

Students' attitudes toward learning English through e-learning at a Thai university

Gregory David Olivier¹

Abstract

The standard of education has not increased in proportion to the demand for improving the standard of English in Thailand, especially in view of the pressure that the AEC will bring to bear on Thai people entering the employment market. Although e-learning appears to be a solution, it is untraditional. Thus, the concept of learning English through e-learning, while unsupervised (online self-study), was examined from the Thai student's perspective. Three hundred and twenty students from Prince of Songkla University in Hat Yai completed a questionnaire, consisting of a 15-item Likert-type scale and one polar question. The objective was to ascertain whether the subjects are pro or anti learning English online and what the major obstacles to this are in terms of student preferences. It was found that the students were approximately 60 % pro the concept of e-learning. The obstacles were: students will seldom take the initiative to study English online unless they could gain credits; they feel uncomfortable without direct guidance from a teacher and feel that they lack self-discipline necessary for e-learning; and favor

¹Lecturer, Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus

studying in groups. It is suggested that a pilot website be developed at PSU for further study.

Keywords: attitudes, e-learning, English, Thai perspective

Introduction

Casual observation of students at PSU reveals a huge amount of interest in using smart phones and computers. Let us consider the following fact: the university (PSU) has free wireless internet and allows students computer access. Why then is e-learning not a huge and ever expanding medium at this university? From the pilot-study results and the literature, the researcher postulates that although, in general, e-learning is useful and viewed in positive way, Thai students have their reservations (Pagram & Pagram, 2009).

It may be argued that supplementary e-learning is unnecessary for the subject of English since there are modern textbooks in use. However, the aim of educational publishers in South East Asia is to produce textbooks that can be sold in several countries, hence, their textbooks do not translate English words or phrases into Thai. Also, they are not written in relation to Thai context. This often leaves foreign lecturers and Thai students at a disadvantage. However, diligently created online content should contain everything a book has but more: audio tracks and correct, concise English to Thai translation. The latter is better facilitated and executed by bilingual educators rather than leaving students to rely solely on dictionaries and online translation. Direct

translation from English to Thai online is at times impossible due to the differing syntax and word context. For example, if one enters an English word into an online translation service, several Thai words (or even a phrase) are offered as translations but perhaps only one word carries the true linguistic meaning.

Defining the problem

Unfortunately, for some Thai students the transition from high school to university is a huge challenge in terms of learning English, in particular, listening and speaking. It is a well-documented fact that, in general, Thai students lack skills in English and according to the English First Proficiency Index of 2015, Thailand falls in the ‘very low proficiency’ category. In 2015, the average O-NET score for Matthayom 6 students was 24.98 out of 100 (National Institute of Educational Testing Service, 2015). O-NET is the Ordinary National Education Test. Thai secondary school teachers of English were surveyed concerning their problems with teaching the language (Noom-ura, 2013). It was reported that some of the more serious problems were, “students not having enough practice in English on their own, lacking opportunities for English exposure outside class, students’ insufficient knowledge and skills of English, students thinking in Thai before translating to English, and problems with listening and pronunciation,” (Noom-ura, 2013, p. 143).

Defining e-learning

In contrast to using a computer which is preloaded with a disk-based program, the emphasis of e-learning in this study is on students engaging in online study, out of class and on their own time, to improve their English. “E-learning is learning utilizing electronic technologies to access educational curriculum outside of a traditional classroom. In most cases, it refers to a course, program or degree delivered completely online,” (eLearning NC, 2016). Essentially, this could include using a smart phone to log on and access the site in question (Segev, 2014).

E-learning at PSU

Unfortunately, students at PSU lack the initiative to improve their English in a self-study environment. In an interview with S. Musigrungsi, an instructor of English at PSU, it was stated that students of Fundamental English Reading and Writing 890-102 can access a website called Tell Me More for improving their reading and writing skills. Using this site is a requirement for those students. The students need to be logged on for a certain amount of time in order to gain a score. However, they log on, leave the program running, and then go away without actually engaging in the program. In her opinion, it is indeed a suitable program, but unfortunately, there are no means by which to monitor the students’ actual usage (S. Musigrungsi, PSU Department of Languages and Linguistics, personal communication, January, 2016). It is thus inferred

that e-learning at PSU is limited in terms of students' motivation to use it for improving their English.

