		Total	17.19	4.32					
	Interaction with IC speakers	High	14.65	3.08	180.53	2	90.27	7.54	.001**
		Mid	14.28	3.60					
		Low	12.42	3.47					
		Total	13.51	3.58					
WTC with OC/EC speakers	High	9.10	1.87	64.05	2	32.02	6.94	.001**	
	Mid	8.18	2.21						
	Low	7.46	2.20						
	Total	8.01	2.22						

According to Bonferroni post hoc tests (see Table 7), there were statistically significant differences between the mid group and low group in terms of learning native-like English and views on native speaker pronunciation. That is, the mid group perceived learning native-like English pronunciation more important than the low group. Furthermore, the mid group also preferred the interaction with IC speakers more compared to the low group. However, it was

also found that the high group was more willing to interact with OC/EC speakers than the low group.

TABLE 7
Results of Multiple Comparisons by Bonferroni Post-Hoc Tests

Dependent Variable	Group	Group	Mean Difference	Std. Error	<i>p</i>
Belief in learning pronunciation	Mid	Low	1.46	.43	.003**
Views on IC speakers	Mid	Low	2.58	.68	.001**
Interaction with IC speakers	Mid	Low	1.86	.56	.003**
WTC with OC/EC speakers	High	Low	1.64	.45	.001**

Cross-Comparison of KESs' Perceptions of EAESs.

TABLE 8
Cross-Comparison of Chinese English Speakers

Question	C1 (Low)		C2 (Intermediate)	
	M	SD	M	SD
11. Understanding	3.63	1.32	3.62	1.20
14. Friendliness	4.18	1.07	3.91	1.17
19. Character	4.30	1.05	4.17	.99
21. Rudeness	4.24	1.08	4.12	1.05
22. Arrogance	4.20	1.03	4.04	1.09
26. Comfort	3.74	1.47	3.66	1.27
27. Speaker as teacher	3.10	1.62	3.18	1.62
30. Interaction	4.20	1.41	4.05	1.46

As for the sample speeches made by three pairs of EAESs (Chinese, Japanese, Korean), the descriptive means were cross-compared by the nationality of the speakers, especially for the items of which the means were similar or atypical given the difference in their proficiency levels. First, as in Table 8, C2 (Chinese, intermediate) was perceived as better for all items except

for 8 questions below. It should be noted that the differences in means for these 8 items were less than .20. The KESs however, did not want to have the two Chinese speakers as their English teachers, for which the means were lowest of all (Q27, *in italic*).

Second, as for the Japanese pair, J2 was perceived as slightly better in all items except Q19, Q21, and Q22, of which the differences were rather small (see Table 9). However, as in the case of the Chinese pair, J1 received the lowest mean score of all in this study (Q27, *in italic*).

TABLE 9
Cross-Comparison of Japanese English Speakers

Question	J1(Low)		J2 (Intermediate)	
	M	SD	M	SD
19. Character	4.48	1.32	4.27	1.19
21. Rudeness	4.40	1.16	4.11	1.03
22. Arrogance	4.38	1.21	4.08	1.03
27. Speaker as teacher	<i>2.40</i>	<i>1.58</i>	<i>3.50</i>	<i>1.56</i>

As for the Korean pair (see Table 10), K2, an intermediate Korean female, was perceived as a better speaker in all the items except Q21 and 22, for which K1, a low-level Korean male, was judged slightly less rude and arrogant. However, it is noteworthy that K1 received the lowest mean for having him as their English teacher ($M=2.23$).

From the cross-comparison of the EAESs of English, it was found that the KESs perceived the intermediate-level speakers favorably or better. However, they rated the lower-level speakers high on seven items, such as Understanding (Q11), Friendliness (Q14), Character (Q19), Rudeness (Q21), Arrogance (Q22), Comfort (Q26), and Interaction (Q30). That is, the low-level EAESs were perceived to be less rude and arrogant than the more proficient speaker. Along another dimension, the KESs were also negative about having three low-level speakers and the high-level Chinese speaker as their English teachers.

TABLE 10
Cross-Comparison of Korean English Speakers

Question	K1 (Low)		K2 (Intermediate)	
	M	SD	M	SD
9. Clarity	3.18	1.45	3.96	1.47
21. Rudeness	4.07	1.05	4.06	1.09
22. Arrogance	4.12	1.04	3.97	1.14
27. Speaker as teacher	2.23	1.39	3.65	1.63

KESs' Self-rated English Proficiency and Perceptions of EAESs

Another MANOVA is concerned with the differences of respondents' perception of the six speech samples depending on their self-rated English proficiency levels below:

TABLE 11
Results of Descriptive Statistics and MANOVA Tests of Between Subjects Effects

