

FACTORS AFFECTING ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF  
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS: A CASE STUDY OF RAJAMANGALA  
UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY LANNA LAMPANG



An Independent Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Master of Arts Degree  
in English  
May 2025

Copyright 2025 by University of Phayao

ปัจจัยที่ส่งผลต่อผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาระดับปริญญาตรี: กรณีศึกษา  
มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลล้านนา ลำปาง



ณัฐพรรณ งามสม

การศึกษาค้นคว้าด้วยตนเองเสนอเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษา

หลักสูตรปริญญาศิลปศาสตรมหาบัณฑิต

สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ

พฤษภาคม 2568

ลิขสิทธิ์เป็นของมหาวิทยาลัยพะเยา

FACTORS AFFECTING ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE  
STUDENTS: A CASE STUDY OF RAJAMANGALA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY LANNA  
LAMPANG



An Independent Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Master of Arts Degree  
in English  
May 2025

Copyright 2025 by University of Phayao

Independent Study

Title

FACTORS AFFECTING ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE  
STUDENTS: A CASE STUDY OF RAJAMANGALA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY LANNA

LAMPANG

Submitted by NATTAPAN NGAMSOM

Approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
Master of Arts Degree in English  
University of Phayao

Approved by

..... Chairman  
(Assistant Professor Dr. Sukanya Kaowiwattanakul )

..... Advisor  
(Assistant Professor Dr. Rutthaphak Huttayavilaiphan )

..... Examiner  
(Assistant Professor Dr. Khomkrit Tachom )

..... Dean of School of Liberal Arts  
(Assistant Professor Dr. Chittima Kaweera )

**Title:** FACTORS AFFECTING ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACHIEVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS: A CASE STUDY OF RAJAMANGALA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY LANNA LAMPANG

**Author:** Nattapan Ngamsom, Independent Study: M.A. (English), University of Phayao, 2024

**Advisor:** Assistant Professor Dr. Rutthaphak Huttayavilaiphan

**Keywords:** Factors, English language proficiency, Learning achievement, Undergraduate students.

#### ABSTRACT

This study examines the factors influencing English language achievement among non-English major undergraduate students in Thailand, with a specific focus on the differences between high-achieving and low-achieving learners. Conducted at Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna Lampang, this research adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative data from questionnaires and qualitative insights from semi-structured interviews. Three primary influencing factors were identified: student-related factors (e.g., motivation and self-regulated learning), teacher-related factors (e.g., pedagogical practices and teacher-student interactions), and environmental factors (e.g., availability of learning resources). Student motivation and self-regulation emerged as the strongest predictors of success, while teacher-related factors unexpectedly showed a negative influence, suggesting a misalignment between teaching strategies and student needs. Environmental factors, though positively perceived, had a less direct impact on outcomes. Practical implications include enhancing intrinsic motivation, adopting tailored teaching strategies to meet diverse learner needs, and strengthening teacher-student relationships to support low-achieving students. Policymakers are encouraged to address resource disparities and develop targeted interventions to enhance English language proficiency among students.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Assistant Professor Dr.Rutthaphak Huttayavilaiphan, for providing invaluable guidance, constructive feedback, and continuous support throughout this Independent Study. Without his patience, expertise, and encouragement, this research would not have been possible.

My sincere thanks also go to the examination committee members, Assistant Professor Dr.Sukanya Kaowiwattanakul and Assistant Professor Dr.Khomkrit Tachom, for their insightful suggestions, critical comments, and meaningful contributions that significantly enhanced the quality of my research. Additionally,

I am deeply thankful to all lecturers and staff at the School of Liberal Arts, University of Phayao, for their support and assistance throughout my academic journey.

Special appreciation is extended to my classmates and friends, whose constant encouragement and camaraderie made my study experience rewarding and enjoyable.

Finally, my heartfelt thanks go to my beloved family – my mother and my brother - for their unwavering love, continuous support, and encouragement, which motivated me to complete this Independent Study successfully.

Nattapan Ngamsom

## LIST OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT .....	D
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	E
LIST OF CONTENTS.....	F
LIST OF TABLES .....	I
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background of Study .....	1
Research Objectives .....	5
Research Questions .....	6
Significance of the study .....	6
Definition of Terms .....	7
Scope of the Study.....	8
Chapter Conclusion .....	9
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH.....	10
English Language Achievement.....	10
Theoretical Perspectives on English Language Achievement.....	17
Characteristics of High and Low-English Achievers .....	23
Factors Influencing English Language Achievement .....	28
Previous Studies Related to Factors Influencing English Language Achievement....	40
Chapter Conclusion .....	43
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	44
Research design.....	44

Population and sample .....	45
Research instrument .....	48
Data collection .....	51
Data analysis .....	53
Ethical Considerations.....	55
Chapter Conclusion .....	56
CHAPTER IV RESULTS .....	58
Answer to RQ1: What are the types of factors that influence English language learning among non-English major students? .....	58
Answer to RQ2: What are the common types of factors that influence English language learning among high-achieving and low-achieving students? .....	67
Chapter Conclusion .....	74
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION.....	76
Discussion of the Results.....	76
Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Further Studies.....	80
Chapter Conclusion .....	84
Conclusion of the Study.....	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	86
APPENDIX.....	93
APPENDIX A .....	94
APPENDIX B .....	98
APPENDIX C .....	101
APPENDIX D .....	104
BIOGRAPHY .....	107





## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1 Summary of Theoretical Perspectives on English Language Achievement.....	23
Table 2 Comparison of High and Low-English Language Achievers.....	26
Table 3 Summary of Factors Influencing English Language Achievement .....	39
Table 4 Research population.....	46
Table 5 The size of research sample .....	48
Table 6 Distribution of Research Interview Participants .....	52
Table 7 The criteria for interpretation of (Best, 1970).....	54
Table 8 Descriptive Statistics of Factors Influencing English Language Learning .....	59
Table 9 Regression Analysis of Factors Influencing English Language Learning .....	62
Table 10 Background Information of Interview Participants.....	64
Table 11 Regression Analysis of Factors Influencing English Language Learning .....	68



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an overview of the study, outlining the significance of English language proficiency in a globalized world and its critical role in education and career development. It discusses the challenges faced by non-English major undergraduate students in Thailand, particularly the gap between theoretical learning and practical language application. The chapter also highlights the research gap, emphasizing the need to examine the factors influencing English language achievement among these students. Furthermore, it presents research questions and objectives, establishing the foundation for the study. By analyzing learner, teacher, and environmental factors, this research aims to contribute to more effective English language education strategies and policy improvements.

#### **Background of Study**

##### **1. Importance of English in a Globalized World**

As globalization continues to shape economies and societies, English has become the dominant lingua franca, facilitating communication across borders in various fields, including education, business, technology, and international relations. It is the most widely used language in science, engineering, medicine, commerce, and digital communication, making proficiency in English a crucial skill for academic and professional success (Hasa, 2019). The ability to use English effectively enables individuals to access global knowledge, engage in international collaboration, and secure employment in multinational companies. In many countries, English is either an official language or a mandatory part of the education system, reinforcing its status as a key driver of career advancement and global integration (Crystal, 1997)

English is particularly significant in higher education, where universities worldwide offer academic programs in English to accommodate international students and ensure accessibility to global research. Many scientific discoveries and academic publications are disseminated in English, making it an essential tool for students and

researchers (Nishanthi, 2018). Additionally, in the digital age, English remains the predominant language of the internet, international media, and social networking platforms. Given its widespread application, English proficiency is no longer an optional skill but a necessity for individuals seeking to thrive in an interconnected world.