Regarding the course, Fundamental English Listening and Speaking, 890-101, students are required to log on to LMS and complete the exercises involving listening and comprehension. The mid-term and final test on LMS contributed 6% in total to their final grade.

Significance of the study

The topic of learning English through e-learning in Thailand has not been fully explored. Consequently, the study findings will enlighten educators at PSU as to the viability of creating an extra website for learning English (in addition to LMS). Such a website would focus on the problems facing some 890-101 students. Obviously, a positive student-attitude is paramount to satisfactory learning goals. It follows that students' attitudes should be gauged before embarking on a time consuming endeavor such as building a bilingual, smartphone compatible website with audio tracks.

If e-learning is to be meaningful, and successfully used to learn English, due diligence is required to isolate and remedy the existing issues which have a negative impact. Moreover, if there are factors that we educators have not perceived as problematic, the data will speak for itself and provide an informed starting point to address our students' reservations on the matter.

Therefore, the researcher, who is also an educator at PSU, explored whether a website for learning English would achieve meaningful learning outcomes since e-learning is contradictory to long established cultural norms (Pagram & Pagram, 2006).

Research questions

On face value, e-learning facilitates the language acquisition process of English, especially since learning English is now possible using a smartphone (Segev, 2014). However, since it goes against the grain of social constructivism which is favored in Thai education (Pagram & Pagram, 2006), would students not be reluctant to engage themselves? The theory of social constructivism was developed by Soviet psychologist Lev Vygotsky. According to the Berkeley Graduate Division (2016), “Social constructivism is a variety of cognitive constructivism that emphasizes the collaborative nature of much learning. All cognitive functions originate in, and must therefore be explained as products of social interactions.” Furthermore, Thai students are unaccustomed to self-study (Malaiwong, 1997). Even though negative factors involving e-learning exist, the literature expounds that e-learning is viewed positively by Thai students. With these present conflicting factors regarding e-learning, the researcher has added the variable of learning English through e-learning.

Therefore, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. To what degree are the students pro or anti learning English through e-learning?
2. What are the major factors against learning English online at PSU?

Literature review

Extensive searches have revealed works of literature that relate to this research, but articles which are wholly specific to Thai students' attitudes toward learning English by means of e-learning are scarce. The researcher found only one study by Munpru and Wuttikrikunlaya (2012) concerning English and that involved using online dictionaries. Even though there have been several studies on e-learning in Thailand, they focused on subjects other than English, for example, business statistics or primary school level English teachers' perceptions of e-learning. Consequently, the available literature which relates to aspects of this study has been reviewed. This review will cover students' perceptions toward e-learning, the general lack of e-learning in Thailand, the apparent obstacles and objections directly relating to Thai students and also the relationship between students' attitudes toward (willingness to use) an e-learning system and its success in terms of education.

First and foremost, e-learning, in this study, is defined as using the Internet to learn. To reiterate, using a computer or a smart-phone to log on to a website and engage in study. E-learning seems to have an edge over traditional learning; the learning process is not dependant on

a classroom, in as much as the student can choose the time and place to learn and access the course material (Suanpang & Petocz, 2003). According to Segev (2014), “Mobile devices and apps are changing the way people learn English”. There is even a new phrase coined from this practice known as m-learning. M-learning enables one to learn anywhere and anytime using one’s mobile phone. Noting this current trend, it is apparent that a student does not even need access to a computer to learn from the Internet (Segev, 2014). In addition to the flexibility that e-learning allows, in terms of schedule and pace of learning, it is cost effective. Of course, we should also note the disadvantages that are intrinsic to e-learning that affect all students throughout the world, albeit not equally. Using a smartphone and using it effectively for study are two different things. E-learning can also require using applications to access audio and/or audio-visual content. Lack of ability to use the technology at hand can frustrate a student, and render the experience to be ineffective. Furthermore, the absence of interaction with fellow students and a teacher also shapes students’ attitudes. Without the presence of a teacher, some students with low motivation cannot adapt to e-learning. Ultimately, unmotivated students rely on the discipline and structure of a traditional learning system (Berteau, 2009).

