การศึกษาข้อดีและข้อจำกัดของการใช้บทเรียนคอมพิวเตอร์ช่วยสอน วิชาภาษาอังกฤษตามความเห็นของนักศึกษาและอาจารย์มหาวิทยาลัย ในประเทศไทย [*]

จรัสดาว อินทรทัศน์ [1]

มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีพระจอมเกล้าธนบุรี บางมด ทุ่งครุ กรุงเทพฯ 10140

บทคัดย่อ

การวิจัยนี้ต้องการศึกษาความเห็นของนักศึกษาและอาจารย์มหาวิทยาลัยในประเทศไทยที่มีต่อการใช้บทเรียนคอมพิวเตอร์ช่วยสอนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ กลุ่มตัวอย่างเป็นนักศึกษา 167 คน ที่กำลังเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ และเป็นอาจารย์ 70 คน ที่สอนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ จาก 8 มหาวิทยาลัยชั้นนำในประเทศไทย โดยวิธีสุ่มเลือกตามจำนวน เก็บข้อมูลด้วยการส่งแบบสอบถามให้ตอบ วิเคราะห์ด้วยการหาคะแนนความเห็นเฉลี่ยและเปรียบเทียบด้วย Mann-Whitney U test และวิเคราะห์ความสัมพันธ์ด้วย Pearson Chi-Square และ Cramer's V test การวิจัยได้ข้อสรุปดังนี้

กลุ่มตัวอย่างทั้งสองกลุ่มมีความพอใจในข้อดีของการใช้ CALL ในด้านความเป็นอิสระในการเรียนมากที่สุด รองลงไปคือลักษณะเฉพาะของ CALL เช่น ปุ่มอัตโนมัติ ภาพเคลื่อนไหว เสียงและสี แต่ความพอใจของกลุ่มอาจารย์ มีมากกว่ากลุ่มนักศึกษาอย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติที่ระดับความเชื่อมั่น 0.05 ส่วนข้อเสียที่สำคัญที่สุดของการใช้ CALL สำหรับนักศึกษาคือการโหลดโปรแกรมที่เสียเวลานาน สำหรับกลุ่มอาจารย์ ปัญหาในการพัฒนาสื่อการเรียนเป็นข้อเสียที่สำคัญสุด

ในการเลือกสัดส่วนที่เหมาะสมระหว่างการใช้ตำรา หรือการใช้ CALL นั้น ทั้งสองกลุ่มพอใจจะใช้ตำราร้อยละ 60-80 และใช้ CALL ร้อยละ 20-40

ผลของการศึกษาครั้งนี้สะท้อนให้เห็นสภาพการณ์ปัจจุบันที่ผู้สอนและผู้เรียนกำลังประสบอยู่ในมหาวิทยาลัยในประเทศไทย ซึ่งเป็น ประโยชน์ต่อผู้บริหารทางการศึกษาในการวางนโยบายเพื่อสนับสนุนการใช้ และการพัฒนาสื่อการเรียนด้วยคอมพิวเตอร์เพื่อการเรียนรู้ด้วยตนเองและการเรียนรู้ตลอดชีวิต การศึกษานี้อาจนำไปปรับใช้กับมหาวิทยาลัยในประเทศอื่นๆ ซึ่งประสบปัญหาเดียวกันกับมหาวิทยาลัยในประเทศไทย

Investigation on Advantages and Disadvantages in using English CALL According to the Opinions of Thai University Students and Lecturers [*]

Charatdao Intratat [1]

King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Bangmod, Toongkru, Bangkok 10140

Abstract

This research intended to study the opinions of Thai university students and lecturers about English computer-assisted language learning (CALL) materials. The data was collected by Quata Sampling from 167 students who were studying English and 70 English lecturers at 8 leading universities in Thailand. The data was collected from the questionnaires and analyzed by standard means and compared by Mann-Whitney U-test. It was analyzed for correlations by Pearson Chi-Square and Cramer's V-test. The results of the study could be summarized as follows:

Both groups of subjects appreciated most the advantages of using CALL materials in terms of freedom in studying, followed by the specific characteristics of CALL such as automatic buttons, animation, sound effects and colors. The lecturer groups valued these advantages significantly more than student groups at 0.05 levels.

