Study on Students’ Attitude Towards World Englishes and Non-native English Teachers


The objectives of this paper are first to investigate how students perceive the relatively new concept “World Englishes” and second to find out whether they prefer native English teachers or non-native local English teachers. A questionnaire survey was conducted on two different groups. One group consists of students of a 2-year college who have never taken a course on World Englishes, thus are not familiar with the new concept. The other consists of students of a 4-year university who have taken a course on World Englishes. The former group shows a stronger preference towards British English or American English while the other group shows a relatively less preference towards the so-called Standard English. The difference between the two groups can be attributed to the formal lectures on World Englishes given to the group of 4-year university students. However, in terms of their preferences towards teachers, the result is reversed. Their preference and choice of teachers may depend on the levels of English proficiency. The 2-year college students with lower English proficiency prefer non-native teachers even without taking the course while the 4-year college students with higher English proficiency still prefer native teachers even after the course.

I. INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that Korea is one of the most vigorous and enthusiastic countries in the world in terms of teaching and learning English as a foreign or international language. A great amount of budget is allocated for the education of English not only on the national level but more greatly on the individual family level for the empowerment of their children with English. In particular, parents are eager to provide their children with better learning

* This paper was supported by a research grant from Hanyang Women’s College in the spring semester, 2007. I would like to thank anonymous readers for their helpful comments.
environment, and exonormative linguistic input and materials. The excessive preference towards native speaker teachers causes a number of social problems including child abuse and diploma forgery. We often read news articles reporting that in elementary and secondary Korean schools there are many unqualified native speaker teachers who have no proper educational and vocational background for teaching English as a foreign language. In relation to these recent social problems, the Korean Ministry of Justice announced that it would implement a regulation that requires any foreigners wishing to teach in Korea submit a criminal background check and a medical check, and undergo an interview at the Korean consulate in their home town (Kerry, 2007). Students, parents, and people in general think that native speaker teachers such as American teachers or British teachers are the ones who can teach legitimate English and regard American English or British English as the only Standard English that they think they have to imitate if not master.

In recent years, as the world is becoming a global village, there is no argument against the fact that English is being used as a lingua franca in most parts of the world. It is also true that English being used in many different parts of the world is not one variety but has many varieties influenced by local languages. Local varieties of English have recently been studied and, as a consequence, some of their major characteristics have been defined (Alsaoff & Lick, 1998; Bao, 2003; Bao & Wee, 1999; Bautista, 2004; Benson, 2000; Bolton, 2000; Bolton & Bautista, 2004; Bolton & Butler, 2004; Gupta, 1991; 1994; Hung, 2000; Kachru, 1992; Kirkpatrick & Zhichang, 2002; McArthur, 2003, 2004; Peng & Ann, 2004; Tayao, 2004; Wee, 2003, 2004; Yang, 2005; Zhang, 2002). Some varieties are characterized in the continuum of sociolectal varieties that includes a standard local English as the acrolectal English and a colloquial English as the basilectal English (Bao, 2003; Bolton, 2000; Gupta, 1991, 1994; Platt, 1975; Platt & Weber, 1980; Tayao, 2004). In this world of free trade and globalization, it is more likely that Korean people use English with non-native speakers of English rather than native speakers. It is imperative and beneficial for us to recognize the existence of local varieties of English and to become more aware of the characteristics of localized Englishes instead of adoring Standard English. Whether we like it or not and no matter to what extent we recognize it, we have created our own English words, expressions, pronunciation and structures that exist in the variety of English used by Korean people in the Korean society.

Kyung-Ja Park (2007) proposed the term “Korea English” that describes the variety of English used by Korean people. She defines Korea English as follows:

Korea English refers to the spoken English used by educated Korean speakers when communicating internationally as well as intra-nationally. It has common cores of normative English but with Korean traits and nuances in pronunciation, lexicon, syntax and discourse, distinct from other types of
English. The term focuses on the unique characteristics of the spoken English used by Koreans. (p. 19)

A number of Chinese researchers (Kirkpatrick & Zhichang, 2002; Li, 1993; Wang, 1991; Xiaoqiong, 2004, 2005; Yun & Jia, 2003) have already started to use the term “China English". They argue that the term “Chinese English” often refers to the derogative name “Chinglish” that can be observed in the interlanguages used by Chinese English learners. Thus, they suggest “China English” to be used as a proper term that describes the variety of English used by Chinese people. Li (1993) revising Wang’s definition (1991) suggests that “China English has normative English as its core but with Chinese characteristics in lexicon, syntax, and discourse, and it is employed to express China-specific things through means of transliteration, borrowing and semantic regeneration but without interference from the Chinese language” (pp. 19-20).