Pagram and Pagram (2006) conducted a study entitled, “Issues in E-learning: a Thai Case Study”. They mentioned that a type of interview was used. A Thai version of the Experience of Change (EoC) instrument, developed by Ainscow et al. (1994), was used to begin the interview.

Usually, the EoC instrument is used for establishing what participants feel about a certain subject. Thirty-three participants were interviewed in this study and they included administrators, adult students, educators, ICT experts, parents, religious leaders and parents, all of whom were selected due to their exposure to e-learning. As well as the data from the interviews, six Thai e-learning sites were examined with regard to pedagogy, interface and culture.

The results of their study show that although the Thai participants viewed e-learning in a positive light, there remains some doubt as to whether Thai learners have the mindset to learn by themselves. In addition, the websites examined were unsuccessful in conveying the importance of social constructs valued in Thai society. Notably, working outside of a group was also stated as being a factor that caused e-learning to be perceived negatively by Thai students. Although e-learning can complement a course or even constitute a course, the issue is that Thai students are not accustomed to learning in an unsupervised situation. On that note, Pagram and Pagram (2006) cited that because Thai students “have never been taught to learn by themselves”, (Malaiwong, 1997, p. 51), they will encounter difficulty when following a different method than the social constructivist method favoured by Thai education. When focusing on the disadvantages which are particular to Thai students, it emerges that traditions in Thailand play a significant role in education.

Another interesting statement, according to Pagram and Pagram (2006), is that the language barrier in Thailand also seems to cause resistance to e-learning. Only 1.4% of the world's websites are in Thai, compared to the 36% which are in English. This statement is supported by Srichanyachon (2010) who wrote that Thai students were more comfortable with websites in their own language. It is thus inferred that e-learning is lagging in Thailand, for whatever reasons that may be, the fact remains the same.

Regarding e-learning and English, a study conducted by Munpru and Wuttikrikunlaya (2012) examined Thai university students' attitudes when using online dictionaries and search engines to correct their grammar and aid translation. The 65 students who participated were all English and English for Careers majors. The results showed that 80% of the subjects reported a positive attitude. In their conclusion, it was stated that although there are advantages to online tools, students complained that online tools gave meanings that were out of context.

Notwithstanding, e-learning has inherent factors that may hinder a Thai student. On this point, the researcher refers to the study by Pagram and Pagram (2006): it emerged that although e-learning was viewed in a positive light, e-learning methods that are effective in other countries may not be suited to Thailand. Education in Thailand is geared toward sustaining her unique culture. Thus, one should examine e-learning from the Thai perspective as it can be argued that the internet

can influence the new generation of Thai students and change their beliefs (Pagram & Pagram, 2006).

Among a number of obstacles, many of which involve personal learning style preference, an obvious adverse factor to e-learning in Thailand emerges: Thai students prefer education which is taught by an instructor. Historically, Thai students regard the teacher as the prime source of knowledge and because of that long established norm, the shift to e-learning (as a supplementary or complementary method) cannot be achieved with the same ease as in other countries (Sirithongthaworn et al., 2006). According to Srichanyachon (2010), the physical presence of an instructor in the classroom is favored over a virtual teaching presence. Furthermore, it was mentioned that IT actually played a negative role in as much as it weakened the order of seniority between Thai students and teachers. Ultimately, since Thailand's culture is far different to that of the West, Thai culture and values should be seriously considered when introducing an e-learning platform.

A study by Suanpang and Petocz (2003) compared two groups of Thai students, one studying a business statistics course online and another group studying the same course but in a traditional classroom setting. It was reported that Thai students were reluctant to ask questions in class and did not apply critical thinking in the traditional learning environment. However, when learning online, the element of shyness could be overcome by using synchronous methods (as in using a chat-line), and also using asynchronous methods (as in an online

discussion board and e-mail). Furthermore, students were positive about having experienced online learning and reported that the process is less formal than learning in a traditional classroom. Even so, both groups stated that the teacher's role is essential to the learning process. It is interesting to note that some students in the traditional group gave positive comments on the use of the Internet as a means of enhancing their education. Students in both groups expressed that they had previously never used the Internet for educational purposes (Suanpang & Petocz, 2003).