The most disadvantageous problem in using CALL for student groups was time consuming in loading the program but the lecturer groups rated problems in developing CALL programs as the most disadvantageous. In voting an appropriate ratio between CALL and books, all subjects preferred to use 60%-80% books and 20%-40% CALL.

The results of this investigation reflected the present situation that both lecturers and students are facing in Thai universities. It will be beneficial to educational administrators for policy planning to support the use and development of CALL for learner autonomy and life-long learning. This study can be applied for universities in other countries that are sharing the same problems as in Thai universities.

---

1. Introduction

Present education policy in Thailand largely focuses on information technology (IT) as an educational tool to promote life-long autonomous learning. The Thai government together with international organizations have initiated and supported several projects to accomplish this policy, starting from primary schools up through university. However, in spite of the government supporting projects, the development of IT, especially in the teaching of English as a foreign language, is mostly available only at tertiary level. The popularity of IT, especially the use of computers and the Internet, is widely appreciated among university students but the popularity of computer-assisted language learning (CALL) among Thai lecturers and students is still questionable. Are there any obstacles that prevent students and lecturers from making full use of this technology in their studying and teaching respectively?

This article reports on an investigation from lecturers and students from 8 universities in Thailand about the opinions, preferences, comments and suggestions in using CALL materials. The study also explores their problems such as computer literacy, program development, available budget, supporting teamwork and equipment.

2. Objectives of the Study

This study aims to investigate the advantages and disadvantages that university lecturers and students are facing in using CALL materials; the disadvantage which was the most problematic for them and their preferable ratio between using books and CALL. The result of this study may lead to the solving of problems in order to promote the use of IT, especially CALL and the Internet for education in Thailand. Moreover, it can also be applied to other

countries that share the same problems in developing IT for learner autonomy.

3. Literature Review

3.1 IT autonomous learning

As current language teaching methodology focuses on getting learners to communicate in the target language, IT nowadays, especially the Internet, ultimately serves the educators' purpose. It offers different authentic materials and ample opportunity to communicate in a foreign language, in particular, English. Many educators agree that the Internet is a marvelous source for multimedia reading materials and teachers who have used it state that it fits into current theories of integrative language learning and learner autonomy [1]

Other researchers such as Simpson [2] agreed that the rapid development of information and communication technologies in recent years has prompted both teachers and learners to engage with the possibilities and complexities of computer-mediated communication for language teaching and learning. This human communication via computers enables new methods of learning and teaching and is associated with increased learner participation and turn-taking initiation.

There are many teacher-created materials to support learning autonomy by using a computer to present lessons or content instead of using formal in-class teaching. These ready-made lessons or CALL materials which can be on-line or off-line, are designed for students to learn in their own convenient time and place and they are highly motivating because they are interactive with learners [3]. These CALL materials not only improve students' communication skills, but also include the possibility for teachers to devote class time to teaching communication skills and for the capacity

of individualizing course work. [4] [5]

3.2 Studies about using CALL materials

Many educators in several countries are interested in using IT, especially CALL, for the sake of teaching. For example, in Denmark where a project team funded by EU to transfer the best practices of language teaching methods for the teaching of less commonly taught languages was selected to develop CALL for learning in context as one of the five methods for teaching communicative skills [6]. Also in Canada, Beaudouin [5] recommended the advantages of computer-assisted grammar teaching. His team has designed a grammar teaching web site, applying educational principles, most of which involve instructional design and the need for structure and adaptability to different learning styles.

I myself designed some CALL materials including self-access supplementary and remedial exercises for students at King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi (KMUTT) Thailand. In one of my studies to evaluate the effectiveness of material on how to deal with English tenses, students who had practiced these exercises said that they were satisfied with the lessons. The study also compared learners' success rates by a pre-test that was taken before visiting the web site and a post-test after practicing exercises in the material. Results of the post-test were significantly higher than the pre-test, showing learners' development in proficiency performance [7].

3.3 Current situation of educational IT in Thailand

At the national level, the Thai government supports the project "School Net" (http://www.school.net.th) which was operated by National Electronics and Computer Technology Center (NECTEC) from 1995 to 2003 then handed on to the Ministry of Education. There are 4,794 schools online at this time. These members are primary and secondary schools and vocational colleges from all regions of Thailand. The aim of the network is to encourage learning from several resources and to exchange ideas between teachers and students in the country and abroad.