When educating students, we as English teachers have to teach standard norms and rules of English grammar and core vocabulary. But at the same time, it is vital for us to understand various varieties of English practiced around the world and to study characteristics of Korea English as well in order to become a member country in the globalizing world. Korea English and even Korean English are relatively new terms in the Korean society and have not received much attention from Korean researchers and educators of English. At the moment, there is little literature that discusses the characteristics of Korea English. More research works are required in relation to the recognition and description of the characteristics and features of Korea English. In this paper, the term “Korea English” is used, even though it has not yet been described properly, with the belief that after more than a hundred years history of English education in this soil, there must be some unique features of English used by Korean people.

Since it is in the embryonic stage, the concept of World Englishes needs to be discussed and made known not only to English teachers and researchers but also more importantly to students to help them set free from the bondage of Standard English. This paper examines what some Korean college students think of World Englishes and teaching of English by non-native local teachers and native teachers of English. For the study, a questionnaire survey was conducted on two groups. One group consists of 118 students of a major 2-year college in Seoul and the other group consists of 41 students of a major 4-year university also located in Seoul. The former group students had not been exposed much to the new concepts of World Englishes until they were given the questionnaire while the latter group
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1 According to Yun and Jia (2002), the term “China English” was first proposed by Professor Ge Chuangui (1983) in 1980 who suggested that China English deriving from Chinese English is a variety of English with Chinese Characteristics and culture.
students took a course on World Englishes and learned some concepts they had not known before. By comparing the results of their responses, the paper aims to find out some new facts concerning students’ understanding of World Englishes, Standard English, and localized English and to investigate who they prefer as their teachers: NNS teachers or NS teachers.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1. Standard English

Standard English is one of the fuzziest and vaguest terms in relation to the discussion of World Englishes. Jenkins (2003) states that Standard English “is purely a social dialect” (p. 32) that is being promoted through an educational system. Various definitions on Standard English have been given by many researchers but none of them are concrete or finalized. But one thing common in some definitions is that it involves educated usage by educated people. Hughes and Trudgill (1979) say that Standard English is a dialect spoken by educated people in the British Isles. Trudgill (1984) writes that Standard English can be characterized in the two aspects, grammatical and lexical forms, which are used by educated native speakers in their speaking and writing discourses. Strevens (1985) argues that in order for a variety to be a standard, its grammar and core vocabulary have to be of educated usage. Trudgill and Hannah (1994) mention that Standard English is the variety of English that is written and spoken by educated speakers of English. Standard English is a variety that is being spread through education and spoken by educated people. It is nothing but a dialect, which has some similarities with other dialects as well as some differences.

Kyung-Ja Park and Nakano (2007) argue that Standard English is a dialect of those in power. Kahane (1992) argues that American English was only a colonial substandard in 1780. However, he mentions that in that year John Adams made a statement as follows:

> English [i.e., American English] is destined to be in the next and succeeding centuries more generally the language of the world than Latin was in the last, or French is in the present age. The reason is obvious, because the increasing population in America, and their universal connection and correspondence with all nations . . . force their language into general use (pp. 211-212).

Australian English had been labeled non-standard or substandard until 1970s. The first dictionary of Australian English was published in 1976 in the land of Australia (Jenkins,
2003) because of its closeness to Standard British English.

As a teacher, I often ask my students which variety of English – American English or British – is Standard English. Some say that British English is Standard English because it is the variety from which various varieties have originated. Others say that American English is Standard English since the population of its speakers is far greater and the United States of America is richer in economic sectors and more powerful in political arenas than the United Kingdom. It is likely that any researcher can get similar answers from any Korean people who have received English education in Korea. Among the standard varieties such as British English, American English, Canadian English, and Australian English, there are some similarities but also many differences especially in terms of words and pronunciation while grammatical differences are few in number on the level of educated usage (Jenkins, 2003). So, which one can be claimed to be Standard English? That is a hard question to be answered.

Even in those so-called standard varieties of English, there are both standard and non-standard dialects. For instance in American English, the non-standard dialects are connected with races such as Southerners, New Yorkers, African Americans, Asians, Mexican Americans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans while in British English such dialects as Brummie, Cockney, Estuary English, and Geordie are more or less connected with class (Jenkins 2003). As many of our parents are preoccupied with native English teachers and Standard English, we have to ask ourselves whether those native teachers command true Standard English or Standard British English or Standard American English. The chance is very high that even native teachers have some non-standard features. The notion of Standard English is only a myth. It is not a tangible entity we can reach or grasp. Kyung-Ja Park and Nakano (2007) and other researchers (Jenkins, 2003; Jin, 2005; Kirkpatrick & Zhichang, 2002; Xiaoqiong, 2004) suggest that, instead of being obsessed with British English or American English and native teachers, it is wiser and more realistic to pursue a standard or to be more specific a localized standard.