## **2. English Language Education in Thailand**

Recognizing the growing importance of English, Thailand has incorporated it into the national education system, making it a core subject from primary school through higher education. Government initiatives aim to enhance English proficiency among students to prepare them for participation in the global workforce (Baker, 2015). However, despite these efforts, Thai students' overall English proficiency remains relatively low compared to other countries in the region, as reflected in international assessments such as the EF English Proficiency Index and TOEFL scores (Test of English as a Foreign Language) administered by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The theoretical foundation and validation of TOEFL scores are based on extensive research conducted by ETS (Norrish, 2020). The emphasis in Thai classrooms has traditionally been on grammar, vocabulary memorization, and reading comprehension, with limited opportunities for students to engage in communicative and practical language use.

In recent years, English language education in Thailand has seen significant shifts, driven by both policy changes and technological advancements. The adoption of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) has been a major step towards standardizing English proficiency levels across educational institutions, aiming to enhance the overall quality of English education in the country. Additionally, there is a growing emphasis on English as a lingua franca within the ASEAN community, reflecting the need for a common language among speakers of different native languages (Jarunthawatchai & Baker, 2024). The integration of technology in classrooms has also become more prevalent, with digital tools and online platforms being used to create more interactive and engaging learning experiences (Sukavatee & Khlaisang, 2023). Despite these advancements, challenges such as outdated teaching methodologies and a shortage of qualified English teachers persist, highlighting the need for ongoing professional development for educators (Noom-ura, 2013). However, many students find it challenging to transition from classroom-based learning to real-

world English usage, particularly in professional settings. Non-English major students often struggle to develop fluency due to limited exposure and practical application of the language outside the classroom.

### **3. Challenges in English Language Learning**

Despite the national emphasis on English education, numerous challenges hinder Thai students from achieving proficiency. One of the primary issues is the disconnect between theoretical instruction and practical language use. English instruction in Thailand is often teacher-centered, relying on rote memorization rather than interactive and communicative approaches (Noom-ura, 2013). As a result, students may develop strong reading and grammar skills but lack the ability to communicate effectively in real-world situations. This limitation is particularly problematic in professional fields where oral communication and listening comprehension are essential.

Another significant challenge is the lack of English exposure outside the classroom, particularly in rural areas where students have fewer opportunities to practice with native speakers or access English-language media. The perception of English as merely an academic subject, rather than a functional skill, further discourages students from engaging with the language in meaningful ways. Additionally, teacher proficiency and instructional quality vary widely across educational institutions, affecting students' motivation and learning outcomes. Many Thai students also experience language anxiety and low self-confidence, which negatively impact their willingness to engage in English-speaking activities (Baker, 2012; Foley, 2005).

For non-English major students, these challenges are even more pronounced, as their academic programs do not prioritize English language development beyond fulfilling curriculum requirements. Unlike English majors, who receive extensive language training, non-English majors often take only a few compulsory English courses, which may not be sufficient to build proficiency. Furthermore, students enrolled in technical or vocational programs may struggle to see the relevance of English to their fields of study, leading to lower motivation and engagement.

#### **4. Research Gap and Need for the Study**

While many studies have explored factors influencing English language learning, most research in Thailand has focused on English-major students or those in urban universities, overlooking the unique challenges faced by non-English major students. Additionally, prior research has largely examined broad factors such as motivation, teacher quality, and resource availability without considering the differences between high-achieving and low-achieving students. Understanding these distinctions is essential for designing targeted interventions that cater to students at various proficiency levels.

There is also a limited number of qualitative studies that capture students' personal experiences, attitudes, and learning struggles. Most existing research relies on quantitative assessments of language performance without delving into the individual and environmental factors that contribute to success or failure. By addressing these gaps, this study aims to provide a more comprehensive understanding of English language achievement among non-English major students, particularly in under-resourced institutions.

#### **5. Institutional Context: Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna Lampang**

Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna Lampang (RMUTLL) provides English language instruction as part of its academic curriculum across all faculties. The General Education Program is one of the courses in the undergraduate curriculum structure, in which the Language and Communication group is a compulsory general education course that students must obtain, totaling 9 credits, consisting of English for Everyday Communication, Academic English, and English for Working Skills. In addition, the Exit Examination for Final Year Students are provided, which is an examination designed to assess students' English language proficiency prior to graduation. The objective is to ensure that students have sufficient English language skills for professional work and international communication. However, student performance in English varies significantly, with some students excelling while others struggle to meet proficiency standards. This variation suggests that multiple factors

contribute to English language achievement, including individual motivation, instructional methods, and environmental influences.

At RMUTL, non-English major students are required to take general English courses, but many do not receive extensive language training beyond these requirements. The curriculum emphasizes reading and writing skills, with less focus on developing oral communication and listening comprehension. Additionally, students come from diverse educational backgrounds, with varying levels of prior English exposure and proficiency. Some students may have attended schools with strong English programs, while others may have had minimal exposure to the language before entering university.

Given these differences, it is important to investigate the specific factors that influence students' English language achievement at RMUTL. By comparing high-achieving and low-achieving students, this study seeks to identify the key contributors to language learning success and the barriers that hinder proficiency development. The findings will provide valuable insights for curriculum developers, educators, and policymakers, helping them design more effective teaching and learning strategies to support students across different proficiency levels.

### **Research Objectives**

To systematically address these research questions, this study aims to:

1. Identify and analyze the key factors that influencing English language achievement among non-English major students in Thailand, focusing on learner-related, teacher-related, and environmental factors.
2. Compare the differences in influencing factors between high-achieving and low-achieving students, examining how these factors contribute to variations in English proficiency levels.

## Research Questions

The primary aim of this study is to identify and analyze the key factors influencing English language achievement among non-English major students at Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna, Thailand. Specifically, the study seeks to compare the experiences of high-achieving and low-achieving students to understand the distinct challenges each group faces in their English learning journey. The study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the key factors influence English language learning among non-English major students in Thailand?
2. How do these factors differ between high-achieving and low-achieving students?

## Significance of the study

This study provides valuable insights into the factors influencing English language achievement among non-English major students in Thailand. By examining learner-related, teacher-related, and environmental factors, the research offers a deeper understanding of the challenges students face and the elements that contribute to successful language learning. The findings are particularly beneficial to students, educators, academic institutions, policymakers, and future researchers.

For students, this study highlights common difficulties encountered in English language learning and offers recommendations on effective strategies to improve proficiency. By understanding the key success factors, students can adopt better learning techniques, increase their motivation, and enhance their overall academic performance. Educators can use these findings to refine their teaching methods by incorporating more communicative and interactive approaches that bridge the gap between theoretical instruction and practical language use. The study also emphasizes the importance of addressing students' individual needs and creating a more engaging learning environment.

Academic institutions can benefit from this research by improving curricula that integrate practical language skills alongside traditional grammar and reading instruction. Additionally, universities and language centers may use the findings to



design targeted support programs for students struggling with English proficiency. Policymakers can apply the study's insights to develop language education policies that strengthen English instruction in non-English major programs and address disparities between urban and rural educational institutions. Finally, future researchers can use this study as a foundation for further exploration into English language learning in Thailand, particularly concerning non-English major students. The study also identifies areas for future research, such as the long-term impact of instructional strategies or the role of technology in language acquisition. By addressing these key factors, the study contributes to improving English language education and ensuring that students are better equipped for academic success and career advancement in a globalized world.

### Definition of Terms

To ensure clarity and consistency in this study, key terms are defined as follows:

**English Language Achievement** refers to the level of proficiency in English attained by non-English major students at Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna Lampang as measured by academic performance in English courses by grading system as state in academic transcript: A =4.00, B+ =3.5, B=3, C+ =2.5, C=2, and D+ =1.5.

**High-Achieving Students** are non-English major students who demonstrate strong English language competence, consistently achieving high scores in English courses, excelling in reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills, and showing confidence and fluency in communication (students with grades B, B+, and A).