Another national project conducted by the Ministry of Education, with cooperation from 5 universities including KMUTT, is in the process of setting up Prototypical ICT Schools to develop Thai students especially in computer-mediated communication. The Ministry of Education with co-operation from the World Bank also sponsored the School of Liberal Arts, KMUTT to develop CALL materials for teaching English at secondary schools.

At the tertiary level, there are educational expansion networks. For example, http://www:Thai2learn.com supported by the National Science and Technology Development Agency (NSTDA) and http://www.vcharkarn.com supported by the Institute for the Promotion of Teaching Science and Technology. These web sites are open for interested learners.

In spite of the government encouragement, the study of Palasri et al. [8] showed that individual Internet users in Thailand were rare because the prices were too high by Thai standards. [9]. The recent poll on 20,000 Internet users' behavior conducted by NECTEC around September and October 2003, reported that the web-server tended to use the Internet too much for entertainment. The on-line games are particularly more popular among children and teenagers than in the previous year poll. NECTEC director said that the best solution

for this problem is to create web-based material with informative context that provides positive knowledge to educate as well as entertain the audience as an alternative to the addictive games [10].

3.4   Related studies

Today, computer skills are normally a pre-requisite for success in higher education and language teachers in training are likely to have become familiar with computers as part of their university experience. CALL and the learning management system (LMS) greatly simplify the task of creating a web for a class and adding functionality such as discussion forums, chat rooms, and on-line quizzes. They have become popular options for teachers in higher education and are being increasingly used in secondary schools as well [11].

Hall [12] examined how a varied application of CALL and IT can be used to overcome the perceived grammar deficit in undergraduates at British universities who wanted to study German. Together with traditional CALL exercises, there are a number of interesting applications of the computer that encourage implicit and exploratory learning. IT can be integrated into foreign language programs by integrating it into assessment and by integrating it into language learning activities.

In South Korea, Suh [13] evaluated the use of CALL in second language learning. Participants were 19 undergraduate Korean students. They reported that CALL can facilitate the learning of writing but teachers must select software that suits their students in terms of proficiency levels, interests, and learning styles. Jones [14] also supported advantages of using CALL in language learning and asked for more teachers' commitment.

Other researchers have studied the opinions of teachers and students towards studying through the Internet. In Turkey, Cagiltay [15] studied how students' performance was affected with the use of CALL tools and examined factors affecting the ways students preferred to use the system. At the same time, in Iran, Alipanahi and Sani [16] studied the effect of the Internet and hypertext on teaching of EFL reading comprehension. They found that 98% of the subjects, who were university students, considered it to be useful.

As for university lecturers in Saudi-Arabia, Al-Kahtani [17] studied the current availability of CALL resources and the types of institutional supports. He proposed that faculty beliefs about teaching and technology, social factors, and other limitations have impacted the current state of CALL implementation in EFL programs.

4. Methodology
4.1   The subjects

The subjects in this study were 70 English lecturers and 167 students from mixed faculties at 8 leading universities in Thailand, which were chosen by Quota Sampling. Two samples were provincial universities and six of them were in Bangkok. Among those six universities in Bangkok, one of them was a private university and the rest were government universities.

The lecturer subjects were English lecturers at the chosen universities and the student subjects were chosen by Purposive Sampling from the ones who were studying English and came from prominent faculties in each university. As for the students' prominent field of study, there were science and technology, medical science, liberal arts, social science and business administration. It

can be assumed that the subjects in this study could reflect the general image of Thai university students

and English lecturers.

The details are shown in Table 1.

Table 1   The subjects in this study

No.	University	Lecturers	Students
1.	King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi Type: government Location: Bangkok Students' study field: Science and technology	11	29
2.	Chulalongkorn University Type: government Location: Bangkok Students' study field: Liberal Arts	8	15
3.	Chiang Mai University Type: government Location: Chiang Mai Students' study field: Liberal Arts	9	23
4.	Mahidol University Type: government Location: Bangkok Students' study field: Medical Science	10	24
5.	Rajamangala Institute of Technology Borpitpimuk-Mahamek Campus Type: government Location: Bangkok Students' study field: Business Administration	7	20
6.	Assumption University Type: private Location: Bangkok Students' study field: Business Administration	10	25
7.	Thammasart University Type: government Location: Bangkok Students' study field: Social Sciences	8	18
8.	Naresuan University Type: government Location: Phitsanulok Students' study field: Liberal Arts and Social Sciences	7	13
	Total	**70**	**167**