2. Localized Englishes

Local varieties of English have been studied and some are even recognized as a standard variety of local English (Alsaoff & Lick, 1998: Bao, 2003; Bao & Wee, 1999; Bautista, 2004; Benson, 2000; Bolton, 2000; Bolton & Bautista, 2004; Bolton & Butler, 2004; Hung, 2000; Kirkpatrick & Zhichang, 2002; McArthur, 2004; Peng & Ann, 2004; Tayao, 2004; Wee, 2003, 2004; Yang, 2005; Zhang, 2002). However, there are some difficulties in codifying local varieties of English. Arguing for World Englishes and against Standard English does not necessarily mean that we should learn broken English and teaching interlanguages is our goal of English education. When we teach a local variety, there are
some dangers that our children might learn a language system that is not accepted by Inner Circle\textsuperscript{2} speakers. In fact, many researchers and scholars in the field of SLA consider local variety features as errors or features of interlanguages or learner languages (Jenkins, 2003). Kachru (1993) argues against the study of Selinker (1972) which suggests that a new variety of English is a fossilized language on the level of the whole community and population. A fossilized learner language is often referred to an unstable learner language. Kachru (1993) asks a question why it is labeled an interlanguage since being fossilized means being stable. He goes on arguing that American English that has been developed by immigrants from non English speaking European countries and indigenous people should also be called an interlanguage.

Deciding what criteria have to be considered is another obstacle in the process of codification. Butler (1997) suggests five criteria that have to be met in order for one variety to be considered a standard. They are as follows:

(1) a ‘standard and recognizable pattern of pronunciation handed down from one generation to another’ (accent); (2) ‘[p]articular words and phrases which spring up usually to express key features of the physical and social environment and which are regarded as peculiar to the variety’ (vocabulary); (3) ‘[a] history – a sense that this variety of English is the way it is because of the history of the language community’ (a history); (4) ‘[a] literature written without apology in that variety of English’ (literary creativity); and (5) ‘[r]eference works – dictionaries and style guides – which show that people in that language community look to themselves, not some outside authority, to decide what is right and wrong in terms of how they speak and write their English’ (reference works). (p. 277)

However, as Kyunghee Choi’s (2007) study on East Asia Englishes suggests, there are few languages that satisfy all the criteria. Bolton (2000) in his study of Hong Kong English also suggests that whether the five criteria are persuasive or powerful is not important. The important thing, according to him, is to create a space in which Hong Kong English can be

\textsuperscript{2} Inner Circle is one of the three circles suggested by Kachru (1992). Kachru divides World Englishes into three circles: the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and the Expanding Circle. The Inner Circle includes British English and the Englishes used as the mother tongues by the people of the countries such as the USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The Outer Circle includes the varieties of Englishes used as second languages in the countries such as Singapore, India, the Philippines, Malaysia, etc. The Expanding Circle includes Englishes spoken as foreign languages in such countries as Korea, Japan, China, Taiwan, etc.
discussed. Jenkins (2003) suggests a different view that there lies a difficulty in the fact that a codified Asian English needs to satisfy those who use it for communication intranationally while it also has to satisfy those from outside world especially from native speaking countries internationally. Besides, it also has to satisfy those non-native speakers who use it for international communication purposes with non-native speakers from other countries.

Bao (2003) suggests that there exists a continuum of Singapore English that includes the acrolectal level on one end, mesolectal level, basilectal level and pidgin on the other end. Not only Singapore English, but also Philippines English has also been analyzed on the continuum (Tayao, 2004). The acrolectal variety is considered to be a standard and the basilectal a colloquial or a non-standard variety often being criticized or stigmatized. In Singapore, Prime Ministers, Lee Kuan Yew and Goh Chok Tong publicly denounced the use of Singlish, a derogative name for basilectal variety of English used in Singapore and launched a “speak good English campaign” (Kyunghee Choi, 2007; Rubdy, 2001). And educators and administrators launched a campaign for the use of internationally acceptable English and try to eradicate the stigmatized colloquial Singapore English (McArthur, 2004).

In China, studies on China English and Chinese English are vigorously conducted recently gaining acceptance and support from many researchers studying China English (Bolton, 2002; Kirkpatrick & Zhichang, 2002; Li, 1993; Qiang & Wolff, 2003; Xiaoqiong, 2004, 2005). Xiaoqiong (2004) puts China English on one end and Chinese English or Chinglish, a derogative term, on the other end. The difference between China English and Chinese English is that the former is understandable to speakers of other varieties of English while the latter is rather incomprehensible for others since it is interfered and influenced by L1 (Jin, 2005). Such researchers as Kirkpatrick and Zhichang (2002), Qiang and Wolff (2003), and Xiaoqiong (2004, 2005) use the term China English not Chinese English to represent a standard, commonly used, and both intranationally and internationally comprehensible variety of English used in China.