Source	Category (Dependent Variable)	Group	M	SD	SS	df	MS	F	p
Group	C1 Understanding	High	20.65	5.69	186.227	2	93.11	3.218	.042*
		Mid	18.96	4.99					
		Low	17.82	5.57					
		Total	18.73	5.44					
Group	J2 Desire for Communication	High	23.90	7.82	390.026	2	195.01	3.923	.021*
		Mid	26.63	5.97					
		Low	23.57	7.59					
		Total	24.80	7.16					

Overall, there was no conspicuous difference in the KESs' perception of the EAESs except for two categories. First, as for the understanding of C1 (Chinese female, low), there was a statistically significant difference between the high and low groups, $F(2, 182)=3.22, p<.05$. The post-hoc Bonferroni test (see Table 12) showed that the high group perceived C1 as clearer and more

understandable. Second, regarding the desire for communication with J2 (Japanese female, intermediate), the mid group had desire for communication more, $F(2, 182)=3.92$, $p<.05$, compared to the low group according to a Bonferroni test.

TABLE 12
Results of Multiple Comparisons by Bonferroni Post-Hoc Tests

Dependent Variable	Group	Group	Mean Difference	Std. Error	<i>p</i>
C1-Understanding	High	Low	2.83	1.32	.040*
J2-Desire for Communication	Mid	Low	3.07	1.14	.023*

Differences in KESS' Perceptions of EAESs Based on Awareness of WE

The examination of the differences in the KESS' perceptions of the six EAESs depending on their awareness on WE was done using independent *t*-tests for both the high and low groups, which were divided by the mean cutoff points of each category as shown below.

Comparisons of KESS' Perceptions Depending on Beliefs

TABLE 13
***t*-Test Results of KESS' Perceptions of EAESs Depending on Their Beliefs**

	Category	Group	N	M	SD	<i>t</i>
Belief in learning pronunciation (Q3-5)	K1-Quality	High	114	27.45	7.79	-1.99*
		Low	79	29.66	7.28	
Belief in studying abroad (Q2, 16)	K1-Quality	High	106	27.29	7.89	-2.15*
		Low	87	29.64	7.17	
Belief in English for social mobility (Q9, 15)	C2-Desire of Communication	High	102	17.71	7.44	-2.05*
		Low	91	19.91	7.51	

First, an unmatched *t*-test shows that, depending on KESS' belief in learning pronunciation, there was a statistically significant difference in the quality of

K1 (Korean male, low), $t(191) = -1.99, p < .05$. Similarly, considering their belief in studying abroad, K1 was perceived as better in both categories by the low group, $t(191) = -2.15, p < .05$. Second, there was a statistical difference between the high and low groups concerning English as a tool for social mobility for C2 (Chinese female, intermediate), $t(191) = -2.05, p < .05$. That is, the lower group perceived C2 as more desirable for communication.

Comparisons of KESs' Perceptions Depending on Views of IC Speakers

As for KESs' views of IC English speakers or Koreans with native-like proficiency, there were statistically significant differences between high and low groups in the quality and traits of J1 (Japanese female, low) and K1 (Korean male, low), who were perceived as better by the low group.

TABLE 14
***t*-Test Results of KESs' Perceptions of EAESs Depending on Their Views of IC Speakers**

	Category	Group	N	M	SD	<i>t</i>
Views of IC speakers (Q6-8, 17)	J1-Quality	High	102	23.99	8.65	-4.89**
		Low	91	29.81	7.78	
	J1-Traits	High	102	42.17	8.26	-2.17*
		Low	91	44.82	8.74	
	K1-Quality	High	102	26.96	8.03	-2.72**
		Low	91	29.91	6.90	
	K1-Traits	High	102	42.17	8.26	-2.17*
		Low	91	44.82	8.74	

Comparisons of KESs' Perceptions Depending on Acceptance of WE

At statistically significant different levels, the KESs in the high group in terms of the acceptance of WE perceived J1 as better in the desire of communication, $t(191) = 1.99, p < .05$, the quality of C1, $t(191) = 2.52, p < .05$, the quality of K2, $t(191) = 2.00, p < .05$, and also for the level of understanding for J2, $t(191) = 2.12, p < .05$.

TABLE 15***t*-Test Results of KESs' Perceptions of EAESs Depending on Acceptance of WE**

	Category	Group	N	M	SD	<i>t</i>
Acceptance of WE (Q1, 10, 11)	J1-Desire of Communication	High	103	19.75	7.23	1.99*
		Low	90	17.60	7.15	
	C1- Quality	High	103	31.97	7.33	2.52*
		Low	90	29.23	7.77	
	K2-Quality	High	103	35.64	9.06	2.00*
		Low	90	33.04	8.95	
	J2-Understanding	High	103	22.50	5.16	2.12*
		Low	90	20.92	5.20	

Comparisons of KESs' Perceptions Depending on Attitude Toward SE

Another independent *t*-tests showed that those who valued SE positively perceived better the quality of J1 (Japanese female, low) and that of K2 (Korean female, intermediate) and the understanding of K2. That is, those who were in the low group in terms of their attitudes towards SE perceived these two speakers better.

