World Englishes-Based Lessons: Their Effects on Anxiety and Language Achievement of Thai Tertiary Students

Jaruda Rajani Na Ayuthaya
Language Institute, Thammasat University, Thailand

Pragasit Sitthitikul
Language Institute, Thammasat University, Thailand

Abstract
Foreign language classroom anxiety (FLCA) is prevalent among Thai learners, affecting language learning achievement. This problem has been rooted in ineffective pedagogical practice informed by native speaker (NS) ideology of English language teaching (ELT) policy in Thailand. This has made learners struggle to reach an unrealistic goal of NS norms as the only way to be proficient users of English, leading to low self-esteem and fear of speaking English. This study aims to investigate a paradigm shift in ELT as a means to reduce students' FLCA. By incorporating World Englishes (WE) into English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom practice, it is believed that students will develop a more realistic goal of being efficient English users rather than struggling, and failing, to become like native English speakers. As a result, they will develop self-esteem and more confidence in using their own English, considered a crucial anxiety-buffering factor. Quasi-experimental research with 92 first-year students at one government university in Bangkok was employed over 17 weeks in one of their required English courses. FLCA questionnaires and English achievement tests were used as a pretest and posttest to find out anxiety and achievement levels, while a focus group interview yielded supplementary data. Means, SD, T-test results and content analysis were used for data analysis, showing a significant reduction in anxiety resulting from the WE-based instruction and an increase in achievement from the FLCA reduction. Therefore, this study concludes that global ELT curriculum should incorporate more WE in classroom practice as an alternative means to reduce FLCA and indirectly increase language achievement.

Key words: English as an international language, L2 learning anxiety, students' L2 achievement, world englishes

Introduction

　　　Anxiety among second or foreign language students is prevalent, affecting language learning achievement in many EFL contexts, including Thailand. Various treatments have been sought by many researchers to date, but the results have not been satisfactory since language classrooms are complex and involve various factors. This study presents another alternative to help reduce anxiety and bring about greater language achievement. This potential solution involves a shift in ELT curricula implementation that incorporates English as an International Language (EIL) or WE notions in classroom practice. This shift is especially appropriate in contexts where English is used as a lingua franca among non-native speakers (NNSs) (Jindapitak & Teo, 2013). Also, traditional pedagogical principles that push NS ideology can cause students to experience tension, low confidence and fear of speaking English, as they tend to devalue themselves as being local NNSs in peripheral positions outside English discourses (Boriboon, 2011; Methitham & Chamcharatsri, 2011).

　　　Through the researcher's teaching experience in Thailand, many students fear to speak English, and experience anxiety and low self-esteem, or low perception of their own success, by having NS norms (mainly British and North American) as a yardstick to judge their success or failure. This is also reaffirmed by the Director of Office of the Basic Education Commission (OBEC) in Thailand (Personal Communication, December 2014) who notes anxiety as the main obstacle for Thai students in learning English. He concludes that among various sources for language anxiety, it appears that *unrealistic learning goals* informed by NS norms, *low self-esteem*, and *fear of negative evaluation or social discrimination* if they cannot speak with a NS accent are most prevailing. These three factors are interrelated and confirmed by previous studies to be crucial sources of anxiety (Boriboon, 2011; Young, 1999). These factors move learners away from participation in comprehensible input and output, indispensable for language learning success (Swain, 1985). Thai students' unrealistic goals, low self-esteem, and fear of negative evaluation have been rooted in the ineffective pedagogical practice guided by NS ideological domination that puts a great deal of pressure on learners to acquire native-like linguistic and sociocultural norms (Boriboon, 2011). Various scholars (e.g. Cook, 2014; McKay, 2012; Matsuda, 2003; Canagarajah, 1999) consider such goals unrealistic and could result in unhealthy attitudes and low self-esteem as the struggle to reach such unrealistic goals can become a great potential source of tension or fear to speak English, affecting language performance (Boriboon, 2011).

　　　In this changing landscape of English, learners should be prepared to communicate in intercultural contexts. In addition, since language anxiety has been found to be rooted in NS-based ELT curriculum in Thailand, the question arises as to whether NS models should be the only correct models to inform ELT policies in Thailand, or whether the curriculum should be more enriched by introducing the legitimacy of other varieties of English alongside NS models. Among various solutions to the anxiety problems, a reconsideration of ELT curricula implementation to address more WE/EIL notions which attempt to go beyond the nativeness might be another effective means to promote realistic learning goals and develop confidence among Thai learners to speak English, leading to a reduction in anxiety.

Need of the Study

Even though various attempts have been provided as solutions to reduce FLCA, none of them have been discussed under the WE/EIL framework. Most suggestions still gear towards traditional classrooms in which NS norms are used as a yardstick to judge students' success or failure (Cook, 2014). Furthermore, even though WE/EIL theory has gained acceptance in the last three decades, there is far less discussion on pedagogical implications that are specific enough to be useful in classroom practice (Jenkins, Cogo & Dewey, 2011). This study will hopefully fill in these gaps in ELT in terms of FLCA minimization and pedagogical practice.

Significance of the Study

This study can contribute to both teaching and learning aspects in a way that provides alternatives for English teachers or administrators to create curriculum that truly reflects the current English learning environment. Also, it offers another effective solution to reduce learners' FLCA, a crucial means for language learning achievement.

Aims and Research Questions

This study aims to investigate the effectiveness of the incorporation of WE in EFL classroom practice in reducing FLCA among Thai tertiary students, as well as explore if the reduction of FLCA could help increase language learning achievement. Two research questions include:

1. Does the incorporation of World Englishes in classroom practice help reduce FLCA among Thai tertiary students?
2. Do the students in a WE group outperform students in a control group in terms of English language achievement?