From the information of the previous, relevant studies mentioned above, we can argue that e-learning has its positive points which will benefit Thai students. Conversely, there are obstacles to address and the following are prevalent: the absence of a teacher, the lack of supervised learning, the application of critical thinking, and lastly, Thai students prefer to work in a group. The author holds the concept that an educator should study what exactly these obstacles are before building an educational website. This concept is partially congruent with the study mentioned below.

The hypothesis that there exists a need to evaluate students' perceptions on e-learning was investigated by Theng et al. (2008), in Singapore. The focus of their study was to implement an improvement in an existing learning system. They wrote that up to now, the technical facets of e-learning systems have been examined in detail by the e-learning community, but not their effectiveness in relation to

pedagogy. The perceived usefulness of the system in question (edveNTure e-learning system) related to students' learning style preference, namely, those students who favored interactive learning perceived a higher level of usefulness.

Mindset determines many an outcome involving the learning curve, and with learning a new language this no different: Teo et al. (2010) wrote that whether or not an e-learning system will have successful outcomes is linked directly to the users' (the students') acceptance and willingness to use it. He also went further to state that despite the importance placed upon this mode of education by the Thai government and their efforts to see it in play, the amount of study and body of knowledge on the subject, within the Thai context, is lacking.

Framework of the study

When viewing the human ecology of the Thai learning environment at PSU, it is apparent that formalized e-learning plays a minor, insignificant role. Thus, factors prominent in the literature, available and popular means of using the internet, and intrinsic factors to e-learning formed the basis of this study. Prominent factors from the literature relate to social constructivism, self-discipline and the physical presence of a teacher. Popular and available means refer to the use of social media, YouTube and search engines, such as Google, to acquire English. Lastly, intrinsic factors refer to time spent studying online and

reading text from a computer screen or smartphone as opposed to reading a conventional book.

Methodology

The population was the total number of students who were enrolled in the course of Fundamental English 890-101 at PSU, Hat Yai, in the first semester of the academic year, 2015. Most of these students were in their first year. The number (N), according the department, was 1,880 students. By using an online calculator, retrieved from www.raosoft.com/samplesize, the sample size was calculated at 320 students and a confidence level of 95% was applied. The male/female ratio was kept in proportion to the present ratio at PSU, (7 females to 3 males), so the sample studied comprised of 224 females and 96 males. The reason for that was to mirror the ratio so the sample would accurately represent the population. In addition, students from a number of different faculties took part, namely, Agro-Industry, Economics, Natural Resources, Management Sciences, Engineering, Pharmaceutical Sciences, Medicine, Nursing, and Liberal Arts.

The instrument used was a questionnaire designed by the researcher (see appendix for an example) that incorporates a 15-item Likert-type scale and one multiple-choice question. The author had the opportunity to run a pilot study and this facilitated the creation of the instrument used in this study in as much as it is adapted from the questionnaire used in the pilot study.

The final questionnaire was not designed as a unidimensional scale, thus, it does not meet the assumptions of Cronbach's alpha, which incidentally was 0.65. Further analysis revealed an alpha of 0.66 by removing item 3 (the highest scoring item). None the less, the instrument was checked, and refined with the help of a bilingual lecturer of English at PSU. The lecturer, who is an expert in English, finally endorsed the instrument. The Likert-type scale-items 1 and 6 result from the literature review, referring to Sirithongthaworn et al. (2006). Whereas items 3, 12, 13 and 14 result from Pagram and Pagram (2006). No part of the instrument is copied from other works.

The ratings range from Strongly Agree, Agree, Not Sure, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree, and were scored follows: Strongly Agree=5; Agree=4; Not Sure=3; Disagree=2; and Strongly Disagree=1. However, items 8 to 14 are scored in reverse, because those items are positive statements. Therefore, agreeing with the statement means that the respondent is pro that concept which relates to learning English online.

The higher the score, the more the students disagree with the concept of learning English online. Thus, a low overall score would indicate that in general the students agree with the concept of learning English online.

Question 16 has only one answer out of two possible answers: the answers were examined as percentages of the total of the participants.

Items 1, 3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14 and 15 were designed to highlight the major objections. Although the above items are included in the overall scoring of the Likert-type scale, they are also examined separately.