Among the three major linguistic categories – grammatical, lexical and phonological – Jenkins (2003) suggests that the phonological aspect is excluded in defining Standard English. Many researchers (Strevens, 1985; Trudgill & Hannah, 1994) focus on grammar and vocabulary in discussion of Standard English. Strevens (1985) mentions that pronunciation can not be labeled “Standard” but only grammar and vocabulary can be. Trudgill and Hannah (1994) also suggest that Standard English refers to grammar and vocabulary but not
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3 As an example of the basilectal Singapore English or Singlish, Bao (2003) suggests that Singaporeans use a unique passive structure influenced by the local language, Malay. According to Bao, Singaporeans might say “John kena scold by her” meaning “John was scolded by her.” In Malay, they say “John kena marah oley dia.”
pronunciation. While pronunciation is given an excuse for the exclusion from the categories of definition of Standard English, there is a more or less identifiable system of accent in many varieties. For example, Hung (2000) suggests that while Hong Kong English is still on the debate of acquiring a status as a new variety of English it is quite certain that it has an identifiable pronunciation. Hung argues that a non-native speaker does not have to be like a native speaker when h/she speaks English. What h/she needs is the proficiency level or ability to pronounce English words and phrases properly so that native and non-native speakers can understand him/her intranationally and internationally. In the aspect of vocabulary, Philippines English, China English, Singapore English, Malaysia English, and other varieties of English have expanded on their own. Grammar is the least different part among varieties of English. However, some localized varieties have different grammatical structures from others. For example Singapore English is famous for its reduplication of words (Wee, 2004) and use of particles (Gupta, 2006; Wee, 2003, 2004; Wong, 2004). The common grammatical features of East Asia Englishes include no conversion of subject and verb, omission of subject, omission of the verb to be, faulty article usage, faulty preposition usage, and lack of subject-verb agreement (Bautista, 2004; Dayag, 2003, 2004; Kyunghee Choi, 2007).

3. NS English Teachers vs. NNS English Teachers

As English is being used as an international language or a global language, the distinction between native and non-native is meaningless and blurred. In a situation in which a Korean speaks to a Singaporean in English, who is native English speaker and who is non-native English speaker? Jenkins (2003) mentions that some speakers from the Outer Circle speak English as their first and occasionally only language. Therefore those English speakers in such outer circle countries as Singapore consider themselves as native speakers of English. Is it also necessary to call a Korean English teacher or user who can command English fluently and proficiently a non-native teacher or user? The term native/non-native causes some negative impacts on teachers whose English proficiency is high. It is often assumed that native speakers are the owners of the language and have the best knowledge of teaching English simply because they were born in native English speaking countries. Jin (2005) argues that even though native speaker teachers have rich experience of learning English as a mother tongue, this does not necessarily mean that they have capacity to teach it as a foreign language. Some problems lie in the assumption that native teachers are automatically capable of teaching English as a foreign language even though they have never learned or taught English as a foreign or second language.

Kirkpatrick (2007) discusses the advantages and disadvantages of both native speaker teachers (hereafter refer to as NS teachers) and non-native speaker teachers (hereafter NNS teachers). He argues that NS teachers can provide with the exonormative model that is
regarded prestigious and legitimate, but it can also undermine “the value and apparent legitimacy of a local teacher’s own model of English” (p. 186). The choice may require local teachers adopt and teach a model that they can never speak, further weakening their self-confidence. Kirkpatrick (ibid.) goes on further arguing that the choice of the NS model can disadvantage learners since they will not attempt to experiment with the language they will never acquire. To support his argument, Kirkpatrick (2007) quotes from Honna and Takeshita, (2000, p. 63) that “. . . Japanese students’ passive attitudes in using this language as a means of international and intercultural communication. They are ashamed if they do not speak English as native speakers do” (p. 188). He adds a passage quoted from Cook (2002, p. 331) that writes “if L2 learners feel that the chief measure of L2 success is passing for native, few are going to meet it. Both teachers and students become frustrated by setting themselves what is, in effect, an impossible target” (Kirkpatrick, 2007, p. 188). Kirkpatrick also (ibid.) notes that the choice of a NS model advantages those norm-providing countries such as the USA and the UK. They can make tremendous benefits by exporting English teaching expertise, materials, and personnel to those norm-dependent countries. In discussing the choice of an endonormative nativised model, he suggests that, among its many advantages, bilingual or multi-lingual local teachers can understand the problems of their students and share their linguistic knowledge in the classroom.