Literature Review

Anxiety and language learning

Anxiety is an unpleasant emotional state filled with nervousness and apprehension (Freud, 1924, as cited in Chiang, 2012). When anxiety is limited to specific language learning situations such as a foreign language classroom, it is a specific anxiety called *foreign language classroom anxiety* (FLCA), defined by MacIntyre and Gardner as a tension or apprehension particularly related to second or foreign language learning, including listening, speaking, and learning (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994, as cited in Tintaboot, 1998). Horwitz et al. (1986) note that performance in foreign language can be problematic as it involves risk-taking and may challenge an individual's self-perception as a competent communicator and lead to self-consciousness, reticence, or fear. The occurrence of frequent mistakes may also put the students in vulnerable positions, opening them up to negative evaluation. Students who exhibit low FLCA tend to have greater success in school and feel like studying more in class than their higher FLCA counterparts (Horwitz et al., 1986).

Since FLCA concerns performance evaluation within both academic and social contexts, Horwitz et al. (1986) provide three related factors or specific anxieties of FLCA. The first is *Communication Apprehension* (CA), or fear of communicating with people. The second is *Fear of Negative Evaluation*, which is anxiety about others' evaluations. The third is *Test Anxiety*, which is anxiety stemming from fear of failure. Young (1999) further includes some other specific anxieties or factors causing FLCA, such as classroom procedures, teachers' beliefs about

language teaching, personal factors involving low self-esteem, and unrealistic learning goals based on NS models. Wang (2010) also notes a close relationship between CA, fear of negative evaluation and low self-esteem. To clarify, self-esteem is closely linked to anxiety. Students who begin with a self-perceived low ability level in foreign language classes are perfect candidates for language anxiety. And vice versa, anxious students tend to have low self-esteem (MacIntyre & Noels, 1994, as cited in Young, 1999). Low self-esteem can be caused by learners' unrealistic learning goals such as developing an accent that approximates that of native speakers (Young, 1999), leading to great anxiety once expectations and reality clash (Ganschow et al., 1994, as cited in Occhipinti, 2009). Students start worrying when they realize it is impossible to acquire such a goal in a short amount of time, or whether it is even possible at all. In the researcher's experience, this realization negatively affects many Thai students' self-esteem. According to such NS goals, to perform differently could lead to the possibility of being wrong and then lead to a fear of negative evaluation, such as being laughed at or perceived as low-level users (Moore, 1997, as cited in Occhipinti, 2009), which impairs self-esteem further. Among affective factors in language learning, anxiety stands out as the best predictor for language learning success (Horwitz, 2001).

To date, there have been various attempts made to overcome FLCA. For example, Tanveer (2007) suggests that teachers promote realistic goals by using materials that do not present nativelike pronunciation as the only model. Greensberg et al. (1992, as cited in Ozwuegbuzie, 1999) propose a terror management theory, which focuses on the idea that positive self-esteem will act as a protector against any type of language anxiety. Other treatments from cognitive, behavior, and pedagogical approaches present Cognitive Modification (CM), Skill Training (ST) (Mejias et al., 1991, as cited in Occhipinti, 2009), and a Community Language Learning (CLL) approach (Koba et al., 2000).

ELT situation in Thailand

ELT policies in Thailand have long been informed by NS ideological domination, which has caused Thai learners to have low self-esteem and a serious and permanent destruction of identity, indirectly affecting language learning achievement (Boriboon, 2011). NS ideology centered around North American and British models in Thailand has been reinforced through textbooks, teaching methods, testing techniques, policy makers, and teachers, all of which get passed on to the students and society as a whole. Most Thai teachers believe that the ultimate goal of English learning is to help students achieve NS models (Choomthong, 2014), including pronunciation, forms, and cultural norms. As a result, most Thai students are afraid to speak English for fear of discrimination if they cannot speak with a NS accent (Boriboon, 2011). Too-much prioritizing of NS models can reinforce the idea that other NNS varieties, including students' own, are not acceptable, inferior, low-competent or even low-class, while the NS counterparts symbolize modern, superior, or high-class (Jindapitak & Teo, 2012), indicating that language learning cannot be discussed from apolitical view. Boriboon (2011) notes that the incomplete presentation of English varieties in English classrooms in Thailand has gradually made other Englishes, including Thai English, be refused and gained no position in the society and contributed to the fear students have in speaking English, both inside and outside the classroom.

WE/EIL prospectives and ELT implications

The use of English has changed from being a language primarily used between NSs to becoming an international medium in multicultural communication used mainly among NNSs (Jenkins, 2009), which has led to the pluralization of English, resulting in the birth of new varieties of English and the emergence of the terms *World Englishes*, *English as an International Language*, and *English as a Lingua Franca*. All highlight the increasing role NNSs play in using English alongside their first language to serve their specific needs (McKay, 2012). To acknowledge the spread of English, Kachru (1992) divides WE into three concentric circles: *The Inner Circle*, referring to native-speaking countries (e.g., USA, UK, Australia, New Zealand, Canada); *The Outer Circle,* referring to former colonial countries where English is used as a second language (e.g., India, Philippines, Singapore); *The Expanding Circle*, referring to countries such as Thailand, China, Japan where English is used as a foreign language (Jenkins, 2009).

The current English profile has important pedagogical implications on ELT, including awareness-raising of the existence of other English varieties, valuing learners' own and other varieties as legitimate modes of communication, and the need for learners to be able to listen and comprehend diverse English varieties for business, travel, study and other purposes (Kubota, 2012). These implications have called for a paradigm shift in ELT curriculum to incorporate realistic and authentic needs of English (Cook, 2014; McKay, 2012) by putting aside NSs as the only, or best, models and addressing more realistic goals of being effective English users, which does not require NS competence (Matsuda, 2003).