TABLE 16***t*-Test Results of KESs' Perceptions of EAESs Depending on Attitude Toward WE**

	Category	Group	N	M	SD	<i>t</i>
Attitude toward SE (Q12-14)	J1-Quality	High	92	25.09	8.85	-2.54*
		Low	101	28.24	8.39	
	K2-Quality	High	92	33.00	8.57	-2.11*
		Low	101	35.73	9.37	
	K2- Understanding	High	92	18.70	5.97	-2.22*
		Low	101	20.58	5.85	

Comparisons of KESs' Perceptions Depending on WTC with OC/EC Speakers

The KESs showed statistically significant differences between the high and low groups for their WTC with other OC/EC speakers. That is, compared to the

low group, the high group said that C2 had a better quality in speech, $t(191) = 2.24, p < .05$. They also said that J1, C1, C2, and K1 were more understandable. There was, interestingly, no statistical difference in KESS' perceptions of EAESs when considering their preference for interaction with IC English speakers (Q18, 19, 21).

TABLE 17
***t*-Test Results of KESS' Perceptions of EAESs Depending on WTC with OC/EC Speakers**

		Category	Group	N	M	SD	<i>t</i>
WTC with OC/EC speakers (Q20, 22)	J1- Understanding		High	110	19.88	5.73	2.34*
			Low	83	17.92	5.62	
	C2-Quality		High	110	30.17	5.57	2.24*
			Low	83	28.13	7.03	
	C2- Understanding		High	110	19.83	5.51	2.37*
			Low	83	18.06	4.61	
	C1- Understanding		High	110	19.37	5.42	2.05*
			Low	83	17.75	5.48	
	K1- Understanding		High	110	19.88	5.73	2.38*
			Low	83	17.92	5.62	

Comparisons of KESS' Perceptions Depending on IC Speaker Ownership of English

TABLE 18
***t*-Test Results of KSE Perceptions of EAESs Depending on IC Speaker Ownership of English**

		Category	Group	N	M	SD	<i>t</i>
IC speaker ownership of English (Q23)	S2-Quality		High	108	28.49	6.31	-2.01*
			Low	85	30.31	6.20	
	S2-Traits		High	108	43.99	8.27	-2.65**
			Low	85	47.25	8.74	
	S3-Quality		High	108	29.53	7.70	-2.42*
			Low	85	32.18	7.34	
	S3-Traits		High	108	42.73	8.10	-2.38*
			Low	85	45.69	8.15	
	S5-Traits		High	108	44.72	9.88	-2.84**
			Low	85	48.69	9.31	

There were statistically significant differences in the quality of C1 and C2 and also in the traits of C1, C2, and K2 between the high and low group based on their views of whether or not IC English speakers owned English. That is, the high group, who agreed more to the IC speaker ownership of English, perceived the two Chinese and the intermediate Korean female EAESs less favorably for their quality and traits.

Comparisons of KESs' Perceptions Depending on OC/EC Speaker Ownership of English

Lastly, depending on the KESs' views of the OC/EC speaker ownership of English, there were statistically significant differences in the quality of C1, the traits of C1, C2, and K2 and the understanding of Speakers C1 and J2, and desire to communicate with J1. That is, unlike the previous result regarding the IC speaker ownership of English, the high group perceived all the speakers, except K1 (Korean male, low), more favorably than the low group whereas they perceived C1 (Chinese female, low) as having good quality, better traits, and more understandability.

TABLE 19
***t*-Test Results of KESs' Perceptions of EAESs Depending on OC/EC Speaker Ownership of English**

		Category	Group	N	M	SD	<i>t</i>
OC/EC ownership of English (Q24-26)	J1-Desire of Communication		High	109	19.68	8.21	1.97*
			Low	84	17.54	4.40	
	C2-Traits		High	109	46.63	8.04	2.24*
			Low	84	43.86	9.12	
	C1-Quality		High	109	32.46	7.53	3.78**
			Low	84	28.40	7.20	
	C1- Understanding		High	109	19.90	5.51	3.64**
			Low	84	17.08	5.07	
	C1-Traits		High	109	45.16	8.76	2.06*
			Low	84	42.58	8.42	
	K2-Traits		High	109	47.75	9.67	2.08*
			Low	84	44.81	9.80	
	J2- Understanding		High	109	22.59	5.32	2.52*
			Low	84	20.70	4.93	

TABLE 20
Combined Results of Independent *t*-Tests on KESs' Perception Difference of EAESs in the Categories of WE