Jin (2005) reports the results of his study on how Chinese university students change their attitudes towards World Englishes after taking his lecture on World Englishes and how the changes in their attitudes influence their preference of NS/NNS teachers. He conducted the pre- and post-lecture questionnaires, individual interviews, and group discussions. The results of the pre- and post-lecture questionnaires reveal that the students show more positive attitudes towards World Englishes after the lecture. Many of them have come to disagree with the ideas that English belongs to the people of the United States or the United Kingdom. They have become less obsessed with American English or British English as Standard English. However, their positive changes did not affect their preferences towards NS teachers’ classes. The Chinese students were reluctant to learn China English and there seems to be no direct relationship between their attitudes toward World Englishes and their choice of English teachers.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

1. Subjects

The total number of participants is 159. The research participants belong to two different classes in two different schools but taught by the same researcher-teacher. The former group
labeled “H Group” consists of 118 students who were sophomores in a 2 year-college in Seoul in 2006 when the questionnaire survey was conducted. Their major was tourism and had never taken a course on World Englishes or related areas. They regard English speaking ability as a key asset for their future success. All the students in this group are native Korean. On the other hand, the latter group labeled “K Group” consists of 41 students who went to a 4 year university in Seoul. They took the course entitled “World Englishes and Miscommunication” in the spring semester in 2007. The course was taught by the same researcher. In K Group, there were three Malaysian, one Chinese, one Uzbekistan, one Taiwanese, and one Korean American students. The rest 34 students were from Korea but most of them had lived abroad except a few. In Korean educational system, it is more difficult to get admission from the 4-year university than the 2-year college. Especially those students with very high scores of English in SAT can be admitted to this 4-year university. Based on the observation of the researcher as the teacher of both groups, it is fair enough to state that the English proficiency of K Group was much higher than that of the other group.

2. Questionnaire

The questionnaire (see Appendix) conducted on both H Group and K Group includes four sections in each of which contains 5 questions. In the first section, the questions on American English and British English as Standard English and ownership of English are being asked. The second section on the other hand deals with issues of World Englishes and recognition of localized Englishes including Korea English. The questions were designed to ask students how much they know about World Englishes and what they think of local Englishes. The third and fourth sections deal with students’ preference for NS English teachers and NNS English teachers. The third section focuses on what students think of NS teachers while the fourth section asks questions in relation to NNS teachers. Each question has five choices that range from Number 1 meaning “strongly disagree” to Number 5 indicating “strongly agree.”

3. Research Questions

This paper is designed to investigate how Korean students react to World Englishes and how their attitudes affect their preferences of teachers. The researcher assumed that, as the course progressed, many of them would begin to understand that there are many varieties of English used by the speakers even in one native English speaking country and many more local varieties of Englishes in different countries around the world. The course focused on the history of English spreads that took place through the first and second
diasporas and due to the recent economic and cultural exchanges and transfers, and the characteristics and features of various varieties of English used in the NS countries such as the UK, the USA, and Australia, and some Asian countries such as Singapore, the Philippines, Hong Kong, China and Korea. However, the researcher could not expect positive attitudes and responses of the K Group students towards Korea English. Even though the researcher used the term “Korea English” to refer to the variety of English that has been used in Korea, she could not fully discuss its characteristics and features due to the lack of literature and studies on it. The course also discussed the roles, and the advantages and disadvantages of NS and NNS teachers in general. Due to the time limit, the detailed discussion was not carried on the different English proficiency levels of NS and NNS teachers and their characteristics.

Most of the 41 students in K Group had a good command of English. They were able to understand the lectures, communicate with their teacher and other students, give presentations, and write essays in English, thus fulfilling the course requirements without major problems. A few of them were “native” English speakers or “near native” speakers. In the beginning of the course “World Englishes and Miscommunication,” the students strongly disagreed with the notion of World Englishes. They were reluctant to discuss the questions and issues raised against the notion of Standard English. Almost all of them thought Standard English is either American English or British English. They did not find a reason to be against the native speaker norms. They took this course so as to fulfill the requirement of taking enough courses conducted in English before their graduation. Since the K Group students are the ones who will be working as leaders playing pivotal roles in many walks of the future Korean society, it is very important to educate them with new and different ideas and help them have a balanced view on the ownership of the English language for the future education of English in Korea.