WE principles reflected in WE-based lessons

WE framework in this study is informed by the Kachruvian approach (1992) and Matsuda & Friedrich (2011), in which the underlying philosophy argues for the importance of pluricentricity in the linguistics of English worldwide. Successful international communication among people who do not share a common first language does not require one particular model of English. WE/EIL concepts in this study also highlight the freedom that learners have in designing their own Englishes without being restricted by NS norms and is not a course or class that teaches a particular linguistic variety as it is believed that there is no single variety that can assure success in all situations of international communication (Matsuda & Friedrich, 2011). Based on this idea, Matsuda & Friedrich (2011) note that a WE/EIL class should aim to prepare learners to become competent users of English in international contexts who are able to use English to serve their specific needs while respecting the needs of others. An attempt to create competent EIL users requires the curriculum to give equal importance to three aspects: linguistic competence; other competences (e.g. pragmatic, strategic); other knowledge (three types of culture). From these three aspects, four principles described by Matsuda & Friedrich (2011) were used to design WE-based lessons in this study. It should be noted, however, that an established variety is appropriate as the primary instructional model as suggested by Matsuda and Friedrich. In other words, teachers can choose one of the established varieties (codified and used for wide communicative functions; e.g. British English, Indian English) as the dominant instructional model, while also introducing other varieties as part of common classroom practice. In this way, teachers should emphasize that the variety selected as dominant is simply one of many English varieties that exist in the world and that other Englishes the students will encounter in the future may look or sound different from this.

The first WE principle is *Awareness of and Exposure to Varieties of English*. Matsuda & Friedrich (2011) note that lack of awareness might lead students to believe there is only one correct variety. Therefore, they may develop negative attitudes towards their own and other NNS varieties, and also lose confidence in successful communication, as they have never seen effective NNS models. Jindapitak & Teo (2012) and Boriboon (2011) also point out that negative attitudes resulting from an incomplete presentation of English varieties in classrooms could cause learners to disfavor other standard varieties and form a deep-seated inferior self-image by concluding that their own English is unacceptable. Moreover, the students would have no way to know how successful they could communicate with their accented English and they may feel embarrassed about their accent and hesitate to use it (Matsuda, 2003). Examples of classroom activities may include YouTube VDO representing varieties of English and how stereotypes are constructed in a society (Bayyurt & Altinmakas, 2012), or inviting international visitors to class (Matsuda & Friedrich, 2011).

The second principle is the *History, Politics and Ownership of English*. According to Matsuda (2003), a traditional curriculum fails to address issues such as language and power, the colonial past of English, stories of the worldwide spread of English and its implications on language learning, the current EIL status, and variations in English standards. As a result, without the awareness of the potential power struggles associated with EIL, learners tend to devalue their own status in international communication (Pennycook, 1998) and likely to assume that it is Inner Circle native speakers who have the right to use English or have the ownership to the English language (Matsuda, 2003). Interestingly, such NS ideology is found to have a psychological impact on users of English, drawing them to get close to those whom they believe to be the owners of the language (Jenkins, 2009). Possible activities to remedy this situation could include reading the history of colonial past and the spread of the English language to help students critically think about the ownership of English, or examine the discourses surrounding the use of English which tend to promote unrealistic expectations (McKay, 2012).

The third principle is *Three Types of Cultures* which includes the awareness of *global culture* or global issues such as world peace, environment, human rights in relation to globalization and the spread of the English language. Activities can be course assignments or appropriate reading encouraging students to critically discuss the topics in class. Next, *culture of future interlocutors* entail those of all three concentric circles to let students learn and understand the wide diversity that exists among English-speaking countries. This can be introduced in class by pointing out resources to learn about a particular country from an English website created by its government (Matsuda & Friedrich, 2011). Last is the *students' own culture*, which may include students explaining their own culture in a way that outsiders can understand. This can be introduced in class by assigning students to create an English website of their hometown. In short, *three types of culture* could help students become conscious about gaining the ability to articulate one's convictions to an international audience. It is a more important objective for language learning than imitating the usage habits of native speakers (Matsuda & Duran, 2012), and also develops students' ability to extend or transfer their cultural knowledge to anticipate cultural traits in new or unexpected communication situations.

The fourth WE principle is *Communication Strategies*. Various scholars (e.g. Kubota, 2012; Matsuda, 2003) note that communicative strategies are required for WE/EIL curriculum as

linguistic knowledge alone is not adequate for successful communication, which individuals bring their own linguistic and cultural backgrounds to approach international communication. Therefore, students should have the ability to make effective use of various strategies to enhance intelligibility, overcome communication difficulties, and develop confidence in their ability to use English (Kubota, 2012). Possible activities include explicitly teaching communicative strategies or exemplifying NNS-NNS interactions to engage students in communication prepared for miscommunication and how to address it (McKay, 2012).

Previous studies of WE in classroom practice

Relevant research on WE in classroom practice over the past 10 years is scarce. The important studies are as follows. Lee's study (2012) supports the positive effects of a WE-based course. This study evaluates a pilot program at Chukyo High School in Japan. The program successfully develops positive attitudes and confidence in students speaking their own English, and lessens anxiety and encourages more class participation. D'Angelo (2012) at Chukyo University in Japan, Sharifian & Marlina (2012) at Monash University in Melbourne, Australia, and Bayyurt & Altinmakas (2012) at Turkish University also find that students successfully develop awareness of other varieties when presented with WE-based courses. Besides, they develop positive attitudes and respect towards their own and other NNS varieties, recognizing them as legitimate varieties. Other attempts include Baik & Shim (2002) who introduce WE in their classrooms via the internet at Open Cyber University of Korean, and Jindapitak & Teo (2012) who use an attitudinal neutrality activity to make the students aware of their linguistic prejudice at a university in Thailand.

Methodology

Research design

This study used a mixed-method approach since it aligns with Dornyei's (2007) suggestion to be appropriate for a classroom research which requires the use of more than one method to understand what is happening in such complex environment. This study employed quasi-experiment as the main approach, with qualitative inquiries (focus group interview and headnotes) to help triangulate the results or to be confident that the results were due to the treatment (WE-based lessons), not some other variables.

Research setting and participants

The university being studied was one government University in Bangkok where the researcher has been working. It was comprised of 15 Faculties (e.g., Humanities, Fisheries, Agro-Industry, Social Science). In this study, the population was around 2,596 who were all first-year and non-English major students, studying in a regular program. About 1,250 students were from arts and 1,350 from science field. The participants included 47 students in the control group and 45 in the experimental group. All participants were first-year students, coming from various faculties. To meet certain practical criteria, students were assigned to enroll in an appropriate English course level determined by the Office of the Registrar (2014) at this government university. Both groups were lower-intermediate and enrolled for the Foundation English II course.