4.2 The equipment

The data in this study were collected by two sets of questionnaires sent to lecturer groups and student groups in each university. Each set was mostly parallel though there were some specific questions for each subject group (look at Appendix

1 and 2). The subjects were asked to comment firstly about the advantages and disadvantages of using CALL materials in the language lab or on the Internet as experienced in their teaching or studying with a five-point rating-scale. The first six questions explored similar advantages of CALL that lecturers

and students preferred. Other questions were designed to cover the specific roles of the subjects. In the next part, both groups of subjects were asked to vote for the ratio between using books and CALL materials that they thought most appropriate to their present situation. The total score obtained from the answers of lecturers and students at each university was calculated in separated means for further analysis.

5. Findings

5.1 Finding 1

The student subjects who were studying in 8 universities in Thailand were asked to rate 7 Advantages of CALL materials with a five-point rating-scale: 5 = the most beneficial, 4 = very beneficial, 3 = average, 2 = less beneficial, 1 = the least beneficial. The level of opinion was interpreted according to the scale adapted from Limwattana [18] as follows:

4.51-5.00 = most beneficial
3.51-4.50 = very beneficial
2.51-3.50 = average
1.51-2.50 = less beneficial
1.00-1.50 = the least beneficial.

In comparing all the Advantages, we can see that students rated the Advantage 1 (availability to unlimited number of learners to study at unlimited time out of class) as the most outstanding benefit of CALL (mean = 3.87). This shows that student subjects appreciated that CALL, especially the one that was on-line, enabled them to study on their own without limitation of time, place or manner. The second highest-rated was Advantage 2 (CALL could specify suitable topics to the students' needs) (mean = 3.59). The lowest-rated was Advantage 5 (sound effects) where the mean was 2.92. In summary, the students thought that the benefit of CALL was average.

The value of mean and standard error of each advantage are shown in Table 2 as follows.

Table 2 The Opinion on Advantages of CALL rated by 167 students

Advantages of CALL	Students' Opinion		
	Mean	Std. Error	Level of Opinion
1. It opens to unlimited number of learners to study at unlimited time out of class.	3.87	0.100	very beneficial
2. It can specify suitable topics to the students' needs	3.59	0.094	very beneficial
3. It provides automatic buttons to search quickly for the desired exercises.	3.25	0.099	average
4. It contains interesting animations.	3.20	0.108	average
5. It has sound effects.	2.92	0.118	average
6. It is colorful.	3.00	0.114	average
7. It requires less expense than buying one's own textbooks.	2.98	0.111	average
Summarized Opinion	3.26	0.0611	average

5.2 Finding 2

The lecturer subjects who were teaching English at 8 universities in Thailand rated the 7 advantages of CALL materials with a five-point rating-scale from the same criteria as the students. The highest score for the most beneficial advantage is 5, and 1 is the lowest score for the least beneficial. The level of opinion was interpreted according to as similar scale as the students' Advantage rating.

According to their opinions, lecturers thought that Advantage 1 (availability to unlimited number of learners to study at unlimited time out of class) was the most beneficial (mean = 4.37). The second highest-rated was Advantage 4 (CALL contains interesting animations) (mean = 3.73). The lowest-rated was Advantage 3 (CALL provides automatic buttons to search quickly for the desired exercises) (mean = 3.49). Overall, the Advantages of CALL were rated by lecturers as very beneficial. The value of mean and standard error of each Advantage are in Table 3 as follows.

Table 3 The Opinion on Advantages of CALL rated by 70 lecturers

Advantages of CALL	Lectures' Opinion		
	Mean	Std. Error	Level of Opinion
1. It opens to unlimited number of learners to study at unlimited time out of class.	4.37	0.131	very beneficial
2. It can specify suitable topics to the students' needs	3.67	0.149	very beneficial
3. It provides automatic buttons to search quickly for the desired exercises.	3.49	0.155	average
4. It contains interesting animations.	3.73	0.154	very beneficial
5. It has sound effects.	3.59	0.177	very beneficial
6. It is colorful.	3.61	0.167	very beneficial
7. Students are interested in technology that corresponds to their daily life.	3.71	0.159	very beneficial
Summarized Opinion	**3.74**	**0.103**	**very beneficial**