The students in H Group, on the other hand, were not given a lecture on World Englishes. They were unaware of the notion of World Englishes at the beginning of the study and remained unaware of it at the time of taking the questionnaire. They might have heard of World Englishes a couple of times from the teacher-researcher who might have mentioned it in passing. They also had a strong belief and preference for Standard English and native speaker teachers. However, these students whose English proficiency is relatively lower and who are shy of speaking English more urgently need to become aware of the new notions. By setting a more realistic target, they can become more active in using the language and successfully achieve their goal. However, the lower-level students tend to set the NS model as their goal. And then they often feel frustrated and demotivated due to the

---

4 The first diaspora refers to the spread of English through the migration of British people to America, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and the second diaspora refers to the spread of English by the colonization of Asian and African countries (Jenkins, 2003).
goal they themselves set. They may be the victims of the native speaker norms and Standard English. They think anything they say and write is considered wrong and bad. They are shy of speaking English in front of their peers, teachers, and foreigners because their pronunciation is far from native. They are afraid of speaking because they may make errors and mistakes. They are the ones who truly need lectures and education on World Englishes so that they can get rid of myth of Standard English and more effectively learn practical English.

The researcher assumes that teaching about World Englishes is important in changing students’ misconception about standard and nativeness. By taking a course on World Englishes, students may change their attitudes towards their English ability and methods of learning English and get rid of bias and worries. This paper aims to suggest what differences there are between the group of students who have taken the course on World Englishes and the group of students who have not. The hypotheses of the study are:

1) The students who have taken the course on World Englishes get rid of the myth of Standard English and have better and positive attitudes towards World Englishes.
2) The students who have taken the course prefer non-native local English teachers.

4. Analysis and Discussion

The result of the reliability test shows that the questionnaire has internal consistency at the alpha value of 0.99 shown at the bottom of Table 1. Question 1 in the questionnaire asks how much they agree with the statement, “Standard English is British English or American English.” The both groups agree with the statement. However, while H Group got the mean score of 4.47, K Group got 3.85. The difference between the two groups is very significant at the 0.01 level ($p < 0.01$), showing a $p$ value of 0.000. The second question that states “English belongs to the UK or USA” has been rated 3.41 by H Group and 2.71 by K Group. The difference between the two is also significant indicating that the students in K Group show less favor towards the idea of ownership of English by the people of UK or USA. Both groups seem to disagree with the statement in Question 3 that British or American people have right to decide how English should be. The difference of mean scores between the two groups is insignificant. The result of Question 4 shows a significant difference between the two groups. More students in K Group are not ashamed of their Korean accent and do not try to get rid of it when they speak English than the other group students. The difference between the two groups is significant. For Question 5, both groups seem to show disagreement with the statement. However, the difference in mean scores between the two groups is significant at the $p$ value of 0.05. This indicates that the students in K Group disagree more with the statement “if English is used differently from
British or American English, it must be wrong.”

**TABLE 1**

Mean Comparison of Each Question Between H Group and K Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>School Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H 118</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.910 (p &lt; 0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>H 118</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H 118</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>(p &gt; 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>H 117</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.361</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>H 117</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>H 117</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.393</td>
<td>(p &gt; 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>H 118</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>H 116</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>(p &gt; 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>H 118</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>H 118</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.403</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>(p &gt; 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>H 118</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>H 118</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.257</td>
<td>(p &gt; 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>H 116</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.332</td>
<td>(p &gt; 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>H 118</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>(p &gt; 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>H 118</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>(p &gt; 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>H 118</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>H 118</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>H 118</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>(p &gt; 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>H 118</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>(p &gt; 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>H 117</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 41</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>(p &lt; 0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.99)

Therefore in Section 1, the students of K Group tend to disagree more with the
statements which show preferences towards Standard English. They were very critical of the new ideas on World Englishes in the beginning of the semester. The questionnaire survey result shows that the group who received education on World Englishes has become less obsessed with the notions of Standard English and its ownership while the group who did not receive the lessons still remains obsessed with them. As Table 2 shows in Section 1, the two groups show a significant difference. More they were educated and informed of World Englishes, the less obsessed they are with the notion of Standard English. This result coincides with that of Jin’s study (2005).