Category of WE	Subcategory	J1	C2	C1	K1	K2	J2
Belief in learning pronunciation(Q3-5)	Quality				-1.99**(L)		
Belief in studying abroad (Q2, 16)	Quality				-2.15*(L)		
Belief in English for social mobility (Q9, 15)	Desire of Communication		2.05*(L)				
Views of IC speaker pronunciation (Q6-8, 17)	Quality	-4.89**(L)			2.72**(L)		
	Traits	-2.17*(L)			-2.17*(L)		
Acceptance of WE (Q1, 10, 11)	Quality			2.52*(H)		2.00*(H)	
	Understanding Desire of Communication	1.99*(H)					2.12*(H)
Attitude toward SE (Q12-14)	Quality	-2.54*(H)				-2.11*(H)	
	Understanding					-2.22*(H)	
WTC with OC/EC speakers (Q20, 22)	Quality		2.24*(H)				
	Understanding	2.34*(H)	2.37*(H)	2.05*(H)	2.38*(H)		
IC speaker ownership of English (Q23)	Quality		-2.01*(L)	-2.42*(L)			
	Traits		-2.65**(L)	-2.38*(L)		-2.84**(L)	
OC/EC ownership of English (Q24-26)	Quality			3.78**(H)			
	Understanding			3.64**(H)			2.52*(H)
	Traits		2.24*(H)	2.06*(H)		2.08*(H)	
	Desire of Communication	1.97*(H)					
Total		6	6	7	5	5	2

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

** H or L indicates the group perceived the speaker better at a statistically significant level.

In sum, in line with the combined results of *t*-tests, there were 31 statistically significant differences in KESs' perceptions between the high and low groups in all the WE categories except for the Interaction with IC English speakers. More specifically, there were 12 statistical differences in the quality (High-4, Low-8), eight differences in the subcategory of the understanding (High-7, Low-1), eight in the traits (High-3, Low-5), and three in the desire for communication (High-2, Low-1).

A few things stand out from the *t*-test results. First, both high and low groups in WE thought that the three low-level speakers (J1, C1, K1) were better nine times compared to the other intermediate speakers, respectively. Second, as for the intermediate speakers (Speakers C2, J2, K2), the high group in WE thought them to be better than the low-level speakers nine times while the low group four times. Therefore, though both high and low groups in WE were parallel in their perception of low-level EAESs, the low group were less favorable to the three intermediate EAESs compared to the high group in WE. This result, nevertheless, should be considered tentative given that there were only 31 cases with statistical significance out of 240 subcategories (12.9%).

Analysis of KESs' Open-Ended Responses

Table 21 presents the results of three open-ended questions for which the respondents could give more than one answer. First, many KESs considered AE or BE and English spoken by IC English speakers as ideal and provided some reasons such as commonality, familiarity, national power, easiness and clarity, originality, intelligibility or prestige.

Second, 29 respondents (18.5%) said that they were satisfied with their own English whereas almost two-thirds of them ($N=103$, 65.6%) said otherwise. In addition, 20 respondents (12.7%) said they were somewhat satisfied while five respondents (3.2%) were unsure of their English. As for the reasons for dissatisfaction with their own English, they provided such reasons as nonnative-like Korean intonation ($N=34$), unnaturalness ($N=8$), lack of fluency or difficulty in communication with NSEs ($N=5$), lack of intensive training and chance to speak ($N=3$), and inaccuracy or interlingual errors ($N=2$).

TABLE 21
Ideal English & Reasons

Ideal English	Reasons		
American English	85	Most common	20
British English	35	Familiar	13
English to get across meaning	25	Official language	10
English used by NSEs	21	Learning of U.S. English	10
English from media	5	Clear pronunciation	8
Fluent English, Regional	3 each	Original country	7
English, Acceptable by NSEs		Strong national power	7
Good pronunciation,		Sound intelligent	5
No ideal language, Educated	2 each	Easy to listen	4
English, English enough for communication, Unsure		Easy to communicate	3
Fluency first	1	Soft, Natural, Attractive, Gentle	2 each
		Express own identity, Convenient, Refined	1 each

Finally, when the KESs were asked when, where, with whom, and why they used English (Q30), they said they used English most in class ($N=97$) or when talking to foreigners ($N=20$). 17 respondents said they used it on a daily basis. Regarding the places they used English, schools ($N=109$) and homes ($N=10$) were the most frequent. They also said they used English with professors ($N=61$), friends ($N=55$), and foreigners ($N=18$).

Analysis of KESs' Focus Group Interviews

The interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed, first, in Korean before checking the interviewees for accuracy. Then, they were translated in English and classified according to the questions first before coding them based on recurring according to the four different proficiency levels; Low (2 male, 2 female), Low-intermediate (4 male, 1 female), and Intermediate (3 male, 6 female), and High (5 female).

First, regarding the impressions of the six EAESs, the participants were more positive and said that EAESs were understandable. They, however, mentioned that the EAESs had different accents and repeated certain words and expressions several times while the flow of the talk was awkward. Second, as

for the best speakers, they rated them in the following order: J2 (Japanese female, intermediate, $N=10$), C2 (Chinese female, intermediate, $N=9$), K2 (Korean female, intermediate, $N=5$), C1 (Chinese female, low, $N=2$), and J1 (Japanese female, low, $N=1$). They said that J2's dialogue was clear, familiar, and easy to understand due to the use of good vocabulary and the appropriate rate of speech. K2 was thought to be fluent and clear because she was a Korean. No one identified K1 as a good speaker, though.