In the questionnaires distributed to students and lecturers, there were six questions concerning aspects of CALL advantages in which either students or lecturers might similarly encounter. In order to find out whether the opinions from the lecturers and students on these six Advantages of CALL were the same or not, the results from these Advantages were compared. Under the condition that both groups of subjects were independent from each other and the rating was non-parametric, the scores were calculated by Mann-Whitney U test. The results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4 Comparison between the comments on Advantages of CALL from students and lecturers

Descriptive Statistics

Advantages of CALL	Students' Opinion		Lecturers' Opinion		Mann-Whitney U	Z	Sig.
	Mean	Std. Error	Mean	Std. Error			
Advantage 1	3.87	0.100	4.37	0.131	5204.500	-1.393	.163
Advantage 2	3.59	0.094	3.67	0.149	5657.500	-.403	.687
Advantage 3	3.25	0.099	3.49	0.155	4525.500	-2.817	.005**
Advantage 4	3.20	0.108	3.73	0.154	4843.500	-2.134	.033*
Advantage 5	2.92	0.118	3.59	0.177	4370.500	-3.143	.002**
Advantage 6	3.00	0.114	3.61	0.167	4230.000	-3.437	.001**

Remark: * significant ($\alpha = .05$)   ** highly significant ($\alpha = .01$)

The results show that the difference between opinions of students and lecturers on Advantage 3, 5 and 6 were highly significant and it was significant on Advantage 4. It was clear that the lecturers rated these Advantages of CALL (namely automatic buttons, animation, sound effect and colors) more beneficial than the students. This means that though both groups preferred the characteristics of CALL, lecturers appreciated these characteristics more than students. As for Advantages 1 and 2, both groups rated them highly without significant difference.

5.3 Finding 3

The student subjects who were studying at 8 universities in Thailand rated the Disadvantages of CALL materials with a five-point rating-scale from 5 = the most problematic to 1 = the least problematic. The level of opinion was interpreted according to the scale as follows:

4.51-5.00 = the most problematic
3.51-4.50 = very problematic
2.51-3.50 = average
1.51-2.50 = less problematic
1.00-1.50 = the least problematic.

From the results, the value of mean and standard error of each Disadvantage are as follows in Table 5.

Table 5 The means of CALL Disadvantages rated by students

Disadvantages of CALL	Students' Opinion		
	Mean	Std. Error	Level of Opinion
1. You are not keen at using computer.	1.89	0.102	least of problematic
2. There are a lot more varieties of textbooks than CALL.	2.57	0.100	average
3. There are more details in textbooks and more exercises for practice.	2.99	0.107	average
4. Loading takes long time and often failed.	3.36	0.105	very problematic
5. Lessons can't be photocopied or noted.	2.46	0.105	less problematic
6. Not enough number of computers at university.	3.19	0.115	average
7. Student needs to buy his own computer or pay for working time at an internet cafe.	3.04	0.117	average
Summarized Opinion	**2.7844**	**0.5303**	**average**

From the results, Disadvantage 4 (loading takes long time and often failed) (mean = 3.36) was rated very problematic. This means that most student subjects had difficulties in loading the material from the Internet because it took a long time and often failed. Unfortunately, this was a common problem that usually occurred with old computers.

The students' other problems came from the lack of computers at university-Disadvantage 6 (not enough number of computers at university) (mean = 3.19). This actually obstructed the students from working with a computer. Therefore, they were forced to whether buy their own computer or pay for working time at an Internet café (Disadvantage 7) (mean = 3.04). The lowest-rated Disadvantage was Disadvantage 1 (computer literacy) (mean = 1.89) showing that students were good enough at using a computer since they didn't see much difficulty in this topic.

5.4 Finding 4

The lecturer subjects who were teaching English at 8 universities in Thailand rated the Disadvantages of CALL materials from 5 as the most problematic to 1 as the least problematic. The level of opinion was interpreted according to as similar scales as the students' Disadvantage rating. The mean and standard error of each Disadvantage are as follows in Table 6.