In the second section, the five statements are concerned with World Englishes and local Englishes. The second section was especially designed to find out what the students think of local Englishes. The result of Question 6 indicates that the students of both groups have heard of World Englishes. However interestingly enough the H Group students who have not taken any formal courses on World Englishes agree more with the statement “Korea English (My local variety of English) should be recognized and stand alongside British or American English” in Question 7. While the students in K Group show more negative attitudes towards the notions that Standard English is either British English or American English and it belongs to the people of either country as shown in Section 1, they are still reluctant to recognize the local English as a legitimate variety of English. This is probably due to the fact that Korea English has not been fully analyzed and recognized. While some local varieties of Englishes in the Outer Circle countries are considered to be in the standardizing process, the local Englishes used in the Expanding Circle have not yet been properly discussed. For Question 8, both group students think that more lectures should be given on World Englishes and local Englishes. When it comes to their accents of local Englishes, both groups disagree with the statement in Question 9 “I am proud of my Korean accent when I speak English.” Especially the students in H Group show strong disagreement with the statement, indicating that they are very ashamed of their pronunciation. Their mean score is 1.94, which falls between “strongly disagree” and “disagree.” The mean difference between the two groups is very significant in Question 9. For the recent argument that foreigners especially native speakers of British English or American English should learn local Englishes if they want to do business and communicate with local people (Kyung-Ja Park & Nakano, 2007), both groups do not give a support as the result of Question 10 indicates. Overall, the two groups do not show a significant difference between them in Section 2, meaning that they both are not yet ready to accept the existence of local Englishes. K Group students show more negative attitudes towards Standard English and its ownership. However these attitudes do not seem to affect their recognition and acceptance of local Englishes. A similar result was suggested by Jin (2005). Even after a series of lectures on World Englishes and China English, the Chinese students Jin conducted the study with did not show favorable attitudes towards China
English. More research on local Englishes should be done in the future.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td><em>(p &lt; 0.01)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.326</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td><em>(p &gt; 0.05)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td><em>(p &gt; 0.05)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td><em>(p &lt; 0.01)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third and fourth sections deal with students’ preference towards NS and NNS teachers of English. The third section focuses on preference of NS teachers while the fourth concerns NNS teachers. While the third section shows no significant mean difference between the two groups, the fourth indicates a very big difference between them. As Question 11 shows, both group students think it is fine to have Korean or non-native teachers to teach them English. However, Question 12 shows that they want to have native English teachers because their English is Standard English. Both group students want to have native speakers because they can provide more reliable linguistic knowledge (Question 13) and correct students’ errors and mistakes better (Question 14). They also answered positively on Question 15 indicating that they assume they will speak like a native if they learn from a native speaker teacher. However, both groups got mean scores of a little less than 3 for Question 13. This illustrates that the students do not show a full support for the reliability of linguistic knowledge of native speaker English teachers.

As Table 2 indicates, the two groups show a big difference in Section 4. While the average mean score of the H Group is 3.51, the score of K Group is 2.78. In other words, the H Group students whose English proficiency is lower than the other group students prefer NNS English teachers. The H Group students reveal that they think they learn more from NNS teachers since they explain grammar better in their mother tongue (Question 16). When teachers explain difficult linguistic features in the same first language, students seem to feel less stressful and understand better (Question 17). The H Group students favor NNS teachers of English because they can help them better with difficulties in learning English since they had similar difficulties as learners thus are more sympathetic with students’ problems (Question 18). For lower level students, NNS teachers who speak the same first language seem to set a good example of successful English learners, which motives them to study harder (Question 19). The H Group students want to have NNS teachers since they...
can provide them with a more realistic model of English that they can set as their goal (Question 20). On the other hand, even though the K Group students have changed their attitudes towards Standard and World Engishes, they have not changed their preference for NS teachers. There seems to be no direct relationship between taking a course on World Engishes and its influence on their preference of teachers. This result is similar to that of Jin’s study (2005).

IV. CONCLUSION

The overall result of the questionnaire survey conducted on Korean college students coincides with that of the study by Jin (2005). Like Jin’s study, the result of this study informs that the students who took a course on World Engishes have become less obsessed with American English or British English as Standard Engish and become more aware of World Engishes. However, they have not yet agreed with the notion of Korea English. Their positive attitudes towards the notion of World Engishes did not influence their preference of NS teachers. Thus, the first hypothesis has proven to be correct while the second one has not.

The result of the first research question is encouraging since the K Group students have become less obsessed with Standard Engish and more aware of World Engishes. It is significant to educate young Koreans who will be playing major roles as parents, educators, or leaders in the future society. To reduce the social problems caused by the excessive obsession with standard myth, more people have to understand the existence and use of varieties of Engish in the world. However, even after studying the course on World Engishes for a semester, the K Group students show more preference towards NS teachers. This result seems to be quite obvious due to their high level of Engish proficiency. They could feel that they did not need NNS teachers. With or without taking the course, students with higher levels of Engish proficiency may still want to learn from NS teachers. The reason that the K Group students do not yet support for Korea English even after the course can be attributed to the fact that it did not deal much with characteristics and features of Korea English which has not yet been defined and recognized by many researchers in the academic fields concerned.