Data were obtained by computing the scores of items 1 to 15 into percentages and then mean scores for items 1, 3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14 and 15 (major obstacles), and the percentages from item 16.

The study was voluntary and anonymous, with no request to fill in names or ID numbers; the participants simply indicated whether they were male or female and denoted their faculty. An explanation in Thai was read to the students stipulating this, including instructions pertaining to the instrument.

Results

This section is in two parts as follows: pro or anti learning online; and major obstacles.

1. Pro or anti learning online

First, Item 16 is examined to establish a general view of whether students are pro or anti. The analysis of the overall scores for all 15 Likert-type scale items will follow. Item 16 was a “tick the box” selection with only two options (see below) and data was filtered into yes or no answers for ease of interpretation, consequently the results are shown as percentages (see Table 1).

Item 16. I will study English online if it is free (Yes) ☐

I do not want to study English online (No) ☐

Table 1 Item 16 results

Yes / No	n=320	Percentage
Yes	199	62.1875%
No	121	37.8125%

From the figures above, we can see that 199 students ticked the box “I will study English online if it is free”. Thus, the students are slightly in favor of studying online. If we round the figures off to the nearest whole, we have 62% voting “Yes” and 38% voting “No”. Although 62% make up the majority, that percentage cannot be considered as the “vast majority”. Conversely, student preference is not equally divided either. When we examine the individual Likert-type scale scores of all 15 items (shown as percentages), a congruous result with item 16 emerges. Please see below table:

Table 2 Likert-type scale scores

Item	Score
1. I can only learn English from a teacher but not the Net.	55.37%
2. I use YouTube for fun but not for learning something new in English.	55.62%
3. I like learning English in a group.	80.75%
4. I never use Google or another search engine to learn something new in English.	38.50%

Item	Score
5. I use the internet for social media (Facebook, Instagram...) and games only, and I do not think I can learn English online.	42.12%
6. I need a teacher in the classroom to teach me English. I do not have discipline to study by myself online.	66.37%
7. I like to read a paper English book but not read an online English book.	64.43%
8. I use a free website to study English online.	46.00%
9. I can study English online for 1 hour a day or more.	53.81%
10. I study English online 5 days a week.	72.43%
11. I study English online 1 time a week.	54.68%
12. I can learn English by myself online.	49.93%
13. I prefer to learn English online with one friend.	58.87%
14. I prefer to learn English online in a group.	50.56%
15. I will only study English online if I get university credits.	62.25%
Average of all percentages	51.38%

When a Likert-type scale is designed with five choices (ranging from one to five points), the choice of “Not Sure” would generate a score of 3 which is considered as neutral. In that case, 320 respondents all answering “Not Sure” for an item would

generate a score of 960 (320 x 3). Nine hundred and sixty, when converted into a percentage is 60%. Since the higher the score, the higher the degree of negative attitude, an average score of below 60 % indicates positive attitude. Since the average percentage was 51.38 %, it shows student attitude to be positive. Furthermore, parameters of score can be used to categorize the respondents into three groups: pro, anti, or neutral.

Table 3 Pro, anti or neutral

n= 320	Score	Pro, neutral or anti
191 respondents	Scores \leq 44	Pro learning English online
23 respondents	Scores = 45	Neutral or “not sure”
106 respondents	Scores \geq 46	Anti-learning English online

An individual respondents’ score of 45 indicates neutrality, or a neutral attitude. Therefore, individual scores of above 45 indicate negative attitude, and the lower scores (below 45) indicate positive attitude. As 191 respondents were clearly pro we can convert that number into a percentage. This shows that 59.68% of the respondents are pro and this is congruent with the results from item 16, which show 62% are pro. In conclusion, it may be now inferred that students at PSU, Hat Yai campus are, in favor of learning English through e-learning.

2. Major obstacles

The table below shows the mean scores for the items specifically designed to highlight the major obstacles. However, only three items had statistically significant scores, meaning that mean scores of above 3 (not sure) are significant as they denote negative attitude and cause an obstacle to learning English through e-learning.