In comparing all the high-rated Disadvantages, lecturers rated Disadvantage 3 (the development of the program that was time consuming and required high budget in spite of lecturers' limited budget) as the most outstanding problem of CALL (mean = 4). This shows that most lecturer subjects had a lot of difficulties in developing a program. The other high-rated topics were Disadvantage 2 (inconvenience in constructing own materials and lack of technical teamwork) (mean = 3.91); Disadvantage 1 (budget problems in buying

ready-made programs) (mean = 3.83) and Disadvantage 4 (requirements of high technology equipment) (mean = 3.60). The lowest-rated was Disadvantage 6 (their university policy didn't focus on CALL) (mean = 2.44).

5.5 Finding 5

The lecturer and student subjects from 8 universities in Thailand indicated the ratio between using books and CALL they desired most for studying English. The choices were ranked from 1 to 5 as follows:

Rank 1: the desired ratio was to use 90%-100% books and 0%-10% for CALL.

Rank 2: the ratio was to use 60%-80% books and 20%-40% for CALL.

Rank 3: the ratio was to use 50% books and 50% for CALL.

Rank 4: the ratio was to use 20%-40% books and 60%-80% for CALL

Rank 5: the ratio was to use 0%-10% books and 90%-100% for CALL.

The frequency of the choices is shown in Table 7.

Table 6 The means of CALL disadvantages rated by 70 lecturers

Disadvantages of CALL	Lecturers' Opinion		
	Mean	Std. Error	Level of Opinion
1. Ready-made programs are more expensive than books, causing budget problems.	3.83	0.1560	very problematic
2. You are not convenient to construct your own material and have no team work.	3.91	0.1600	very problematic
3. The development of program takes time and high budget but your budget is limited.	4.00	0.1480	very problematic
4. It requires high technology equipment.	3.60	0.1420	very problematic
5. The program is not user-friendly.	2.71	0.1650	average
6. University policy doesn't focus on this.	2.44	0.1610	less problematic
7. Students have no computer or there are not enough computers in class.	3.47	0.1870	average
Summarized Opinion	**3.78**	**0.1034**	**very problematic**

Table 7 The frequency of the most desired ratio between books
and CALL voted by students and lecturers

Ratio of Text book / CALL * subject Cross tabulation

Ratio of Text book / CALL	Subject		Total
	Students	Lecturers	
Rank 1. 90%-100% books	13	4	17
0%-10% CALL	5.5%	1.7%	7.2%
Rank 2. 60%-80% books	91	5	96
and 20%-40% CALL	38.4%	2.1%	40.5%
Rank 3. 50% books and	46	12	58
50% CALL	19.4%	5.1%	24.5%
Rank 4. 20%-40% books	16	19	35
and 60%-80% CALL	6.8%	8.0%	14.8%
Rank 5. 0%-10% books	1	30	31
and 90%-100% CALL	0.4%	12.7%	13.1%
Total	167	70	237
	70.5%	29.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	107.417(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	113.590	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	86.217	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	237		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum
expected count is 5.02.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.673	.000
	Cramer's V	.673	.000
N of Valid Cases		237	

a Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

From the table, we can see that the majority of all subjects indicated that they preferred Rank 2 (40.5%). This means that they preferred to use 60%-80% for books and 20%-40% for CALL. Actually, this was the students' vote because the majority of students (38.4%) voted for this Rank whereas the majority of lecturers (12.7%) voted for Rank 5 (0%-10% books and 90%-100% CALL).

The second largest group of students (19.4%) preferred Rank 3 (to use 50% of books and 50% of CALL) whereas the second largest group of lecturers (8%) preferred Rank 4 (to use 20%-40% books and 60%-80% CALL). From the results, university lecturers incline to prefer CALL materials more than students. The Chi-Square tests show that there is significant difference between the answer of the two groups at 0.01 levels. The result of Cramer's V test at .673 shows that there is a significant correlation between the choice of ranks and the status of subjects whether they were students or lecturers.

6. Summary and Discussions

From the findings on the Advantages of CALL, the average means of every group of students and lecturers show that they appreciated this kind of teaching tool. Especially the freedom in studying in unlimited numbers at unlimited times out of class, the specific topics that are suitable to the students' needs and automatic buttons to search quickly for the desired exercises were preferable characteristics of CALL rated by the subjects.

As for the Disadvantages of CALL rated by the students and the lecturers, the results showed that all the subjects had problems in using CALL. Most of the students' problems possibly came from the lack of more advanced equipment such as high-speed modems, an efficient network

system and more facilities such as computer labs. The common problem among students was that there were not enough computers at university.