The rest of the interview questions focused on the KESs' views on accents including their own. First, they commented that accents were country-specific and unavoidable even though they may sound awkward. Second, as for their own pronunciation, although some said they wanted to improve their bad accents, the majority said that having Korean accents was unique and okay as long as they could communicate. They said they wanted to be more fluent and express themselves better. In addition, when asked how different it may have been if the same task had been conducted with IC speakers, the interviewees said their description probably flowed better using different vocabulary and expressions.

Regarding the concepts of SE or EIL, the KES interviewees said that SE exists, but one should become used to different Englishes. They said that communication is important along with one's effort to understand others. More specifically, five interviewees strongly agreed to the idea of learning one, standardized, international English, saying that it is beneficial. The others were rather cautious in accepting such ideas saying that one should try to understand varieties of English. Some interviewees also commented that the notion of EIL is rather vague and will not last long.

DISCUSSION

Though the KESs in this study acknowledged the difficulty of acquiring native-like pronunciation, they believed that they should do their best to learn it even though they thought having native-like pronunciation was not necessary.

Regarding English as a basis for social success, the respondents were not in fully agreement. They knew their non-native status and said that their accents were okay as long as they could communicate. This view, however, seems at odds with their view of AE/BE as SE, on which more than half of them agreed on. A great majority of the respondents were envious of those who speak AE or BE. Accordingly, their disagreement to the IC speakers' ownership of English while endorsing that of the OC/EC speakers' ownership is, at best, conflicting. That is, such a conflict may betray their double standards on ideal English-it is okay to have accents but they feel obliged to learn SE, if possible.

From the KESS' perception questionnaire, C2, a Chinese intermediate level speaker, was perceived negatively in more items compared with her counterparts whereas K2 (Korean female, also intermediate level) was perceived negatively in fewer items among the three pairs. Moreover, that all three intermediate speakers surprisingly were perceived as more rude and arrogant than their counterparts. K1, a Korean low level speaker, as the only male, was not well-perceived, either and it may be necessary to examine in future research whether his gender, which was not the focus of this study, influenced the respondents' perceptions of him. In addition, the KESSs said that they would not want to have any of the EAESSs as their English teachers because of non-native like pronunciation. However, these KESSs' narrow perceptions of Asian speakers of English should be questioned and challenged in that regional Englishes in East and Southeast Asian countries now increasing play the role of a lingua franca in communicating with the people in these countries (Kirkpatrick, 2012).

According to MANOVA analysis based on the KESSs' self-rated proficiency and the WE data, the mid group, on the one hand, appeared to have strong beliefs in learning native-like pronunciation compared to the low groups. They also wished to interact with IC English speakers more than the low group did. The high group was more willing to interact with OC/EC English speakers than the low group. These results, nevertheless, should be interpreted more cautiously and there could be different results if it were possible to have more accurate measurement of respondents' proficiency levels.

Another set of MANOVA using the respondents' self-rated proficiency and the perceptions of six EAESs only revealed significant differences in the case of the understanding of C1 (Chinese, low level) and the desire for communication with J2 (Japanese, intermediate). Once again, the self-reported proficiency levels limit our ability to interpret such results. The *t*-test results showed somewhat interesting results. In 18 times out of 31 cases, both the high-level group (9 times) and the low-level group (9 times) perceived the low-level EAESs as better. That is, the high group in the WE professed J1 (3 times), C1 (5 times), and K1 (1 time) to be better in one of the subcategories (quality, traits, understanding, and desire to communicate) while, the low group also did so for J1 (3 times), C1 (2 times), and K1 (4 times).

From the open-ended questions, it appeared that KESs were strongly entrenched with the view that there is an SE, such as AE/BE, for which they were mostly exposed to and familiar with. They said SE is ideal, powerful, easy to understand and clear, and even original. Accordingly, they were dissatisfied with their own English due to accents, unnaturalness, or inability to communicate with IC English speakers. In addition, the KES interviewees said all the intermediate EAESs were viewed as the best by saying that their speaking was familiar and confident. On the other hand, although they thought the low EAESs had traits, such as friendliness and less rudeness, they rated their speaking as awkward and lacking confidence.

This study showed that the KESs' levels of awareness of WE, levels of belief in SE, and their attitudes toward EC speakers are important factors in their perceptions of EAESs. Therefore, further studies would be valuable in determining how these factors are related, to what extent EFL learners' conceptions about ideal Englishes influence their perceptions, and, more importantly, how differently they may engage in learning or using English due to these factors. Furthermore, research comparing IC English speakers or other OC/EC English speakers' perceptions of EAESs would also shed important light on similarities or differences they may have for WE speakers in various parts of the world. Such research will surely help both IC and OC/EC English speakers to understand what constitutes legitimate Englishes from the

perspective of learners and how they perceive others' Englishes in the context of WE.