**Low-Achieving Students** are non-English major students who face difficulties in mastering English, scoring below average in English assessments, struggling with grammar, vocabulary, listening comprehension, and speaking fluency, and experiencing low confidence in using English in academic or real-world settings (students with grades C, C+, and D+).

**Learner Factors** mean individual characteristics that influence a student's ability to learn English, including motivation to learn the language, self-confidence, study habits, learning strategies, previous English exposure, and attitudes toward

English language learning. These factors impact how effectively students engage with their English coursework and improve their proficiency.

**Teacher Factors** mean elements related to English language instructors at Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna, including their teaching methodologies, level of English proficiency, experience in language instruction, ability to engage students in interactive learning, and the use of communicative teaching approaches. These factors influence students' motivation and overall success in learning English.

**Environmental Factors** are external conditions that affect English learning, including availability of learning resources (textbooks, language labs, online materials), classroom environment, peer support, opportunities to practice English outside the classroom, and access to native or fluent English speakers. These factors contribute to students' exposure to and engagement with the English language.

These definitions provide a clear framework for understanding the key concepts discussed in this research, ensuring that each term is contextually relevant to the study of English language achievement among non-English major students.

### Scope of the Study

This study was conducted at Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna (RMUTL), Lampang campus, in northern Thailand during the 2024 academic year. It focuses on English language achievement among final-year undergraduate students enrolled in non-English major programs. The population scope is confined to these undergraduates across three faculties; Business Administration and Liberal Arts, Science and Agricultural Technology, and Engineering; thereby excluding any English major or graduate-level students from the investigation.

The content scope encompasses the key factors influencing English language achievement in this context, grouped into three primary domains: Learner Factors, Teacher Factors, and Environmental Factors. Within these domains, the study specifically examines variables such as students' motivation and learning strategies (learner factors), teaching practices and instructional methods (teacher factors), and the learning environment and institutional resources (environmental factors). Furthermore, the study compares high-achieving and low-achieving student groups to identify distinct

challenges and success factors for each group in their English learning journey. Methodologically, a mixed-methods approach is employed: quantitative data were gathered through a structured questionnaire survey, and qualitative insights were obtained via semi-structured interviews. This comprehensive scope ensures that the research captures both broad trends and in-depth perspectives, providing valuable insights for curriculum developers, educators, and policymakers in designing effective strategies to enhance English language learning outcomes for similar student populations.

### **Chapter Conclusion**

This chapter provided an overview of the study, emphasizing the significance of English proficiency in a globalized world and its role in education and career development. It discussed the challenges faced by non-English major students in Thailand, particularly the gap between theoretical learning and practical language application and identified the need to investigate the factors influencing English language achievement. The research questions and objectives were presented, focusing on identifying key factors that contribute to English language proficiency and comparing the experiences of high- and low-achieving students.

Additionally, the chapter outlined the significance of the study, explaining how its findings benefit students, educators, academic institutions, policymakers, and future researchers. Key terms were defined to ensure clarity and consistency throughout the research. This chapter established the foundation for the study by highlighting the research gap and the rationale for conducting this investigation.

The next chapter, Chapter 2: Literature Review, will provide an in-depth discussion of existing research related to English language learning. It will explore theoretical frameworks, previous studies on learner, teacher, and environmental factors, and relevant research on English education in Thailand. By reviewing these studies, the next chapter will establish a strong foundation for the research methodology and support the analysis and discussion in later chapters.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

This chapter presents a comprehensive review of literature related to English language achievement. It explores key concepts, theoretical perspectives, and factors influencing language proficiency. The chapter begins with an overview of English language achievement, including its definition and significance, measurement methods, and challenges in the Thai context, government and institutional efforts and summary. It then examines theoretical perspectives, Krashen's Input Hypothesis, Gardner's Socio-Educational Model, Gardner's Socio-Educational Model, Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory and Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System and summary that inform language acquisition, followed by a discussion of the characteristics of high and low achievers, consist of high and low achieving learners and summary of characteristics. Additionally, it explores learner, teacher, and environmental factors and summary that shape English language proficiency. The chapter concludes with a synthesis of previous research to highlight research gaps relevant to this study.

#### **English Language Achievement**

English language achievement among undergraduate students is a critical area of study in the field of education. As English has become the predominant language of international communication, commerce, and academia, achieving proficiency in English is essential for students' academic success and future career opportunities. The ability to effectively communicate in English opens doors to a wealth of information, resources, and global networks, making it a valuable skill in today's interconnected world (Soland, 2019).

#### **1. Definition and Significance of English Language Achievement**

English language achievement refers to an individual's ability to effectively use English in academic, professional, and social settings (Habók & Magyar, 2022). It encompasses proficiency in the core language skills, such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing, along with grammatical accuracy and communicative competence.

In an increasingly globalized world, English serves as the primary medium for international business, higher education, and cross-cultural communication (Crystal, 2003). As a result, achieving proficiency in English is considered a crucial factor for academic success, career advancement, and participation in global discourse.

In non-English-speaking countries, including Thailand, English language achievement plays a pivotal role in educational and professional domains. University students are often required to demonstrate a certain level of English proficiency to access academic resources, complete coursework, and engage in research collaborations. Additionally, strong English skills are a key requirement in sectors such as tourism, trade, and technology, where communication with international stakeholders is essential (Kirkpatrick, 2012). However, despite its importance, many Thai students struggle with achieving communicative competence due to challenges such as limited exposure to English outside the classroom, an exam-oriented education system, and traditional teaching methods that emphasize memorization over practical language use (Baker, 2012). Addressing these challenges requires a comprehensive approach that integrates meaningful language exposure, interactive teaching strategies, and real-world application of English skills.

## **2. Measuring English Language Achievement**

English language achievement is commonly assessed through standardized proficiency tests and classroom-based evaluations, both of which provide insights into a learner's language competence across different skill areas. International assessments such as the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) evaluate students' academic English abilities, particularly in listening, reading, writing, and speaking. Additionally, the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) is widely recognized as a standard measure of English language skills in the business world (ETS Global, 2024). It assesses proficiency in listening, reading, speaking, and writing, which are essential for workplace communication. These tests are widely accepted by universities and employers worldwide as indicators of English proficiency. Similarly, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) classifies English ability into

six levels, from A1 (beginner) to C2 (proficient user), offering a standardized benchmark for language competence (Council of Europe, 2001).

In Thailand, The National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education in Thailand outlines the standards and learning outcomes expected from graduates, including proficiency in English (National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education in Thailand, 2006). This framework ensures consistency in educational quality and helps institutions develop programs that meet international standards. In addition, English proficiency is assessed through national examinations such as the Ordinary National Educational Test (O-NET) for secondary school students and the General Aptitude Test (GAT) for university admissions. These exams primarily emphasize reading comprehension and grammatical knowledge, often neglecting communicative skills such as speaking and listening (Baker, 2012). Moreover, In Thailand, the term "A-level" can also refer to the Applied Knowledge Level exams, which are part of the Thai University Central Admission System (TCAS) (The Planner Education, 2022). These exams are required for senior year high school students to enroll in universities in Thailand 3. This focus on written assessments has led to a gap between students' test performance and their ability to use English in real-world contexts.

In addition to standardized tests, classroom-based assessments play a crucial role in evaluating students' ongoing progress. Formative assessments, such as quizzes, presentations, and group discussions, provide continuous feedback and help track language development. Summative assessments, including final exams and written essays, measure overall achievement at the end of a learning period. In addition, In addition, the Exit Examination for Final Year Students are provided, which is an examination designed to assess students' English language proficiency prior to graduation at university level. However, in many Thai classrooms, assessments remain heavily exam-oriented, reinforcing rote memorization rather than enhancing communicative competence (Noom-ura, 2013). To bridge this gap, educational institutions must adopt more performance-based assessments, such as oral presentations, debates, and real-world language tasks, to ensure that students develop practical and applicable English skills.