As for lecturers, they all faced the problems of insufficient budget for ready-made programs. The most problematic Disadvantage was that the development of CALL programs was time consuming and it required a high budget but lecturers' time and budget were limited. Moreover, there were not enough computers in class and students had no computer at home so it would be inconvenient, for lecturers and students alike, to use CALL.

However; all groups showed that they recognized CALL benefits when they chose the proportion of studying with textbooks or CALL. The largest group of the students preferred to use 20%-40% for CALL in studying languages, whereas the largest group of lecturers preferred most of CALL in spite of several problems that they encountered. This indicated that lecturers had more positive attitude towards using CALL materials than students.

These findings could be interpreted that the real problems for students and lecturers likely derived from the lack of institutional support. Though lecturers in this study rated the least problematic that their university policy didn't focus on CALL, it could be the most possible origin of all Disadvantages. Actually, the policy that provided limited budget for CALL and its supporting equipment would consequently initiate most of the problems for lecturers. Should the development of CALL materials be fully supported by the institutions, these problems would be reduced. At the same time, if institutions provide more support on high technology system, equipment and efficient network as well as supply of more computers at university, most obstacles in studying with CALL would be reduced and thus Thai students can acquire the full profit of

this modern technology.

As this research could study only about 8 universities, due to limited budget and time, the researcher would like to suggest further studies that cover all universities in Thailand to reflect the actual situation of opinions and problems in teaching and learning with English CALL.

7. Acknowledgements

8. References

1. Hanson-Smith, E., 1999, "Classroom Practice: Using Multimedia for Input and Interaction in CALL Environments", In Egbert, Joy and Hanson-Smith (Eds.), *CALL Environments, Research, Practice, and Critical Issues*, Virginia: TESOL, pp. 189-215.

2. Simpson, James, 2002, "The Computer-mediated Communication", *ELT Journal,* Vol. 56, No. 4, pp. 414-415.

3. NECTEC, 2004, "NECTEC's Web Based Learning", On-line. Internet. Available: http://www.nectec.or.th/courseware/cai/0006.html [12/1/2004]

4. Healey, D., 1999, "Classroom Practice: Communicative Skill-Building Tasks in CALL Environments", In Egbert, Joy and Hanson-Smith (Eds.), *CALL Environment, Research, Practice, and Critical Issues*, Virginia: TESOL, pp. 116-136.

5. Beaudoin, M., 2003, "Principes d'enseignement de la grammaire a l'Internet", *Proceedings of WorldCALL 2003 CALL from the Margins*, Banff, Alberta, Canada, 7-10 May, p. 44.

6. Andersen, K., 2003, "Best Practice - Best Language Teaching Method", *Proceedings of WorldCALL 2003 CALL from the Margins*, Banff, Alberta, Canada, 7-10 May, p. 33.

7. Intratat, C., 2003, "CALL Materials for EFL Students at KMUTT, Thailand", *Proceedings of WorldCALL 2003 CALL from the Margins*, Banff, Alberta, Canada, 7-10 May. p. 119.

8. Palasri, S., Huter, S., and Wenzel, Z., 1999, "The History of the Internet in Thailand", On-line, Internet. Available: http://www.nsrc.org/case-studies/thailand/english/index.html [25/1/2004]

9. Suriyasan, B., 1996, "A Critical Perspective on Thai Internet Policy Making Commercialization and Public Access", On-line, Internet. Available: http://www.oak.cats.ohiou.edu/-bs388085/th-net4.htm [11/7/1997]

10. Kerdboon, P., 2004, "On Line Game: Problems without Solution!", *Than Settakit*, Vol. 24, No. 1873, 22-24 January, p. 44.

11. Godwin-Jones, Bob, 2002, "Emerging Technologies, Technology for Prospective Language Teachers", *Language Learning & Teaching*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 10-14.

12. Hall, C., 1998, "Overcoming the Grammar

Deficit: the Role of Information Technology in Teaching German to Undergraduates", *Canadian Modern Language Review*, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp. 41-60.

13.   Suh, Jae-Suk, 2002, "Effectiveness of CALL Writing Instruction: The Voices of Korean Learners", *Foreign Language Annuals*, Vol. 35, No. 6, pp. 669-679.