Data collection

Data was gathered in the first semester of the 2015 academic year. The semester covered 17 weeks, running from August to December. Seven of those weeks were devoted to university activities, so the actual data collection took place over 10 weeks, separated into eight weeks of WE lesson plans plus two weeks for the pretest and posttest. Each lesson took 1.5 hours. To answer the first research question (Does the incorporation of WE-based lessons in classroom practice help reduce FLCA among Thai tertiary students?), three main instruments were used.

FLCAS questionnaire

A 39-item Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) was used to measure foreign language anxiety, adapted from the 33-item tool designed by Horwitz et al. (1986) and Aida (1994), and expanded upon by Young's (1999) and Matsuda & Friedrich's (2011) framework. Validation by three experts through the Item Objective Congruence (IOC) process was done and piloted for its high reliability of 0.929 by using the coefficient of Cronbach. All items were scored on a Likert-5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The minimum score was 39 points, while the maximum was 195 points. A higher score showed a high level of FLCA, while a lower score showed a low level of FLCA. The questionnaire contained five specific anxieties: Communication apprehension and Fear of negative evaluation; Fear of failing the class; Comfortableness in speaking with native English speakers; Negative attitudes towards the English class; Unrealistic learning goals and low self-esteem. All items were written in the Thai language to assure valid answers. (See the questionnaire in Appendix A)

WE-based lesson plans

Eight WE-based lesson plans were used with the experimental group as treatment to explore its effects on reducing FLCA. The researcher collected, adapted and developed speech samples and materials representing many English varieties as suggested by Matsuda (2003). These samples and materials include YouTube clips, dialogues, readings, and others. A conscious effort was made to use a wide range of English varieties, rather than being limited by speech samples from the British and American standards presented in the textbook used in this course. The eight lesson plans were designed to reflect all four WE principles based on Matsuda & Friedrich (2011), and integrated into the existing tasks sheets, topics, and course objectives set for the Foundation English II course. The activities were adapted from Matsuda & Friedrich (2011), Matsuda & Duran (2012), McKay (2012), and expanded upon by the researcher. (See the sample lesson plan in Appendix B)

Focus group interview

The focus group interview was used to supplement the results from the FLCA questionnaire to see how WE principles may help reduce FLCA. 10 voluntary students were selected from those who showed a significant reduction in FLCA scores between the pretest and posttest, and showed an increase in their English achievement scores. These students were further separated by gender (five males/five females), and fields of study (five arts/five science). The researcher developed 10 guideline questions, validated by three experts, piloted and revised before their actual use.

The second research question is: Do the students in the experimental group outperform the students in the control group in terms of English language achievement as a result of the FLCA reduction? The *English achievement test* was used to find their English achievement level. This test was adopted from previous Foundation English II tests and validated through IOC. The finalized test included 50 items worth 50 marks, and divided into four main parts: vocabulary-15 items; expressions-10 items; structure-15 items; reading comprehension-10 items (one reading passage). All items were in a multiple choice format with four options (a, b, c, d).

Procedures

Before the experiment, the FLCA questionnaire and English achievement test were given as a pretest, taking about 15 and 45 minutes, respectively. Prior to the tests, the participants were told the purpose, ethical issues and given the consent forms.

During the experiment, eight WE lessons began in the third week and continued until week 14th. The two groups were taught by the same teacher, and the same grammar points, expressions and vocabulary that were used in the midterm and final examinations.

After the experiment on the last day of the course, the FLCA questionnaire and English achievement test were given as a posttest, while the purpose of the study and ethical issues were explained again. Then, the scores were checked to select ten participants to join the focus group interview one week later.

Data analysis

To answer the first research question, scores from the FLCA questionnaires were calculated for means (x) and standard deviations (SD). Independent Sample T-test (2-tailed) was used to find any significant differences in the pretest and posttest anxiety scores between the two groups. Second, qualitative content analysis (QCA) adopted from Schreier (2012) was used to analyze data from the interview, based on a partial transcript. QCA is a summary of data, rather than generating new themes, so it helps the researcher describe the data only in certain aspects which we may pre-specify based on some coding frames in our mind (Schreier, 2012). The steps involve units of data that were sorted into predetermined categories based on four WE principles in relation to the FLCA framework. The large amounts of data were reduced, and repeated significant patterns were carefully identified.

To answer the second research question, scores from the English achievement test were calculated for means (x) and standard deviations (SD). Independent Sample T-test (2-tailed) was used to find any significant group differences in the pretest and posttest achievement scores as a result of FLCA reduction.

Results and Discussion

To discuss the first research question, the results from FLCA questionnaire in Table 1 and from the focus group interview will be presented.

Effectiveness of WE lessons on FLCA reduction reported in the FLCA questionnaire

Table 1. *The overall anxiety results of the pretest and posttest from FLCA questionnaire*

Control group	Experimental group)N = 45(	Test for equality

)N = 47(				Mean dif.	of means	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		t Value	Sig.)2-tailed(
Pretest	3.37	.47	3.27	.45	.10	0.996	.322
Posttest	3.19	.49	2.37	.575	.815	7.339	.000

Note. Significant at the p < .05 level.

According to Table 1, the t-test results indicated that there was no significant difference in the pretest FLCA of the two groups at 0.05 level (sig.= .322), implying the two groups were equivalent, both showing a moderate-anxiety level before the treatment. However, the posttest mean scores indicated a significant difference in the FLCA levels between the two groups (sig.= .000), in which the experimental group's mean significantly reduced to a low level in the posttest, whereas the control group remained at a moderate level. The results in Table 1 show the effectiveness of WE-based lessons in reducing FLCA among the students.

Effectiveness of WE lessons on FLCA reduction reported in focus group interview
The focus group interview was employed to explore the participants' reasons for considering the effectiveness of WE in reducing their anxiety. The main reasons are grouped under four WE principles, as follows.