### 3. English Achievement in the Thai Context

Despite continuous efforts to enhance English education in Thailand, the country lags behind its ASEAN counterparts in English proficiency (EF English Proficiency Index, 2021). This issue stems from curriculum design, traditional teaching methods, a lack of immersive exposure, and regional disparities in education (Kirkpatrick, 2012).

Historically, English instruction in Thailand has relied on rote memorization and the grammar-translation method, with students focusing on grammar rules, vocabulary lists, and written exams rather than developing communicative competence. This approach, while effective for test performance, does little to promote real-world language use, particularly in speaking and listening (Noom-ura, 2013). Consequently, Thai students often excel in reading comprehension and grammar-based assessments but struggle with practical communication skills, a gap that remains a major obstacle in professional and academic settings.

Adding to this challenge is Thailand's predominantly monolingual environment, where English is not widely used in daily interactions. Unlike countries such as Malaysia and Singapore, where English plays a significant role in business and media, Thai students have limited opportunities to use English outside the classroom (Baker, 2012). This lack of real-world exposure hinders fluency development and reinforces a passive approach to learning English, with students relying heavily on formal instruction rather than active engagement with the language.

Language anxiety is another key issue affecting English achievement. Many Thai students fear making mistakes in front of their peers, leading to avoidance behaviors in speaking activities and a reluctance to participate in class discussions (Horwitz et al., 1986). This issue is compounded by Thailand's exam-driven education system, which places a strong emphasis on correctness over fluency, discouraging students from taking risks in language production (Phothongsunan, 2019).

Furthermore, regional disparities continue to impact English learning outcomes. Urban schools, particularly in Bangkok and other major cities, benefit from better-trained teachers, modern teaching resources, and greater access to English-speaking environments. In contrast, rural schools often face a shortage of qualified English teachers, outdated curricula, and minimal exposure to native or proficient

English speakers (Hayes, 2010). These disparities contribute to significant variations in English proficiency across different regions of Thailand, with students in wealthier urban areas achieving higher levels of fluency compared to their rural counterparts.

The university level, English language achievement at the university level in Thailand is a critical area of study, given the increasing importance of English proficiency in global communication, academic success, and career opportunities. Research indicates that English proficiency among Thai university students varies significantly. A study by Rudd and Honkiss (2019) found a positive correlation between English language proficiency and academic performance among students at a private university in Bangkok. This suggests that higher English proficiency is associated with better academic outcomes. Several challenges affect English language achievement in Thai universities. These include limited exposure to English outside the classroom, traditional teaching methods that emphasize rote learning, and a lack of qualified English teachers. Additionally, socio-economic factors play a role, as students from higher socio-economic backgrounds tend to have better access to quality English education and resources (Waluyo & Panmei, 2021).

#### **4. Government and Institutional Efforts to Improve English Achievement**

In response to persistent challenges in English language education, the Thai government has introduced various initiatives to enhance English proficiency nationwide. One of the most significant reforms has been the promotion of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which shifts the focus from traditional grammar-based instruction to interactive, student-centered learning approaches (Rodsawang, 2017). Unlike conventional methods that emphasize rote memorization and translation, CLT prioritizes real-world language use through discussions, role-playing, and task-based learning. However, its implementation has been inconsistent, as many Thai teachers lack sufficient training in communicative teaching methodologies (Baker, 2012). This issue is particularly pronounced in rural schools, where teacher proficiency remains a significant barrier to effective English instruction. Without adequate support and training, educators often revert to traditional, teacher-centered methods, limiting students' opportunities to practice authentic communication.



To enhance students' exposure to authentic English, the Thai government has also launched programs such as "English for All", aimed at increasing the number of native English-speaking teachers in Thai schools. While this initiative has seen some success in urban areas, its impact in rural regions has been limited due to a shortage of qualified foreign teachers, logistical challenges in recruitment and retention, and a lack of sustainable funding (Hayes, 2010). Additionally, foreign teachers often face cultural and pedagogical challenges that make long-term integration into the Thai education system difficult. As a result, many students, particularly in rural areas, continue to learn English primarily from non-native speakers, which may limit their exposure to authentic pronunciation, fluency, and natural language use.

The integration of technology in English education has been another key focus, especially following the COVID-19 pandemic, which accelerated the adoption of online learning platforms, mobile applications, and virtual classrooms. E-learning tools, such as interactive language software, AI-driven tutoring systems, and mobile-assisted language learning (MALL), provide students with greater opportunities for independent study and real-world practice (Erarslan, 2021). However, despite the potential of these tools, several barriers have hindered their effectiveness, particularly in underprivileged areas. Digital inequality, inconsistent internet connectivity, and insufficient teacher training in digital pedagogy have made it difficult for many students, especially those in rural and low-income communities, to benefit from technology-enhanced learning (UNESCO, 2022). Addressing these disparities requires substantial investment in infrastructure, teacher training, and affordable digital resources to ensure equal access to technology-based education.

Additionally, some Thai schools have implemented bilingual education models, where subjects are taught in both Thai and English to enhance natural language acquisition. This approach has been particularly successful in private and international schools, where students benefit from greater language exposure, higher-quality instruction, and an immersive learning environment. However, bilingual education remains largely inaccessible to lower-income students, as public schools still lack the resources and policy framework to implement large-scale bilingual programs (Baker, 2015). Without system-wide support, bilingual education will continue to be a privilege

limited to wealthier students, further widening the gap between urban and rural English proficiency levels.

Despite these government and institutional efforts, several systemic barriers continue to impede progress in English education across Thailand. The misalignment of the curriculum remains a significant issue, as standardized tests continue to emphasize grammar and reading comprehension over communicative competence, leaving students ill-prepared for real-world English use. Additionally, insufficient teacher training, particularly in CLT and technology-enhanced learning, limits the effectiveness of modern pedagogical approaches. Socioeconomic disparities further exacerbate the issue, as students in wealthier areas have access to better resources, qualified instructors, and immersive English environments, while students in rural or underfunded schools struggle with outdated materials and limited exposure to native English speakers. Furthermore, Thailand's exam-driven education culture discourages fluency development, as students prioritize memorization and test performance over active engagement in speaking and listening practice.

To bridge these gaps, future reforms should prioritize curriculum restructuring to emphasize real-world language applications rather than rote memorization. Expanding professional development programs for teachers, equipping them with modern pedagogical skills and language proficiency, is essential to ensuring the successful implementation of CLT and technology-enhanced learning. Furthermore, increasing access to digital learning resources, particularly in underprivileged communities, will help reduce educational inequality and improve English language achievement across the country. Finally, developing immersive language environments, such as English-speaking clubs, study-abroad programs, and workplace internships, will provide students with authentic exposure to English, enabling them to develop both confidence and fluency in real-world settings.