CONCLUSION

How the English spoken by users outside the IC varies is a linguistic variation or political matter. Some varieties may converge to the form of standard varieties through codification whereas others become divergent by being more pidginized or localized without necessarily being compared to native norms from the IC countries. As a matter of fact, once we understand that SE in the IC, if there is one, should be viewed as a minor variety given the sheer number of WE speakers in the world, EFL educators should not discourage their students from using local varieties. Instead, they should encourage learners not to be ashamed of their own dialects, especially at their beginning stage of learning English.

Consequently, EFL learners do not always have to seek acceptance for speakers of the standard variety. It is rather incumbent upon the speakers from the IC, whose number of speakers are rather small compared to those who use English in the EC, to understand other varieties, especially when they are engaging in communication in an international context. In other words, regardless of one's status as IC or OC/EC English speakers, we all should be aware of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural diversity and share the mutual responsibility of engaging in meaningful communication by understanding different varieties of English. EFL practitioners should also understand what constitutes WE, how such a perspective enriches their practice, and should help their student enhance their confidence in their own Englishes to eventually, claim legitimate ownership as a speaker of WE (Yoon, 2007).

In line with the results of this study, most of the KESs were receptive to the importance of using English for communication. They, however, wanted to eliminate their non-native accents despite their understanding of diverse roles and uses of English in various contexts. Therefore, as a means of resolving

KESs' ambivalent attitude on different pronunciation or accents while continuously desiring to learn a standard pronunciation, both EFL practitioners and learners should acknowledge these double standards and come to grips with specific roles of English and goals of learning it in their life. That is, the excessive yearning for native-like pronunciation by associating it with one's proficiency or success hinders their meaningful use of language in communicative contexts. Learning a foreign language is more than learning pronunciation. While making efforts to acquire good pronunciation, if possible, learners should, therefore, consider other important linguistic and discourse components in local varieties of English. In the context of WE, not all learners have to conform to norms of native speakers as commonly assumed. Instead, EFL practitioners can consider a standard variety as part of WE and give their learners choices in learning different varieties. That is, a standard variety is not an ultimate norm but rather an option as long as learners can communicate with diverse people in different parts of the world.

In ELT, it will take some time for people to accept WE as legitimate varieties and some struggles may occur where most ESL or EFL practitioners and learners view SE as ideal or when they want to sound like NSEs. Nevertheless, given that the desire of acquiring native-like pronunciation is an ideological matter, a plethora of political and socio-cultural factors influence either the acceptance or rejection of WE. English is, however, used as an official language in such places as India, Hong Kong, and many African countries and those varieties are now recognized as legitimate. Therefore, WE used in EFL contexts will eventually acquire such a status or be acknowledged as intelligible varieties. In sum, the concept of WE reflects ever-changing faces of English and surely expand the breadth and depth of English to various inter-cultural or cross-cultural communicative contexts. As a result, it is incumbent upon ELT practitioners to help their learners be aware of diverse WE and value their and other varieties as they have done for SE or other standard varieties for so many years.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are truly thankful to three anonymous reviewers for their valuable and insightful comments and feedback for revision.

AUTHORS

Ji Young Lee received her Ph.D in English Language & Culture at Kyung Hee University, in February, 2013. Her doctoral dissertation relates to English teachers' attitudes towards teacher evaluation in South Korea. She has been teaching English to college students for six years at universities. Her main professional interests are teacher education, World Englishes, curriculum development and language policy.

Email: monicayi@khu.ac.kr

Su Kyoung Mo completed her Ph.D coursework majoring in English Education at Kyung Hee University. She is currently teaching at Woosong University, and her academic interests are curriculum development and materials design for EFL students. She has participated in several relevant projects such as developing IPTV contents and writing English textbooks for elementary and middle school students.

Email: sukyoungmo@khu.ac.kr

So Hee Lee received her MA in English Language & Culture at Kyung Hee University in 2012. Her master's thesis topic was "A Study on Korean College Students' Awareness of English as a Global Language and Attitudes on English Pronunciation." Her primary interest is the function of English as a global language throughout the world.

Email: sakura11525@naver.com

Kiwan Sung is a professor at the Department of English Language & Culture at Kyung Hee University and has taught ELT undergraduate and graduate

courses while conducting research in teaching approaches and curricular development related to critical theory and pedagogy. He is currently president of The Korea Association of Multimedia Assisted Language Learning (<http://www.kamall.or.kr/>).