WE principle 1: exposure and awareness of varieties of English
The majority of the participants reported that the exposure to varieties of English helped them develop more *positive attitudes towards their own and other NNS varietie*s. Instead of considering these varieties as wrong or inferior, they began to see these more as different, but still legitimate. This view not only affected their self-esteem and confidence in speaking English, but it lessened their fear of negative evaluation as they no longer devalued themselves as being inferior local NNSs. The WE lessons where the students watched different varieties of English accents and forms from YouTube VDO clips especially assisted them in uncovering and adjusting their attitudes.

> *From the first activity that I learned that there are not only US and UK accents. There are actually varieties of accents. This made us see a difference. And we don't have to follow anyone if there is a difference and it does not mean wrong. We could also make a difference. And we know that we can communicate with them successfully even it's different from US or UK models. We realized that they have their accent, we also have ours. It's just different. This made me feel more confident to speak.*
> *I learned that there are actually many English accents. I feel more confident in speaking. Before this I felt shy to speak English with my Thai accent…like I fear that others would think that I am not proficient. But now I think we don't have to stick with US or UK accents. Thai accent is ok.*

Participants also had opportunity to witness successful NNS models, which helped them develop more realistic goals and self-esteem by putting aside NSs as the only correct model. One of the WE lessons was particularly effective in presenting a successful NNS model. In the lesson, the teacher invited a Chinese international student to share her study experience in class.

> *I like activity 3 that teacher invited Jessica (Chinese guest speaker) to class. I met a real NNS that spoke with Chinese NNS accent. When she came, she didn't use US or UK accent. I could understand her… understand her accent. So, I think I could also do it. No need to follow just only British or American models.*

The results from these examples corroborate Matsuda & Friedrich (2011) and Jindapitak & Teo's study (2013) in finding that unhealthy attitudes are more likely to occur if students remain unaware that varieties of English exist. These unhealthy attitudes develop because they conclude that there is only one correct variety, one they are unable to master, and their English and other NNS varieties are not acceptable. Also, without such awareness, it can affect students' confidence in speaking English as they never witness effective NNSs who are able to effectively use English with their accented English (Matsuda, 2003). With this exposure, however, most students developed better attitudes towards their own and other NNS varieties, and set more realistic goals by putting aside a single NS model. Moreover, fear of negative evaluation was reduced as a result of an increasing positive attitude, since attitude, self-esteem and fear of negative evaluation are closely connected. This aligns with Boriboon (2011), in that most Thai students fear of negative evaluation or social discrimination because they have developed a deep-seated inferior self-image or low self-esteem. In a nutshell, it is possible that WE principle 1 was effective in helping the students develop a more positive attitude towards their own and other NNS varieties, leading to more realistic goals and self-esteem in speaking English, considered as a crucial means to reduce FLCA (Greensberg et al., 1992, as cited in Ozwuegbuzie, 1999).

WE principle 2: politics & ownership of the English language
Through the recognition of the global role of English, its spread, EIL power, its uses and users, and that English is used increasingly more between NNS-NNS rather than NS-NNS, all participants reported an increased sense of ownership of the English language. They recognized that it is no longer limited to the Inner Circle countries. Instead, it is owned by whoever uses it. Consequently, this also helped them develop more realistic goals by putting aside NS models and gaining more confidence in speaking English, regardless of whether it is with a Thai accent.

> *In the past I think we use English to communicate mainly with NS and US and UK are the owners of the language. After reading the articles about the current status of English, its spread or users, I think English belongs to everyone who uses it. Also in real life we meet NNS. We don't see many NS…like when doing i-VDO project that we went to Wat Pra Kaew (a famous temple in Bangkok). We met just Chinese, Japanese, or Romanian. Now people around the world uses English. So, I think the owners should be the ones who use it.*
> *I realized that English is no longer used by US and UK. Now everyone around the world uses it. And they have their own different accents. We don't have to speak like NS. When they speak with their accents, we can reply with our own Thai*

accent. I feel no shame, but rather have more confident and less pressure. In the past if I speak, I wanted to speak like NS because I think they are the owner.

The results from these statements are consistent with the findings of Matsuda (2003) and Boriboon (2011) in that being taken away the presentation of real current uses and users of English, the learners might assume that it is only Inner Circle native speakers who have ownership of English. In response to WE principle 2, the results indicated that most students developed a sense of ownership in the English language and didn't feel a need to get close or acquire an NS norm, which resonates Jenkins (2009) in terms of the psychological impact that the perception of language ownership and students' goals has on language learners. In summary, WE principle 2 was effective in helping the students develop a sense of ownership of the English language, leading to more realistic goals, greater self-esteem and less fear of speaking their own English variety, considered as a crucial means to reduce FLCA.

WE principle 3: recognition of three types of cultures
Through the teaching of all three types of culture including global, future interlocutors, and students' own cultures, most participants developed more confidence in communicating with others in English. The main reason involved the development of students' ability to transfer and extend cultural knowledge to facilitate their international communication.

I feel more confident to communicate with others because I think I kind of understand people from other cultures more…like Singaporeans they have the words siah or lah. We learn that the person we are talking to is in bad mood or moment or how he/she feels. Or different gestures of Indian people like shaking head that means yes or how they treat senior like the example of the last piece of cake Rusma (the invited Indian guest speaker) told us in class. These all link to their cultures. We (=Thais) also use the words like na, naja to express our moods as well.

Moreover, from the introduction of global culture in the classroom, many students developed more realistic learning goals. Their increase in this cultural knowledge helped to recognize communicative effectiveness in cross-cultural interactions, beyond linguistic knowledge. The more realistic goals also involved learning and using English to bring about positive global change, rather than only imitating NS ability.

In the past, I gave pressure to myself very hard that I have to speak with NS accent. But now I feel that what really matters is to succeed in real world communication and learn about other cultures as well.
… In the past I focused only on learning English to pass the exam or speak like NS, but now I think English is also used for communicating the campaign which proposes solutions to something to the world. Because if we use Thai language, others might not understand. But with the use of English it can broadcast our message to worldwide. We can use simple words and with our own accents like Ban Ki-moon. He used a very strong Korean English accent, but we could still get it.