Table 4 Obstacles to learning English through e-learning

Item	Mean scores
Item 1 I can only learn English from a teacher but not the Net.	2.76
Item 3* I like learning English in a group.	4.03
Item 5 I can only learn English from a teacher but not the Net.	2.1
Item 6* I need a teacher in the classroom to teach me English. I do not have discipline to study by myself online.	3.31
Item 12 I can learn English by myself online.	2.49
Item 13 I prefer to learn English online with one friend.	2.94
Item 14 I prefer to learn English online in a group.	2.52
Item 15* I will only study English online if I get university credits.	3.11

Note: The * (asterisk) shows the significant items

Three items had mean scores above 3 and are marked with an asterisk in the above table. The mean scores above are calculated

from the 320 responses for those items. A more detailed analysis with the items ranked by order of score from lowest to highest follows:

Item 15: *I will only study English online if I get university credits*, scored 996 in total and had a mean score of 3.11. It is apparent that offering credits is indeed a means of influencing students to use online resources to learn English, with 34% choosing “Agree” and 33% choosing “Strongly Agree”. However, this also shows that most students would not choose to study voluntarily.

Item 6: *I need a teacher in the classroom to teach me English. I do not have the discipline to study by myself online*, scored 1,062 and had a mean score of 3.31. This shows that if the presence of the teacher is lacking, then indeed it is an issue with the students at PSU. The noteworthy responses were 42% “Agree” and 39% “Strongly agree”. This also infers that students are not comfortable being asked to manage their own study time, and that they rely heavily on the presence of a teacher for guidance, and obviously they lack discipline regarding self-study.

Item 3, *I like learning English in a group*, emerges as the prime obstacle regarding this study, with a total score of 1,292 and a mean score of 4.03. The overwhelming majority of the students at PSU feel they need to learn in a group. The figures of 47% for “Agree” and 45% for “Strongly Agree” show a clearly defined attitude in this regard.

Discussion

Although the students who participated in the research opted for learning English from the internet, it was not by an overwhelming majority. As the data from the Likert-type scale shows 59.68% in favor, and the multiple-choice question shows 62% of the respondents in favor. Nonetheless, taking into account there are approximately 1,900 students studying the fundamental English course, 890-101, there would be a large number who would *not* take advantage of online supplementary content. This finding is supported by Theng et al. (2008), who stated that an e-learning system's success relates to the students' preferred learning style. Despite the latter statement Suanpang and Petocz (2003) found that the Thai students, in their study, regarded e-learning as less formal than a traditional classroom setting and generally gave positive feedback.

Considering the advance of e-learning at PSU, three issues arise and these are clearly indicated by items 3, 6 and 15. Regarding gaining university credits (item 15), most students (67%) were in agreement that they would only study online if points were awarded. Then on the issue of guidance from a teacher (item 6), 71% expressed a negative attitude toward the concept of self-study sans a teacher. The literature supports this finding, for example,

Sirithongthaworn, Krairit, Dimmitt and Paul (2006) stated in their study that in Thailand, students value instruction by a teacher, and in addition, teachers are believed to be the principal source knowledge. In addition, Suanpang and Petocz (2003) reported that Thai students regard the teacher to be an intrinsic component of learning. Finally, the major obstacle is the preference to study English in a group. Learning online implies studying alone and for item 3 we see that 92% of the students were to some degree or another pro learning in a group. These findings are totally congruent with prior studies mentioned in the literature review. For example, Pagram and Pagram (2006) wrote that for Thai students, working outside of a group was viewed as a negative factor of e-learning.

Aside from the previously mentioned items, item 10, *I study English online 5 days a week*, also shows a high level of negative attitude, scoring 72.43%. Conversely, item 11, *I study English online 1 time a week*, scored 54.68%, which shows a positive attitude in that regard. This shows that time available for students to study English online is limited.