Email: kiwansung@khu.ac.kr

REFERENCES

- Berns, M. (2005). Expanding on the Expanding Circle: Where do WE go from here? *World Englishes*, 24(1), 85-93.
- Brown, D. (2007). *Principles of language teaching and learning*. White Plains, NY: Pearson.
- Canagarajah, S. (2010, July). *New definitions of English proficiency and changing pedagogical priorities*. Paper presented at the Korea Association of Teachers of English International Conference, Seoul, Korea.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Field, J. (2005). Intelligibility and the listener: The role of lexical stress. *TESOL Quarterly* 39(3), 399-423.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next*. London: The British Council.
- He, D., & Zhang, Q. (2010). Native speaker norms and China English: From the perspective of learners and teachers in China. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44(4), 769-789.
- 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. (2005a). Teaching pronunciation for English as a lingua franca: A sociopolitical perspective. In C. Gnutzmann & F. Intemann (Eds.), *The globalisation of English and the English language classroom* (pp. 145-158). Tübingen, GER: Narr.
- Jenkins, J. (2005b). 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.
- Jordan, E. (2010). A Hollywood English pronunciation for Japanese students? An exploration of Japanese university students' attitudes towards Japanese English pronunciation. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 7(1), 363-387.

- 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.
- Kachru, B. B. (2005). *Asian Englishes: Beyond the canon*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kachru, B. B., & Nelson, C. L. (1996). World Englishes. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 71-102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. B., & Smith, L. E. (1985). Editorial. *World Englishes*, 4(2), 209-212.
- Kachru, Y. (2008). Cultures, contexts, and interpretability. *World Englishes*, 27(3/4), 309-318.
- 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.
- Kirkpatrick, A., Deterding, D., & Wong, J. (2008). The international intelligibility of Hong Kong English. *World Englishes*, 27(3/4), 359-377.
- Knapp, K., & Meierkord, C. (Eds.). (2002). *Lingua franca communication*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Kubota, R. (2001). Teaching world Englishes to native speakers of English in the USA. *World Englishes*, 20 (1), 47-64.
- Levis, J. M. (2005a). Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 369-377.
- Levis, J. M. (2005b). Pronunciation and the assessment of spoken language. In R. Hughes (Ed.), *Spoken English, TESOL and applied linguistics: Challenges for theory and practice* (pp. 245-270). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 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.
- Major, R. C., Fitzmaurice, S. F., Bunta, F., & Balasubramanian, C. (2002). The effects of nonnative accents on listening comprehension: Implications for ESL assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(2), 173-190.
- Matsuura, H., Chiba, R., & Fujieda, M. (1999). Intelligibility and comprehensibility of American and Irish Englishes in Japan. *World Englishes*, 18 (1), 49-62.
- McArthur, T. (1987). 'The English languages?' *English Today*, 11, 9-13.

- McArthur, T. (2002). *The Oxford guide to World English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moore, J. (2007). *Common mistakes at IELTS advanced and how to avoid them*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1995). Foreign accent, comprehensibility and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning*, 45(1), 73-97.
- Phillipson, R. (2010). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. New York: Routledge.
- Scales, J., Wennerstrom, A., Richard, D., & Wu, S. H. (2006). Language learner's perceptions of accent. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(4), 715-738.
- 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.
- Shohamy, E. (2001). *The Power of tests: A critical perspectives of the uses of language tests*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Sifakis, N. C., & Sougari, A-M. (2005). Pronunciation issues and EIL pedagogy in the periphery: A survey of Greek state school teachers' beliefs. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 467-488.
- Smith, L. E. (1992). The spread of English and issues of intelligibility. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 75-90). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Smith, L. E., & Bisazza, J. A. (1982). The comprehensibility of three varieties of English for college students in seven countries. *Language Learning*, 32(2), 259-269.
- Smith, L. E., & Nelson, C. L. (1985). International intelligibility of English: Directions and resources. *World Englishes*, 4(3), 333-342.
- Stevens, P. (1985). Standards and the standard language. *English Today*, 1(2), 5-7.
- Trudgill, P. (Ed.). (1984). *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trudgill, P., & Hannah, J. (2002). *International English: A guide to the varieties of standard English*. London: Arnold.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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.

APPENDIX A

Survey for Level of Awareness of World Englishes

Please circle the number that corresponds to your opinion about each statement.

Example:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree		Neutral				Strongly Agree

If you strongly disagree with this statement, circle 1. If you strongly agree with this statement, circle 7.

Note that 4 is the middle point.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree		Neutral				Strongly Agree

1. Anyone can learn to speak English with an accent that is different from his/her own.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Anyone can learn to speak perfectly in English if s/he lives in the country where English is spoken.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. It is easy for me to change my English accent.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. It is easy for me to learn to speak English like a native speaker of English.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I think learning English pronunciation like native speakers is very important.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I think native English teachers are generally better than Korean English teachers in learning English.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. English speakers with various accents should try to get rid of their foreign accent.