These statements are consistent with Matsuda & Friedrich (2011) in that broader cultural understanding based on WE principle 3 could help increase students' ability to extend and transfer their cultural knowledge to facilitate international communication. It could also help students become more aware that gaining the ability to articulate one's convictions to an international audience and bring about positive global change is a more important objective for language learning than imitating NS ability (Matsuda & Duran, 2012). This is considered to be a more realistic learning goal by many WE/EIL scholars. As a result of greater confidence in being able to communicate, and more realistic goals beyond NS imitation, these could be crucial factors for reducing anxiety.

WE principle 4: communicative strategies

The majority of participants expressed more confidence in using English to communicate in real world environments outside the classroom than before they were explicitly taught with these skills. This is because they learned how to repair the communication breakdown by using various strategies, rather than avoiding communication like before.

...learning about various communication strategies in class helped me a lot when talking to foreigners. Sometimes I don't know the words I want to say. It's like it is on the tip of my tongue. But now we can categorizing or finding synonym to communicate with foreigners more successfully. This gives me more courage to speak.

Learning communication strategies allowed me to learn how to make myself understood by others and also to understand others. Before this, I didn't know the strategies, I kept talking and talking and the foreigners could not understand me and I felt bad. But now I know how to use categorizing or asking for repetition. I feel more confidence to speak even though I am not good at grammar or don't know many vocabularies.

These statements support the importance of teaching communication strategies in EIL classrooms, as addressed by Kubota (2012), in that it could help learners develop more confidence in their ability to communicate in English when confronting interlocutors from different linguistic backgrounds. They could select different strategies to overcome communication difficulties and this added confidence could also encourage them to use language more. As they developed confidence in speaking English, it is possible that FLCA was reduced.

Table 2 *English achievement results of the pretest and posttest of English achievement test*

	Control group)N = 47(		Experimental group)N = 45(		Mean dif.	Test for equality of means	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		t Value	Sig.)2-tailed(
Pretest	28.49	7.69	30.56	5.94	2.07	1.446	.152
Posttest	33.68	8.43	37.42	5.93	3.74	2.470	.016

Note. Significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Results from Table 2 were used to answer the second research question. The independent t-test (2-tailed) indicated no significant difference in the pretest between the two groups at 0.05 (sig = .152). However, the posttest mean scores indicated a significant difference at 0.05 (sig. = .016), indicating that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group, which could be due to the significant reduction of their FLCA. The results support various studies in that language anxiety has a negative correlation to language learning achievement (Tanielian, 2014; Chiang, 2012; Mahmood & Iqbal, 2010).

Conclusion & Pedagogical Suggestions

This study challenges NS guided practice that has long informed traditional ELT policy in Thailand and maintains the need for a paradigm shift addressing WE/EIL notions in curriculum implementation, which can better serve current English profile. From the shift in this study, it is found to help learners develop more realistic goals of being *effective English users*, rather than requiring NS competence (Matsuda, 2003). This will help them develop better attitudes towards their own and other NNS varieties, build self-esteem and increase confidence in speaking English. It does so by allowing the students to express their national identity, leading to less anxiety, which has a negative relationship to language learning achievement. This study also maintains the need for English learners to be exposed to multiple varieties of English, introduced to politics and ownership of the English language, three types of cultural awareness, and communicative strategies in order to re-conceptualize the notion of effective users beyond the nativeness. This study also suggests an early stage of WE-in-class implementation and introduction into different schooling ages (Boriboon, 2011) since attitude or linguistic prejudice take time to reform. Since most students in this study showed recognition of the importance of WE/EIL notions in studying English in this era of globalization, few still desired to acquire NS norms. A shift in classroom practice, however, is unlikely to occur until policy makers and teachers let go of their traditional assumptions of ELT informed by NS ideology. This shift can be supported by professional development or teacher training. On the top of that, with the incorporation of WE/EIL, English classes will be more than a language class where teachers teach only linguistic competence; learners will also be trained to critically reflect on their current roles as EIL users and able to seek their own voice in English. However, this is not to say that NS models should be excluded from classroom practice; rather, in order to enrich global ELT curriculum, it requires the introduction of English varieties which represent a more realistic context of English where people bring diverse English varieties to approach their international communication.

Recommendations for Future Research

The participants in this study are all first-year, lower-intermediate students from both arts and science fields. Collecting data from participants of different ages, proficiency levels, and other fields of study may yield different findings. Moreover, since this study employed a questionnaire and interview method to investigate the effectiveness of WE lessons on reducing anxiety, it is recommended for future studies to use other approaches (e.g. headnotes, vignette, researcher's log, students' diary) to yield other relevant data.

About the Authors:
Jaruda Rajani Na Ayuthaya is an English instructor in the Foreign Language Department, Faculty of Humanities, at Kasetsart University in Thailand. She is also a Ph.D. student in English Language Teaching (International Program) at Thammasat University. Her research interests include World Englishes and English as an International Language in ELT curricula implementation, and L2 learning anxiety.

Dr. Pragasit Sitthitikul is Assistant Professor from the Language Institute, Thammasat University in Bangkok, Thailand. He earned a doctorate in Language and Literacy Studies, with a concentration in second-language reading processes, at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA. His areas of interest include Second Language Literacy, and Cognitive and Sociocultural Factors in Second Language Learning.

References
Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's Construct of Foreign Language Anxiety: The Case of Students of Japanese. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*, 155-168.
Baik, M. J. & Shim, R. J. (2002). Teaching world Englishes via the internet. *World Englishes, 21*(3), 427-430.