At the university level, Governments around the world recognize the importance of English proficiency for academic and professional success. Various initiatives have been implemented to improve English language achievement at the university level. Governments often develop policies aimed at enhancing English language education. For example, the Thai Ministry of Education has implemented

policies to integrate English language learning into the national curriculum and to promote bilingual education (Waluyo & Panmei, 2021). Additionally, governments provide funding for programs and resources to support English language learning. This includes grants for universities to develop English language courses and training programs for teachers. In term of curriculum design, universities design curricula that emphasize English language proficiency. This includes offering specialized English courses and integrating English language learning into other subjects. For example, many institutions have introduced English for Specific Purposes (ESP) courses tailored to students' fields of study, such as business English or technical English (Martirosyan, Hwang & Wanjohi, 2015)

### **5. Summary of English language achievement**

In summary, English language achievement is essential for academic and professional success, yet Thai students face challenges due to traditional teaching methods, exam-focused assessments, and limited real-world exposure. While government initiatives like CLT, technology integration, and bilingual education aim to improve proficiency, inconsistent implementation and unequal access to resources hinder progress. Addressing these issues requires curriculum reforms, enhanced teacher training, and immersive learning opportunities. To better understand these challenges, the next section explores theoretical frameworks that explain how students acquire and develop English proficiency. Moreover, Governments worldwide recognize the importance of English proficiency for academic and professional success. They implement policies and provide funding to support English education. Universities also design specialized courses like English for Specific Purposes (ESP) tailored to students' fields of study.

### **Theoretical Perspectives on English Language Achievement**

Understanding English language achievement requires an exploration of various theoretical perspectives that explain how individuals acquire, process, and apply language skills. Several key theories provide insights into the cognitive, social, and motivational aspects of language learning. These theories help identify the factors influencing English achievement and offer frameworks for improving English education,

particularly for non-English major students in Thailand. The following section discusses four major theoretical models: Krashen's Input Hypothesis, Gardner's Socio-Educational Model, Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory, and Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System.

### **1. Krashen's Input Hypothesis**

One of the most well-known theories in second language acquisition is Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis, which emphasizes the role of comprehensible input in language learning. According to Krashen, language acquisition occurs when learners are exposed to input that is slightly beyond their current level of proficiency, referred to as  $i+1$ . This means that students should engage with English materials that are challenging yet understandable, as this stimulates learning without causing frustration. The theory suggests that passive exposure to language, such as listening to or reading English, can lead to acquisition without the need for explicit grammar instruction or formal learning.

Krashen's theory is based on five main hypotheses: (1) the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, (2) the Monitor Hypothesis, (3) the Natural Order Hypothesis, (4) the Input Hypothesis, and (5) the Affective Filter Hypothesis. The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis distinguishes between subconscious language acquisition (which occurs naturally, like how children learn their first language) and conscious learning (which is deliberate and involves formal instruction). The Monitor Hypothesis explains that learners use their acquired knowledge to produce language fluently, while their learned knowledge acts as a monitor or editor for accuracy. The Natural Order Hypothesis suggests that learners acquire language structures in a predictable sequence, meaning that certain grammar rules are naturally learned before others. The Input Hypothesis asserts that meaningful exposure to language is the key to acquisition, while the Affective Filter Hypothesis highlights the impact of emotions such as anxiety, motivation, and self-confidence on language learning.

In the context of English education in Thailand, Krashen's Input Hypothesis has significant implications. Traditional teacher-centered instruction in Thailand often relies on rote memorization, grammar drills, and translation exercises, which may not provide students with sufficient comprehensible input (Noom-ura, 2013). This lack of meaningful exposure limits students' ability to develop natural fluency in English. To

improve English language achievement, educators should integrate more interactive and immersive learning experiences, such as reading authentic English texts, engaging in discussions, watching English media, and participating in real-life communication scenarios. These strategies align with Krashen's recommendation that language learners should be exposed to rich, meaningful, and slightly challenging English content to facilitate acquisition.

## **2. Gardner's Socio-Educational Model**

Another influential theory in language learning is Gardner's (1985) Socio-Educational Model, which emphasizes the role of motivation and attitude in second language acquisition. Gardner argues that a learner's attitude toward the target language, culture, and learning process significantly affects their success in acquiring a new language. He distinguishes between two main types of motivation: instrumental motivation and integrative motivation.

Instrumental motivation refers to learning English for practical benefits, such as better job opportunities, higher academic achievement, or professional advancement. Many Thai students, for example, are driven by instrumental motivation because English proficiency is often a requirement for university entrance exams, job applications, and career growth (Kirkpatrick, 2012). In contrast, integrative motivation involves learning English to integrate into or connect with the culture of English-speaking communities. This type of motivation is often seen in students who have a strong personal interest in English media, culture, or travel.

Studies have shown that students with high integrative motivation tend to achieve greater English proficiency compared to those who are only instrumentally motivated (Gardner, 2007). However, in Thailand, integrative motivation is often low, as English is generally perceived as a school subject rather than a tool for real-world communication (Baker, 2012). Thai students rarely have opportunities to interact with native English speakers, and English is not widely used outside the classroom, making it difficult for students to develop a personal connection with the language.

To enhance English achievement in Thailand, it is crucial to increase students' motivation by making English learning more engaging and relevant. This can be done by incorporating real-life communication tasks, exposure to English-speaking

cultures, and interactive classroom activities that encourage students to use English in meaningful ways. Study abroad programs, international student exchanges, and collaboration with native speakers are also effective ways to raise integrative motivation and improve language proficiency.

### **3. Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory**

Vygotsky's (1978) Sociocultural Theory highlights the importance of social interaction and cultural context in language learning. According to Vygotsky, language is learned most effectively in collaborative environments, where students interact with more knowledgeable individuals, such as teachers, peers, or mentors. He introduced the concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which refers to the gap between what a learner can do independently and what they can achieve with guidance and support. When learners receive structured assistance, known as scaffolding, they can gradually develop independence in using the language.

The ZPD and scaffolding techniques are especially important for Thai learners, as many students struggle with confidence and fluency in English communication (Noom-ura, 2013). In many Thai classrooms, traditional teaching methods emphasize individual learning and memorization, with limited opportunities for peer collaboration or active engagement. As a result, students often lack the confidence to speak English in real-life situations.

To enhance English achievement, educators should incorporate collaborative learning strategies such as pair work, group discussions, peer mentoring, and project-based learning. By allowing students to interact, negotiate meaning, and support each other, they can develop stronger communication skills and greater confidence in using English.

### **4. Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System**

Dörnyei's (2009) L2 Motivational Self System expands on Gardner's motivation theory by emphasizing the role of self-identity and personal goals in language learning. He suggests that students' motivation to learn English is shaped by their vision of themselves as successful English speakers. The model consists of three components: the Ideal L2 Self, the Ought-to L2 Self, and the L2 Learning Experience. The Ideal L2 Self represents a learner's aspiration to become a proficient



English speaker, such as imagining oneself giving a presentation in English at an international conference. The Ought-to L2 Self refers to external expectations and obligations that push students to learn English, such as the need for English proficiency to meet academic or career requirements. Lastly, the L2 Learning Experience encompasses the immediate classroom environment, including teaching methods, curriculum design, and peer influences, all which shape students' motivation.

In the Thai context, many students struggle with developing a clear vision of their Ideal L2 Self, as they often perceive English as merely an academic requirement rather than a skill relevant to their future aspirations (Baker, 2012). This lack of personal connection to the language may result in low motivation and disengagement from English learning. To enhance motivation and improve English achievement, educators should help students develop a strong Ideal L2 Self by encouraging them to visualize real-world applications of their English skills. This can be achieved through goal setting, exposure to English-speaking role models, and creating meaningful learning experiences that connect English proficiency to students' career and personal aspirations.

### **5. Summary of Theoretical Perspectives**

The discussed theories provide complementary insights into English language achievement, each highlighting a unique factor that contributes to language acquisition. As summarized in Table 1, Krashen's Input Hypothesis emphasizes the importance of comprehensible input ( $i+1$ ), suggesting that students need to be exposed to slightly more advanced language in meaningful contexts to acquire proficiency. This highlights the need for increased real-life English exposure in the Thai educational system, where many students lack authentic opportunities to use English beyond the classroom.