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. Varieties of English (grammar, expressions, etc.) prevent social and professional upward mobility. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. Varieties of English (grammar, etc.) should not prevent social and professional upward mobility. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. Some accents are more attractive to me than others. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. I am proud of my English accent. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. It is important for me to acquire a native-like accent. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. I am most familiar with American English. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. I want to pronounce English like American or British people. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. Speaking English like a native speaker of English is necessary for the success in our society. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. I would choose America or the UK for the place of studying English. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 17. I envy those Koreans who pronounce English like American or British people. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18. I would like to make friends with Native speakers of English. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 19. I would like to engage in a real conversation with Native speakers of English. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 20. I prefer learning English with Non-native speakers in English only. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 21. I like to go out where I can meet foreigners. | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Korean English Speakers' Perceptions of East-Asian English Speakers' Pronunciation

22. I'm not afraid of meeting foreigners.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. I think the native speakers of English should be the owners of English.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. I think those whose mother tongue is another language, but have grown up using English like bilinguals are the owners of English.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. I consider anyone fluent enough to speak the language without major problems to be the owner of English.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. I think anyone born in the country which is spoken in English is the owner of English.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please write your opinions briefly.

27. If you could choose any accent including your own, what accent of English would you most like to have? Why?

28. Are you proud of your English accent? If yes, please write the reason.

29. Tell me a bit about English you use:

When: _____

Where: _____

Who with: _____

Why: _____

APPENDIX B

Speech Samples (Broad Transcription)

Speech Sample #2 (C2; Chinese Female, Intermediate)

Uh...ok um...in this picture, I can uh...see three person, two women and the man and the... from this picture I think this is about their dreams and uh...first I can...I will talk about the first women, uh...the first woman uh... she is a very...she is a very beautiful woman and the um...and the...from this picture I think her dream is becoming a mill-i-on-naire she wants to have a lot of money and the uh...And also I think she is uh... she is...she maybe wants to have a many ((inaudible)) from other people. And the...the second...the second person is a man and he...and the...((pause)) and the...in his hand, he has a... he hold the book. And the...from this picture, I think his dream is becoming a scientist uh-m...maybe I think he likes to...Ah...maybe he explore to something. And the...and the third person is a... woman and she is... she is very fashion uh...From the picture I think her dream is maybe become to uh... modern girl yea...maybe she likes to to um...((inaudible)) the most uh...the fashion uh...fashion clothes and the...in this picture I can um...see a very modern girl and the...she wears um...uh...very beautiful clothes and wears a glasses um...So... um...((quiet laugh) um...so, I think everyone... everyone has a dream...and...um...so... How to say...um.....ha!ha!

Speech Sample #4 (J2; Japanese Female, Intermediate)

Um...There are three people on the subway um... two woman, two women and one man, they are thinking about their dream. Um...One ladies, she is thinking about she would be star so she's thinking and thinking and get the big many and she will be famous star and next is...a man he is thinking about space shuttle and he is riding shuttle and watching us from space and take a picture with us so last woman she is thinking about she would be model like pretty woman. She is wearing expensive dresses, and wearing big hat, and wearing sunglass and walking down the street um...and they uh...thinking...they are thinking...sitting on the seat um...and going to somewhere. So...It is very interesting picture because they not...they don't know each other but they are thinking same things, their dream. And...one man he is wearing black t-shirt and holding um...his favorite book...and wearing cap and he has beard...And one ladies, she is wearing red T-shirt and she has short hair um...and last women, he is...she is long hair and wearing really nice T-shirt and having handbag and wearing jeans. Um~! Maybe I think she would be model like her dreams because she's really nice type

um...and it's going to...it's night time maybe I think because I can't see light from the window.

Speech Sample #5 (K1; Korean Male, Low)

There are three people in subway tri...in subway...there are two woman and one man. One woman think she has...she earns a lot of money (pause) She proud her hands and smile? Many people cheer...in...cheering at her ((pause)) she...she is very happy And another women think she will be mod-u-l...um...She wanted to ((pause)) be dressed up and wearing his glasses, gloves...(pause) um... He is so beautiful ((laugh)) but I...I like...it. One man think the fantasy...is so weird. She...she sees...ah~! He see over through...the glasses and it may be the reading part in star-track um...they're think... they think different trip and...It is a ((pause)) wanting dream. Um...I think that women and man ((pause)) so uh...part very different trip. When women are more practical and man is very (pause little) fantastic um...It is a...it is a same view of seeing the thing.

APPENDIX C

Semi-structured Interview Questions

1. What was your overall impression of the 6 speech samples you had listened to?
2. Whose samples were easiest or most difficult for you?
3. Why do you think you thought a particular sample was easiest or most difficult to listen to?
4. What differences do you think there would be if someone whose mother tongue is English described this picture?
5. What do you think is most important in listening to or speaking English?
6. What do you think of the trend of using English as a basic tool for communication due to the globalization in the world?
7. What is your opinion on English as a lingua franca?
8. If you agree to the idea of one language as a lingua franca, what is required for English become one?
9. What is most important when communicating with other people in English?