Conclusion

The study had limitations. Only students studying Fundamental English Speaking and Listening 890-101, at the Faculty of Liberal Arts on the Hat Yai campus of the Prince of Songkla

University participated. Hence, the findings cannot be said to represent all Thai university students. In addition, it was a quantitative study, which may be viewed as a limitation. Further, the instrument was developed by the researcher and could be improved upon for future research. However, in as much as serving the initial purpose and answering the research questions, the study was a success. It may be concluded students studying Fundamental English 890-101, at PSU, Hat Yai campus were approximately 60 % in favor of learning English online. In summary, the factors which emerge as obstacles (in order of importance) are that students:

1. felt uncomfortable learning outside a group.
2. preferred guidance from a teacher as opposed to self-study.
3. would seldom take the initiative to use e-learning to improve their English. Sixty-seven percent of the students surveyed would only study English by using the internet if they could gain credits.

Recommendations

Due to the students' limited positive mindset, and apparent obstacles, it is debatable if a website for self-study would be largely successful. Thus, the researcher suggests further study: for example, the launching of a pilot site and then testing its viability, and success level in terms of student feedback and learning outcomes.

Acknowledgments

The research was financially supported by the Research Fund of the Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, contract number N.001/2559.

Eternal thanks to the students and academic staff of the Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University—you collectively are my source of inspiration. The author would like to thank Sammireh Nagaratnam, Jarren Hildenbrandt, and Bunthan Teng for their assistance in facilitating the survey, Arunporn Saetia for translation, and last but not least Kemtong Sinwongsuwat for guidance.

References

- Bertea, P. (2009). Measuring students' attitudes to e-learning: A case study. *Conference proceedings of "eLearning and Software for Education" (eLSE)*, issue: 01/2009, pages: 417424. Retrieved from <http://ceeol.com>.
- Munpru, S., & Wuttikrikunlaya, P. (2013). A survey of online tools used by English-Thai and Thai-English translation by Thai students. *FLLT conference proceedings by LITU*, 2(1). Retrieved from <http://www.litu.tu.ac.th/journal/FLLTCP/Proceeding/069.pdf>.

- Noom-ura, S. (2013). English teaching problems in Thailand and Thai teachers' professional development needs. *English Language Teaching*. 6(11). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n11p139>.
- Pagram, J., & Pagram, P. (2006). Issues in e-learning: a Thai case study. *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*. Vol. 26. Retrieved from <https://www.ejisdc.org/ojs2/index.php/ejisdc/article/view/276/175>
- Raosoftware. (2011). Sample size calculator. Retrieved from <http://.raosoftware.com/samplesize>.
- Segev, E. (2004). Mobile learning: improve English anytime anywhere. *The British Council online*. Retrieved from <http://britishcouncil.org/blog/mobile-learning-improve-english-anytime-anywhere>.
- Siritongthaworn, S., Krairit, D., Dimmitt, N., & Paul, H. (2006). the study of e-learning technology implementation: A preliminary investigation of universities in Thailand. *Springer Science and Business Media*. Retrieved from <https://springer.com>.
- Srichanyachon, N. (2010). *Key components of e-learning readiness*. Retrieved from http://bu.ac.th/knowledgecenter/epaper/jan-june2010/pdf/Page_56.pdf.
- Suanpang, P., & Petocz, P. (2003). *Students' experience in learning business statistics using traditional versus online methods in Thailand*. [Academic Paper]. Retrieved from <https://w3.unisa.edu.au/evaluations/Full-papers/SuanpengFull.doc>.

- Teo, T., Luan, W., Thapanee, T., & Chattiwatt, W. (2010). Assessing e-learning acceptance by university students in Thailand. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, Special issue 8*. Retrieved from <http://ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet27/teo.html>.
- Theng,Y., Tun, E., Zaw, M., Cho, S., Miao, C., Kan, M., & Tang, A. (2008). An empirical study on students' perceptions on e-learning systems. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Convention on Rehabilitation Engineering & Assistive Technology*. Retrieved from <https://di.acm.org>.
- Unknown. (2015). *English First English Proficiency Index 2015*. Retrieved from <http://ef.co.th/epi/>.
- Unknown. (2015). *eLEARNINGNC*. Retrieved from http://elearning.gov/about_elearning/.
- Unknown. (2012, March 27). *Poor O-Net scores could reflect*. Retrieved from <http://nationmultimedia.com/national/Poor-ONet-scorescouldreflect-30178788.html>.
- Unknown. (2016). *Social constructivism*. Retrieved from <http://gsi.berkeley.edu/gsi-guide-contents/learning-theory-research/social-constructivism/>