Gardner's Socio-Educational Model focuses on motivation and attitudes, distinguishing between instrumental motivation (learning English for practical benefits such as career advancement) and integrative motivation (learning English to engage with native speakers and culture). In Thailand, many students approach English as merely an academic requirement rather than a means of communication, which limits their engagement with the language. This theory suggests that promoting integrative

motivation, through cultural exposure, exchange programs, and interactive learning, could improve students' overall English proficiency.

Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory highlights the importance of social interaction and scaffolding in language learning. According to this theory, learners progress best when supported by more knowledgeable individuals, such as teachers and peers, within their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). This suggests that Thai educators should implement more student-centered, communicative activities, such as group discussions and peer-assisted learning, rather than relying solely on teacher-centered instruction.

Finally, Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System proposes that learners' future self-concept plays a crucial role in their motivation to learn English. Students who can visualize themselves as proficient English speakers are more likely to engage actively in language learning. However, many Thai students struggle to see English as directly relevant to their personal and professional aspirations. This theory suggests that helping students set clear, personalized goals and providing real-world applications for English, such as exposure to international job markets and study-abroad opportunities, can significantly enhance motivation and achievement.

As seen in Table 1, each of these theories presents valuable perspectives on English language learning and provides practical recommendations for improving English education in Thailand. By integrating meaningful language exposure, motivation-building strategies, collaborative learning, and goal-setting practices, educators can create a more effective learning environment that raises higher English achievement among students.



Table 1 Summary of Theoretical Perspectives on English Language Achievement

Theory	Key Concept	Main Focus	Implications for Thai Learners
<b>Krashen's Input Hypothesis</b>	Comprehensible input(i+1) enables acquisition	Language exposure & meaningful input	Increase real-life English exposure
<b>Gardner's Socio-Educational Model</b>	Motivation (instrumental/ integrative) affects learning	Attitude and motivation	Enhance integrative motivation through cultural engagement
<b>Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory</b>	Social interaction and scaffolding aid learning	Collaborative and peer-assisted learning	Implement more student-centered, communicative activities
<b>Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System</b>	Future self-concept influences motivation	Goal setting and identity in language learning	Help students visualize real-world English applications

### Characteristics of High and Low-English Achievers

Language learners exhibit different levels of proficiency based on their cognitive abilities, motivation, learning strategies, and environmental influences. Understanding the distinctions between high- and low-achieving learners can provide valuable insights for educators and policymakers to enhance English language instruction. High-achieving students tend to display strong motivation, confidence, and active engagement in learning, whereas low-achieving students often struggle with a lack of motivation, language anxiety, and ineffective learning strategies. These differences influence their overall language proficiency and ability to apply English in academic, professional, and social contexts.

### 1. High-Achieving English Language Learners

High-achieving English learners demonstrate both intrinsic and instrumental motivation, which drives them to master the language for personal and professional development. These learners recognize the importance of English as a global language and its role in higher education, career advancement, and international communication. Their motivation is often reinforced by long-term goals, such as studying abroad, securing jobs in multinational companies, or engaging in global networking. Unlike their lower-achieving counterparts, they view English not merely as a subject to pass but as a tool for future success (Soland, 2019; Shi, 2018).

In addition to strong motivation, high achievers employ effective learning strategies that contribute to their proficiency. They engage in metacognitive strategies, such as goal setting, self-monitoring, and adjusting study techniques based on their progress. Cognitive strategies, such as reading extensively in English, watching English-language films, and actively listening to native speakers, help them develop comprehension skills. They also take advantage of social strategies by interacting with peers, participating in group discussions, and seeking opportunities for language immersion. These varied approaches allow them to reinforce their learning through multiple channels, leading to greater fluency and confidence (Shi, 2018).

Another defining characteristic of high-achieving learners is their high self-efficacy and willingness to take risks in language learning. They believe in their ability to succeed, which enables them to engage in challenging tasks such as public speaking, debates, and essay writing. Their confidence allows them to approach English learning with a growth mindset, where mistakes are seen as opportunities for improvement rather than failures. Moreover, these students actively seek real-world language exposure by participating in language exchange programs, international conferences, and digital learning platforms. Their proactive approach helps them develop fluency and adaptability in diverse linguistic environments (Soland, 2019; Shi, 2018).

Furthermore, high achievers experience lower levels of language anxiety, which enables them to use English more comfortably in both formal and informal settings. They are more likely to engage in spontaneous conversations, ask questions, and seek clarification, which further strengthens their communication skills. Their positive

attitude toward English learning makes them resilient in overcoming language barriers, as they view challenges as part of the learning process. Through consistent practice, strategic learning, and high motivation, high achievers attain strong language proficiency that enhances their academic and professional opportunities (Soland, 2019; Shi, 2018; *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2022).

## **2. Low-Achieving English Language Learners**

In contrast, low-achieving English learners often struggle with a lack of motivation, which significantly affects their engagement and progress. Many of these students perceive English as a difficult or irrelevant subject, leading to minimal effort and disinterest in learning activities. Unlike high-achievers who set clear goals for language acquisition, low-achievers may lack a long-term vision of how English can benefit them. This absence of motivation results in passive participation, where students complete assignments and attend classes out of obligation rather than a genuine desire to improve (Yuksel, et al., 2023).

One of the major challenges faced by low achievers is their reliance on ineffective learning strategies. Many of these students adopt rote memorization techniques, focusing on repetitive grammar exercises and vocabulary lists without developing a deep understanding of language use. Their limited engagement in active learning methods, such as listening to English media or practicing speaking skills, prevents them from acquiring practical communication abilities. Furthermore, low achievers often lack self-regulated learning strategies, such as time management and self-assessment, making it difficult for them to track progress or identify areas for improvement (Yuksel, et al., 2023).

Another significant barrier to English proficiency among low achievers is language anxiety. Many of these students experience fear or embarrassment when speaking in English, leading them to avoid classroom participation and real-world language use. This anxiety is often exacerbated by negative past experiences, such as being corrected harshly in front of peers or receiving poor grades in language courses. The fear of making mistakes discourages them from practicing speaking and listening skills, which further hinders their language development. Over time, this avoidance

behavior creates a cycle of low confidence and poor performance, making it increasingly difficult for these learners to improve (Yuksel et al., 2023).

Additionally, low achievers tend to have limited exposure to English outside the classroom. Unlike high-achievers who seek out English-language media and immersive experiences, low-achievers often confine their learning to formal education settings. Their reluctance to engage with English beyond academic requirements restricts their ability to develop fluency and adaptability in different contexts. Without consistent exposure to authentic language use, their progress remains slow, and they struggle to apply English effectively in real-world situations (Teng, 2022; Yuksel, et al., 2023).

### 3. Summary of Characteristics of High and Low-English Language Achievers

The differences between high- and low-achieving English language learners are influenced by several key factors, including motivation, learning strategies, self-efficacy, and exposure to English (Soland, 2019 & Hanus,2016). High achievers demonstrate strong intrinsic and instrumental motivation, employ effective learning strategies, and actively engage in language use beyond the classroom. In contrast, low achievers often struggle with motivation, experience language anxiety, and rely on ineffective learning methods, which hinder their progress. Table 2 summarizes the key distinctions between high- and low-achieving English learners, highlighting their respective strengths and challenges.

**Table 2 Comparison of High and Low-English Language Achievers**

Factors	High-Achieving Learners	Low-Achieving Learners
<b>Motivation</b>	Strong intrinsic and instrumental motivation; clear goals	Lack of motivation; view English as difficult or irrelevant
<b>Learning Strategies</b>	Use of metacognitive (goal setting, self-monitoring) and cognitive (reading, listening, practicing) strategies	Rely on rote memorization and passive learning methods

Table 2 (Cont.)