Bayyurt, Y., & Altinmakas, D. (2012). A WE-based English Communication Skills Course at a Turkish University. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and Practices of Teaching English as an International Language* (pp.169-182). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Boriboon, P. (2011). Language, Ideology and Domination: Problems of English Language Teaching in Thailand and Solutions. *Songklanakarin Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 17*(6), 23-59.
Canagarajah, A.S. (1999). *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Chiang, M.C. (2012). *The Relationship between Foreign Language Anxiety and Foreign Language Speaking Proficiency among Elementary School Students in Taiwan* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ming Chuan University, Taiwan.
Choomthong, D. (2014). Preparing Thai Students' English for the ASEAN Economic Community: Some Pedagogical Implications and Trends. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network (LEARN) Journal, 7*(1).
Cook, V. (2014). Challenging Hidden Assumptions in Language Teaching, *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network (LEARN) Journal,* Special Issue.
D'Angelo, J. (2012). WE-Informed EIL Curriculum at Chukyo: Towards a Functional, Educated, Multilingual Outcome. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and Practices of Teaching English as an International Language* (pp.121-139). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety.

Modern Language Journal, 70, 125-132.

Horwitz, E. (2001). Language Anxiety and Academic Achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21.*

Jenkin, J. (2009). *World Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of Developments in Research into English as a Lingua Franca. *Language Teaching*, *44*(03), 281-315.

Jindapitak, N. & Teo, A. (2013). Accent Priority in a Thai University Context: A Common Sense Revisited. *English Language Teaching, 6*(9), 193-204.

Jindapitak, N. & Teo, A. (2012). Thai Tertiary English Majors Attitudes Towards and Awareness of World Englishes. *Journal of English Studies, 7*, 74-116.

Kachru, B. (1992). *The Other Tongue: English across Culture*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kubota, R. (2012). The Politics of EIL: Toward Border-Crossing Communication in and Beyond English. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and Practices of Teaching English as an International Language* (pp. 55–69). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lee, H. (2012). World Englishes in a High School English Class: A Case from Japan. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and Practices of Teaching English as an International Language* (pp.154-168). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Mahmood, A., & Iqbal, S. (2010). Differences of Student Anxiety Level Towards English as a Foreign Language Subject and Their Academic Achievement. *International Journal of Academic Research, 2*(6).

Matsuda, A. (2003). Incorporating World Englishes in teaching English as an International Language. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(4), 719-729.

Matsuda, A., & Duran, C.S. (2012). EIL Activities and Tasks for Traditional English Classrooms. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and Practices of Teaching English as an International Language* (pp.201-250). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Matsuda, A., & Friedrich, P. (2011), English as an International Language: A Curriculum Blueprint, *World Englishes*, *30*(3), 332-344.

McKay, S.L. (2012). Principles of Teaching English as an International Language. In L. Alsagoff, G.W.Hu, S.L. McKay & W.A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and Practices for Teaching English as an International Language* (pp.28-46). New York, NY: Routledge.

Methitham, P., & Chamcharatsri, P.B. (2011). Critiquing ELT in Thailand: A Reflection from History to Practice. *Journal of Humanities*. Naresuan University, *8*(2), 57-68.

Occhipinti, A. (2009). *Foreign Language Anxiety in In-Class Speaking Activities.* (Master's thesis, University of Oslo, Norway). Retrieved from https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/25584/Daxstamparexoggixultima.pdf?sequence=1

Ozwuebuzie, A. J., Bailey, P., & Daley, C.E. (1999). Factors associated with foreign language Anxiety. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 20,* 217-239.

Ozwuebuzie A.J., Bailey, P., & Daley, C.E. (2001). Cognitive, Affective, Personality, and Demographic Predictors of Foreign-Language Achievement. *The Journal of Education Research, 94*(1), 3-15.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. London: Routledge.

Renandya, W.A. (2012). Teacher roles in EIL. *The European Journal of Applied Linguistics*

and TEFL, 1(2), 65-80.

Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative Content Analysis in Practice*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Sharifian, F., & Marlina, R. (2012). English as an International Language (EIL): An Innovative Academic Program. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and Practices of Teaching English as an International language* (pp.140-153). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative Competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, *15*, 165-179.

Tanielian, A.R. (2014). Foreign Language Anxiety in a New English Program in Thailand, *The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives, 3*(1), 60-81.

Tanveer, M. (2007). *Investigation of Factors that Cause Language Anxiety for EFL Learners in Learning Speaking Skills and the Influence It Casts on Communication in The Target Language* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Glasgow, Scotland.

Tintaboot, P. (1998). *Relationships among Beliefs, Anxiety, and Academic Achievement in English Language Learning of Mathayom Suksa Five Students, Bangkok Metropolis*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Wang, S. (2010). An Experimental Study of Chinese English Major Students' Listening Anxiety of Classroom Learning Activity at the University Level. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(5), 562-568.

Young, D.J. (1999). Giving Priority to the Language Learner First. In D.J. Young (Ed.), *Affect in Foreign Language and Second Language Learning: A Practical Guide to Creating a Low-Anxiety Classroom Atmosphere* (pp.241-247). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

APPENDIX A

Thai Tertiary EFL Students' Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale
Descriptions: Please provide true information about yourself and your foreign language anxiety experience by rating 1 to 5. Your responses are valuable and considered highly confidential.
1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = not sure, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

Questionnaire items	Rating scales				
	1	2	3	4	5
1(Communication apprehension & fear of negative evaluation no. 1-16					
1 I tremble when I know that I am going to be called upon in English class.					
2 I don't feel confident to volunteer to answer in my English class.					
3 I can feel my heart pounding when I am going to be called on in my English class.					
4 I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of					

	Questionnaire items	**Rating scales**				
		1	2	3	4	5
	other students.					
5	I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English.					
6	I keep thinking that the other students are better at English than I am.					
7	In English class I can get so nervous, I forget things I know.					
8	I always feel that the other students speak English better than I do.					
9	I feel confident when I speak in my English class.					
10	I get nervous when the English teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance for.					
11	Even if I am well-prepared for English class, I feel anxious about it.					
12	The more I study for an English test, the more confused I get.					
13	It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in English class.					
14	I am usually at ease during tests in my English class.					
15	I don't worry about making mistakes in my English class.					
16	I am afraid that my English teacher will correct every mistake I make.					
2(Fear of failing the class no. 17-22						
17	I worry about the consequences of failing my English class.					
18	English class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.					
19	I feel more tense and nervous in my English class than in my other classes.					
20	I don't feel pressure to prepare very much for my language class.					