14.   Jones, Jeremy F., 2001, "CALL and the Responsibilities of Teachers and Administrators", *ELT Journal*, Vol. 55, No. 4, pp. 360-367.

15.   Cagiltay, N., 2003, "DITOD: A Digital Language Support System", *Proceedings of WorldCALL 2003 CALL from the Margins*, Banff,

Alberta, Canada, 7-10 May, p. 56.

16.   Alipanahi, Fatemeh; Sani, Lemna P., 2003, "Internet and Language Teaching", *Proceedings of WorldCALL 2003 CALL from the Margins*, Banff, Alberta, Canada, 7-10 May, pp. 27-28.

17.   Al-Kahtani, Saad Ali, 2003, "The Current State of Call at Saudi Arabian Universities", *Proceedings of WorldCALL 2003 CALL from the Margins*, Banff, Alberta, Canada, 7-10 May, p. 26.

18.   ฉวีวรรณ หลิมวัฒนา. 2546. การศึกษาความคาดหวังของนักศึกษาและสภาพที่เป็นจริงตามการรับรู้ของนักศึกษาต่อการศึกษาในหลักสูตรศิลปศาสตร์บัณฑิต คณะโบราณคดี มหาวิทยาลัยศิลปากร, กรุงเทพ: โรงพิมพ์มหาวิทยาลัยศิลปากร, หน้า 28.

Appendix 1

Teacher's comments about CALL (Computer Assisted Language Learning)

1. How do you think that CALL materials for teaching in language lab or Internet are advantageous or disadvantageous? Please rate your comment from 5 (the most) to 1 (the least) by writing the marks in the box provided. You may answer as many topics as you experienced in your teaching.

Advantage of CALL	**Disadvantage of CALL**
☐ It opens to unlimited number of learners to study at unlimited time out of class.	☐ ready-made programs are more expensive than books, causing budget problems
☐ It can specify suitable topics to the students' needs.	☐ You are not convenient to construct your own material and have no team work.
☐ It provides automatic buttons to search quickly for the desired exercises.	☐ The development of program takes time and high budget but your budget is limited.
☐ It contains interesting animations.	☐ The program is not user-friendly.
☐ It has sound effects.	☐ It requires high technology equipments.
☐ It is colorful.	☐ University policy doesnût focus on this.
☐ Students are interested in technology that corresponds to their daily life.	☐ Students have no computer or there are not enough computers in class.
☐ Other…………………………………..	☐ Other ……………………………………..

2. What is the ratio between using books and CALL that you desire most? Please choose only one topic.

☐ Using books 90% - 100%   : CALL 0% -10%
☐ Using books 60% - 80%   : CALL 20% -40%
☐ Using books 50%   : CALL 50%
☐ Using books 20% - 40%   : CALL 60% - 80%
☐ Using books 0% - 10%   : CALL 90% - 100%

Appendix 2

Student's comment about CALL (Computer Assisted Language Learning)

1. How do you think that CALL materials for studying in a language lab or on Internet are advantageous or disadvantageous? Please rate your comment from 5 (the most) to 1 (the least) by writing the marks in the box provided. You may answer as many topics as you experienced in your studying.

Advantage of CALL	Disadvantage of CALL
☐ It opens to unlimited number of learners to study at unlimited time out of class.	☐ You are not keen at using computer.
☐ It can specify suitable topics to the students' needs.	☐ There are a lot more varieties of textbooks than CALL.
☐ It provides automatic buttons to search quickly for the desired exercises.	☐ There are more details in textbooks and more exercises for practice.
☐ It contains interesting animations.	☐ Loading takes long time and often failed.
☐ It has sound effects.	☐ Lessons can be photocopied or noted.
☐ It is colorful.	☐ Not enough number of computer at university
☐ It requires less expense than buying oneûs own textbooks.	☐ Student need to buy his own computer or pay for working time at an internet cafe.
☐ Other …………………………….......……..	☐ Other………………………….......…………..

2. What is the ratio between using books and CALL that you desire most? Please choose only one answer.

☐ Using books 90% - 100%   :   CALL 0% -10%
☐ Using books 60% - 80%   :   CALL 20% -40%
☐ Using books 50%   :   CALL 50%
☐ Using books 20% - 40%   :   CALL 60% - 80%
☐ Using books 0% - 10%   :   CALL 90% - 100%