The H Group students strongly support for the statement that American Engish or British Engish is Standard Engish. This result of the H Group students seems to be obvious since they did not formally study World Engishes. This may reflect most of the Korean people who have not learned about World Engishes and have not thought of why we need to understand the notion. The H Group students show stronger preference for NNS teachers. The lower level language learners who are known to be less confident of
their English ability may feel less stressful with NNS teachers of English. They are usually nervous to produce anything that is not “good” and “normative” and to misunderstand what NS teachers say. The lower level students may feel more comfortable with NNS teachers of English who can better understand their mistakes and difficulties. With or without taking the course on World Englishes, they may still want to learn from NNS teachers because of the advantages they can get from NNS teachers. When lower level students learn English from those teachers whose linguistic, cultural, and geographical backgrounds are similar if not the same, they can benefit more from NNS teachers since they can share their experience as an English learner in similar backgrounds. Phillipson (1992) suggests that educated local teacher is an ideal English teacher. Seidlhofer (1999) even suggests that NNS teachers can take advantage of their status as NNS teachers for they can develop their assets for the benefit of their students. However, what is more important is the fact that teacher education has to focus on how to identify their assets and develop them as important resources to satisfy the needs and preferences of their students. NNS teachers should have more confidence in teaching English while they have to keep trying to improve their general English ability. Being born in native countries does not guarantee native speakers teaching proficiency even though their communicative ability surpasses that of NNS teachers. Well trained NNS teachers can teach a foreign language better and more efficiently than NS teachers of the target language.

Lower level students need education on World Englishes since they are the ones who are usually too shy to communicate in English with foreigners because of their “incorrect” pronunciation and grammar. Their level of English may be on the basilectal level or the mesolectal level. They can move up to the acrolectal level only by learning and using the language in any given situation. Instead of letting many learners blindly adore native norms and NS teachers, we have to give more lectures on World Englishes that are being used between the people of the same nation and among the people from different countries. It is impossible to learn features of all the varieties of English existing in the world. However, depending on the situation, we may have to understand a local variety of English of other nations so as to do our business more successfully and achieve our goal more effectively. At the same time, we should be ready to communicate easily even with some unique features of our pronunciation and structure instead of being silent and passive in fear of making mistakes. To help many lower level Korean learners of English to get rid of “standard myth” and become more confident of speaking English, more lectures on World Englishes and localized Englishes must be given. Full-fledged research works have to be undertaken for the description of Korea English and its variety that is being used by educated Korean speakers. In order to upgrade English communicative ability of Korean people, more opportunities should be provided for them to proudly use the language even with indigenous Korean features.
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**APPENDIX**

**Questionnaire**

This questionnaire consists of four sections. The first two sections include questions on World Englishes and Korea English. The last two sections are on your preference for native or Korean teachers of English. Please circle the number depending on how strongly you agree or disagree with the statements. (1 = I strongly disagree; 5 = I strongly agree)
Section A
1. Standard English is British English or American English.
   1 2 3 4 5
2. English belongs to the UK or the USA.
   1 2 3 4 5
3. It is British or American English speakers who have right to decide how English should be.
   1 2 3 4 5
4. I am ashamed of my Korean (local) accent and try to get rid of it when I speak English.
   1 2 3 4 5
5. If English is used differently from British or American English, it must be wrong.
   1 2 3 4 5

Section B
6. I have heard of World Englishes.
   1 2 3 4 5
7. Korea English (My local variety of English) should be recognized and stand alongside British or American English.
   1 2 3 4 5
8. More lectures should be given on World Englishes and Korea English.
   1 2 3 4 5
9. I am proud of my Korean (local) accent when I speak English.
   1 2 3 4 5
10. Korea English (My local variety of English) is used differently from British or American English. It should be learned by foreigners, especially the native speakers of English who want to communicate with Korean (my local) people in English.
    1 2 3 4 5

Section C
11. I do not want a Korean (Malaysian, Chinese, etc.) teacher to teach me English.
    1 2 3 4 5
12. I want a native English speaker teacher to teach me English since his/her English is Standard English.
    1 2 3 4 5
13. Native speaker teachers provide more reliable linguistic knowledge.
    1 2 3 4 5
14. Native speaker teachers correct me better when I make mistakes.
    1 2 3 4 5
15. Eventually, I will speak native like English if I study with a native speaker teacher.

16. I learn more with Korean (Malaysian, Chinese, etc.) teachers of English since they explain grammar better than native speaker teachers.

17. I learn more with Korean (Malaysian, Chinese, etc.) teachers of English since they can sometimes explain in the Korean (my) language and that helps me understand English better.

18. Korean (Malaysian, Chinese, etc.) teachers help me better with difficulties in learning English since they have experienced similar difficulties.

19. Korean (Malaysian, Chinese, etc.) teachers of English set a good example of successful English learners. That motivates me to study hard.

20. I want to have a Korean (Malaysian, Chinese, etc.) teacher as my English teacher since his/her English is more realistic for me to achieve as a learning target.

Applicable Levels: tertiary education
Key words: World Englishes, Standard English, localized Englishes, native English teachers, non-native English teachers
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