	Questionnaire items	Rating scales				
		1	2	3	4	5
3(Comfortableness in speaking with native english speakers no.21-23						
21	I feel comfortable around native speakers of English.					
22	I don't understand why some people get so upset over English classes.					
23	I would not be nervous about speaking English with native English speakers.					
4(Negative attitudes towards English class no.24-26						
24	It wouldn't bother me at all to take more English language classes.					
25	I often feel like not going to my English class.					
26	When I'm on my way to English class, I feel very sure and relaxed.					
5(Unrealistic learning goals & low self-esteem no.27-39						
27	It makes me feel worried to speak grammatically perfect when I speak English.					
28	I can never speak English like native speakers no matter how hard I try.					
29	I feel upset to speak English like a native speaker.					
30	I feel embarrassed with my own accent when I speak English.					
31	The awareness of English varieties makes me feel more relaxed when learning English.					
32	The knowledge about history, current users of English, and ownership of English lessens my anxiety in English class.					
33	The knowledge about intercultural communication and broader cultural knowledge helps me feel more confident in communicating in English.					
34	Knowledge about communication strategies helps me feel more confident in communicating in English.					
35	Practice in intercultural competence that goes beyond linguistic					

	Questionnaire items	Rating scales				
		1	2	3	4	5
	knowledge from this class helps me realize that being a competent EIL user does not require obtaining native speaker competence.					
36	In this class, exposure to samples of communication breakdown situations between L2 speakers, and communication strategies to overcome these breakdowns, has helped me increase my confidence in using English.					
37	One of the reasons why I feel anxious in learning English is because I have never known the existence of other standard varieties of English apart from British and American.					
38	The idea that British and American English should be the only correct standards makes me feel worried about my English language learning.					
39	I believe that current users of English use English to communicate with native speakers of English more than with those from other countries, which makes me worry about being able to acquire native speaker competence.					

Appendix B

The sample of WE-based lesson plan (week 12th)
Tasksheet (unit) # 5: topics
1) Grammar: participles used as adjective
2) Reading: reading for the main idea and specific information, using cues to identify word meanings and understanding references
3) Expression: asking for and giving opinions
Focus: Critical examination of the fallacies about English language learning and the discourses surrounding the use of English that promote the learning of English.
Objectives: Students will be able to

- Apply linguistic structure focusing on participles used of adjectives in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.
- Develop awareness of the role of EIL and EIL users, and have fundamental knowledge to further discuss the controversies of EIL.
- Aware of that English proficiency is only one of many factors which may affect the status of individual.
- Be autonomous and independent-thinking students who can seek their own voice in English.
- Develop realistic learning goal: no need to acquire NS norms.

Interaction patterns

T → C   = Teacher → whole class
GG   =   Students work with their group
GG → C   = Each group shares/ presents ideas to class

The sample WE-based lesson plan

WE principle	Activity	Procedures	Aims	Materials	Interaction patterns	Time)min(
1. Politics, Ownership of the English language	Activity#1: Comprehen-sion check on reading: *Fallacies about the learning of English*	1. Each group summarizes the six fallacies)take-home reading(to class)group1-fallacy#1, group2-fallacy#2, and so on(. 2. Teacher gives students time to answer the questions related to the reading and to discuss in their group)e.g., *"According to the argument of 3th fallacy, is it possible to define who native speakers are? Why?"*(3. Teacher discusses each question and answer with class and teaches them skimming and scanning skills to help them read more effectively.	- Practice reading for main idea and specific information, using cues to identify the meanings, understanding references. - Develop awareness of the role of EIL and EIL users, and have fundamental knowledge to further discuss controversies of EIL.	-Reading passage: *Fallacies about English* -Work sheet #1	GG → C GG T → C	10 10 10

WE principle	Activity	Procedures	Aims	Materials	Interaction patterns	Time)min(
1. Politics, Ownership of the English language	Activity 2: Critical examination of discourses surrounding the use of English	1. Teacher provides each group some extracts of the discourses drawn from the websites and brochures designed to advertise local English language institutions, and then asks if they have seen this type of discourses before, where they saw and how they felt. After that, students are asked to examine these discourses with their group to seek their own voice in relation to English language learning. Each group has to share their ideas to class based on the following prompts.

 - List down the claims that are made regarding the advantages of acquiring English.

 - Which claims do you think is a real benefit of learning English and which one is imagined benefits? Why do you think so?

 - Do you think being successful users of English must require a native speaker model (accent, culture)? Why?

2. Teacher concludes the key points of today's activities that are to help them aware of the fallacies about English language teaching and learning. Also, teacher points out the importance for students to develop a realistic view of the benefits that the acquisition of uses of English may bring to them and aware of that English proficiency is only one of many factors which may affect the personal, social and professional status a person has)McKay, 2012(. | -Practice expressions for asking and giving opinions

- Aware of the imagined benefits VS the real benefits of learning English.

- Aware of that English proficiency is only one of many factors affecting the status of individual.

- Be independent thinking students who can seek their own voice in English.

- Develop realistic goal: no need to acquire NS norms. | - Sample English discourse from the websites and brochures

-Work sheet#2 | T → C

GG

GG→C | 5

5

10 |
| | **Wrap-up** | | | -Power Point | T → C | 5 |

WE principle	Activity	Procedures	Aims	Materials	Interaction patterns	Time)min(
1. Politics, Ownership of the English language	**Class assignment:** *An ideal language school advertise-ment*	1. In group of 2-3, students are asked to imagine that they are the owner of a language school, and they have to create their own advertisement to promote their language school in the form of a poster)1 page(. The students are provided with the prompt to help them critically think about how they want to design their advertisement as follows. - *What benefits of learning English and what goal would you like the students at your English school to achieve?* The students are also required to use participles)adjectives(in creating the poster. 2. Each group presents their poster to class.	-Develop awareness of the role of EIL and roles EIL users. - Be independent-thinking students who can seek their own voice in English. - Develop realistic goal. - Apply linguistic structure focusing on participles adj.	- A4 paper - websites -poster	GG GG→C	15 10