Factors	High-Achieving Learners	Low-Achieving Learners
<b>Self-Efficacy</b>	High confidence in language ability; willingness to take risks	Low self-efficacy; fear of making mistakes and avoidance behaviors
<b>Language Anxiety</b>	Low anxiety; actively participate in speaking and listening activities	High anxiety; avoid speaking due to fear of embarrassment
<b>Social Engagement</b>	Engage in discussions, peer learning, and real-world language practice	Limited interaction with English speakers outside the classroom
<b>Exposure to English</b>	Actively seek English media, travel, and immersive experiences	Confine learning to classroom settings; minimal exposure to English outside school

The table highlights how motivation, learning strategies, and exposure to English play a crucial role in determining students' success in language acquisition. High-achievers benefit from goal-oriented learning and proactive engagement, while low-achievers often require additional support to build confidence, motivation, and effective study habits (Griffiths, 2003; Hanus, 2023; Soland, 2019).

By understanding these characteristics, educators can develop targeted interventions to support low-achieving students while enhancing the strengths of high-achieving learners. Strategies such as communicative language teaching (CLT), goal-setting exercises, and increased exposure to English in real-life contexts can help bridge the gap between these two groups. The next section will explore the various learner, teacher, and environmental factors that further influence English language achievement (Griffiths, 2003; Hanus, 2023).

## Factors Influencing English Language Achievement

English language achievement is shaped by a complex interplay of individual, instructional, and environmental factors. Learner characteristics, teacher influence, and external environmental conditions all contribute to students' success or struggle in mastering the language. Understanding these factors is crucial for developing targeted teaching strategies and policies that enhance language learning outcomes.

### 1. Learner Factors

Learner-related factors significantly impact English language achievement. At the university level include cognitive abilities, motivation, learning styles, and self-efficacy, all of which determine a student's ability to acquire and apply English effectively. Prior exposure to English and strategic learning methods also plays crucial roles. Additionally, access to diverse learning resources and peer support significantly enhance language proficiency. Addressing these factors can help educators develop effective strategies to support students' English language learning.

#### 1.1 Cognitive Abilities

Cognitive abilities refer to the mental processes involved in learning, such as memory, attention, problem-solving, and information processing speed. Research has shown that learners with strong memory retention can better acquire and recall vocabulary, grammatical structures, and pronunciation patterns (Robinson, 2011). Short-term and long-term memory play distinct roles in language acquisition; short-term memory helps in processing new information, while long-term memory stores and retrieves language structures for effective communication. Additionally, students with higher cognitive flexibility; the ability to switch between different linguistic structures and contexts, tend to excel in English learning, as they can quickly adapt to new vocabulary, sentence structures, and cultural expressions.

Conversely, students with cognitive limitations may struggle with comprehending complex grammatical rules, retaining large amounts of vocabulary, or processing spoken language at natural speeds. To support such learners, instructional strategies such as repetition, chunking information, and using mnemonic devices can help reinforce retention and retrieval of language structures (Ellis, 2008).

## 1.2 Motivation and Attitude

Motivation is one of the most critical factors influencing English language achievement. Gardner (1985) categorized motivation into two types: instrumental motivation, where students learn English for practical purposes such as job opportunities or academic success, and integrative motivation, where learners desire to integrate into an English-speaking culture. Research suggests that students with high integrative motivation tend to perform better in language acquisition, as they develop a deeper interest in mastering English beyond its academic or career benefits (Dörnyei, 2009).

In the Thai context, many students exhibit strong instrumental motivation due to the growing importance of English in securing employment, particularly in industries such as tourism, business, and technology. However, a lack of integrative motivation often results in lower engagement in authentic language use, as English is frequently perceived as a subject rather than a practical communication tool (Baker, 2012). Educators can enhance greater motivation by incorporating real-world applications, such as project-based learning, role-playing activities, and exposure to English-speaking cultures through media and interactions with native speakers.

## 1.3 Learning Styles and Strategies

Learning styles refer to the preferred ways in which individuals process and retain new information. According to Oxford (2003), learners can be categorized into visual, auditory, kinesthetic, and reading/writing learners. Visual learners benefit from diagrams, charts, and videos, while auditory learners absorb information best through listening to lectures, music, or spoken dialogues. Kinesthetic learners prefer hands-on activities and real-world applications, while reading/writing learners excel in text-based materials such as books and written exercises.

In addition to learning styles, the strategies that students use to acquire language significantly affect their achievement. High-achieving students often employ metacognitive strategies, such as goal setting, self-monitoring, and adjusting their learning approaches based on feedback. Cognitive strategies, such as summarization, translation, and note-taking, help in understanding and retaining new language structures. Social strategies, including group discussions and peer interactions,



promote active language use and improve fluency. Conversely, low-achieving students tend to rely on passive learning techniques such as rote memorization, which may help with short-term retention but fail to develop deep language competence (Weinstein & Mayer, 1986).

#### 1.4 Self-Efficacy and Language Anxiety

Self-efficacy, or the belief in one's ability to succeed, significantly impacts English learning outcomes. According to Bandura (1997), students with high self-efficacy are more likely to take risks, engage in speaking activities, and persist through challenges. These learners are confident in their ability to understand and use English effectively, which enhances their achievement.

On the other hand, language anxiety; the fear of making mistakes or being judged, is a major barrier to language acquisition (Horwitz et al., 1986). Students with high levels of anxiety tend to avoid speaking, hesitate to participate in class, and struggle with listening comprehension. Anxiety is often linked to negative past experiences, strict evaluation systems, or a lack of supportive learning environments. To reduce language anxiety, teachers can create a low-stress classroom atmosphere, use communicative activities, and encourage error correction in a non-threatening manner.

In summary, learner factors significantly influence English language achievement. Strong cognitive abilities enhance language retention and processing, while motivation, whether instrumental or integrative, drives engagement and learning success. Effective learning strategies, such as goal-setting and active practice, further support proficiency, whereas reliance on rote memorization hinders progress. Additionally, high self-efficacy raises confidence in using English, while language anxiety can lead to avoidance and reduced participation. Addressing these factors through targeted instructional approaches can help learners develop stronger language skills and improve overall achievement.

## 2. Teacher Factors

Teachers play a pivotal role in shaping students' English language achievement at university level. Their teaching strategies, classroom management, proficiency, and ability to promote student motivation significantly influence how



well students develop language skills. Effective language teaching through interactive and communicative approaches goes beyond delivering content; it requires engagement, support, and adaptation to students' needs. Research suggests that students who are taught by motivated, well-trained, and proficient English teachers tend to have higher levels of fluency and confidence, while those exposed to ineffective teaching methods often struggle with long-term language retention (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

In Thailand, teacher-related challenges remain a major obstacle to improving English proficiency nationwide. Many schools, particularly in rural areas, lack qualified English teachers, leading to a reliance on outdated teaching methodologies that emphasize rote learning rather than communication (Baker, 2012). Additionally, the teacher-student relationship and instructors' own proficiency levels play a crucial role in determining students' engagement and success in language learning. This section examines three key teacher-related factors that impact English achievement: teaching strategies, teacher-student relationships, and teacher proficiency.

### 2.1 Teaching Strategies and Pedagogical Approaches

The effectiveness of English instruction largely depends on the teaching strategies and methodologies employed in the classroom. Pedagogical approaches that emphasize communication, interaction, and student-centered learning have been shown to be more effective than traditional lecture-based methods. In contrast, outdated, teacher-centered techniques, such as the grammar-translation method, continue to dominate English classrooms in Thailand, limiting students' ability to use English in real-world situations.

Among the most effective language teaching approaches, CLT focuses on real-world communication through interactive activities, role-plays, and group discussions. Instead of emphasizing grammar rules in isolation, CLT encourages students to practice English in authentic contexts, improving fluency and confidence. Research suggests that this approach raises greater student engagement and helps learners develop practical language skills needed for everyday interactions. Similarly, Task-Based Learning (TBL) shifts the focus from theoretical learning to real-world application by requiring students to complete meaningful tasks using English. Examples

include problem-solving exercises, presentations, and collaborative projects, all of which encourage active learning, improve critical thinking skills, and enhance language retention. Another innovative approach, the Flipped Classroom Method, allows students to engage with learning materials before class, such as watching instructional videos or reading texts, while class time is used for discussions and hands-on practice. This model personalizes learning, enabling teachers to focus on individual students' needs and maximize in-class engagement.

Despite the effectiveness of CLT, TBL, and the flipped classroom approach, many Thai schools continue to rely on traditional, teacher-centered methods. The grammar-translation method, which emphasizes memorization of vocabulary and direct translation between Thai and English, remains widely used. While this method may help students understand grammatical rules, it fails to develop speaking and listening proficiency, resulting in low communicative competence among Thai learners. To enhance English achievement, educators should integrate modern teaching strategies, promote interactive learning, and move away from rigid, exam-oriented instruction.

## 2.2 Teacher-Student Relationships

A strong teacher-student relationship plays a crucial role in shaping students' motivation, confidence, and overall engagement in language learning. When students feel comfortable interacting with their teachers, they are more likely to participate in class, ask questions, and take risks in using English. Supportive teachers create a learning environment where students feel valued and encouraged, which enhances their willingness to communicate in English, even when making mistakes (Dörnyei, 2001). Teachers who provide positive reinforcement, constructive feedback, and individualized attention help reduce students' fear of failure, promoting a growth mindset that leads to better language acquisition outcomes (Pianta, et al., 2012).

On the other hand, a rigid, exam-oriented teaching style that emphasizes correctness over fluency can heighten student anxiety and discourage them from using English beyond structured exercises (Horwitz, et al., 1986). Students in such environments often hesitate to speak due to fear of making mistakes, which hampers their ability to develop communicative competence. A lack of interaction between

teachers and students can further limit engagement, making the learning process passive and ineffective. Encouraging open communication, collaborative activities, and student-centered learning approaches can promote a more engaging classroom atmosphere that supports language acquisition. Teachers who act as mentors and facilitators rather than strict evaluators help build students' confidence and motivation, ultimately improving their overall English proficiency (Mercer & Ryan, 2010).

### 2.3 Teacher Proficiency and Training

Teachers' own English proficiency and pedagogical training significantly influence students' success in language learning. Teachers who demonstrate fluency and confidence in English serve as role models, providing students with accurate pronunciation, natural language use, and meaningful communication practice (Farrell & Richards, 2007). Well-trained teachers are also better equipped to implement effective instructional methods, adapt to students' learning needs, and create engaging lesson plans that go beyond rote memorization. However, in Thailand, research indicates that many English teachers, particularly in rural areas, lack the necessary fluency and teaching expertise to effectively model correct language use (Baker, 2012). This gap in teacher proficiency often results in lessons that prioritize textbook exercises and grammar drills over interactive, real-world language use (Hayes, 2010).

To address this issue, continuous professional development programs are essential. Language immersion training, modern teaching workshops, and exposure to native English-speaking environments can help educators improve their fluency and instructional effectiveness (Richards & Farrell, 2005). Additionally, training in innovative teaching methodologies, such as CLT and TBL, can empower teachers to move away from traditional, teacher-centered approaches toward more student-centered, interactive language instruction (Littlewood, 2007). Government and institutional support in the form of training scholarships, online teaching resources, and peer mentorship programs can further enhance teachers' professional growth. Ensuring that English educators receive adequate training and language support is crucial in bridging the proficiency gap and improving students' overall English achievement.

To sum up, teachers play a crucial role in students' English language achievement through their instructional methods, classroom interactions, and overall

proficiency. Effective teaching strategies, such as communicative and interactive approaches, help students develop language skills in meaningful contexts, while a positive teacher-student relationship enhances motivation, reduces anxiety, and encourages active participation. However, many English teachers, especially in rural areas, lack the necessary fluency and pedagogical training to implement modern teaching techniques, often relying on outdated, exam-focused instruction. Addressing these challenges requires continuous professional development, improved teacher training programs, and institutional support to enhance English instruction and improve student learning outcomes.

### **3. Environmental Factors**

Beyond individual learner differences and teacher-related influences, external environmental conditions play a crucial role in determining students' English language achievement at the university level. Factors such as access to learning resources, exposure to English outside the classroom, and socio-economic background significantly impact students' ability to acquire and apply English proficiency. A positive classroom environment, peer support, and opportunities to practice English outside the classroom are crucial. These factors often determine whether students have sufficient opportunities to practice and reinforce their language skills beyond formal instruction.

#### **3.1 Access to English Learning Resources**

The availability and quality of English learning resources are fundamental to language acquisition. Access to well-developed textbooks, online language platforms, and language-learning applications provide students with additional exposure to the language and opportunities for independent learning. Digital learning tools such as Duolingo, BBC Learning English, Rosetta Stone, and interactive multimedia resources help students practice pronunciation, vocabulary, and listening comprehension in an engaging and interactive manner (Liang, et al., 2024). Furthermore, educational websites and mobile applications allow students to engage in self-directed learning at their own pace, reinforcing classroom instruction and offering personalized feedback.

However, disparities in access to resources create significant challenges for students from underprivileged backgrounds. In rural or economically disadvantaged

areas, schools may lack modern English textbooks, functional language labs, or reliable internet connectivity, limiting students' ability to supplement their learning outside of class (Baker, 2012). Without adequate access to these materials, students are often restricted to outdated teaching methods that emphasize rote memorization rather than interactive and communicative learning. This gap in resources contributes to the urban-rural divide in English proficiency, where students in well-funded schools tend to achieve higher levels of fluency compared to those in resource-constrained environments.

Additionally, library access and availability of supplementary reading materials also play a critical role in language development. Research suggests that students who frequently engage with English books, magazines, and newspapers develop better reading comprehension skills and a broader vocabulary compared to those who rely solely on classroom instruction (Nation, 2009). Schools and universities should therefore prioritize investment in well-equipped libraries and digital language-learning platforms to ensure that all students, regardless of socio-economic background, have access to high-quality language resources.

### 3.2 Exposure to English in Real-World Contexts

Beyond classroom instruction, students' ability to use English in real-world situations is a major determinant of fluency. Authentic exposure—engaging with native speakers, consuming English media, and using the language in everyday interactions—plays a crucial role in enhancing listening comprehension, vocabulary retention, and speaking confidence (Krashen, 1985). Countries with higher levels of English proficiency tend to have immersive environments where English is used in public spaces, entertainment, and professional settings.

For many Thai students, real-world English exposure is limited, leading to difficulties in applying learned language structures to practical communication. Unlike countries where English is commonly spoken in daily interactions, Thailand has a predominantly monolingual environment, with Thai being the dominant language in education, media, and public services. As a result, students often struggle with oral communication skills, as they have fewer opportunities to practice speaking and listening outside the classroom (Noom-ura, 2013).

However, technology and globalization have expanded opportunities for language immersion. Students can enhance their English proficiency by engaging in movies, podcasts, video games, and social media content in English. Platforms such as YouTube, Netflix, Spotify, and TikTok expose learners to diverse accents, slang, and conversational English. Additionally, participation in international forums, online courses, and virtual language exchange programs enables students to interact with English speakers worldwide. Schools and universities should encourage students to participate in study abroad programs, English-speaking clubs, and exchange partnerships to provide more authentic exposure to the language.

A key challenge in Thailand is the perception of English as an academic subject rather than a communication tool (Kirkpatrick, 2012). Many students focus solely on passing English exams rather than developing speaking and listening fluency. This issue is compounded by teacher-centered instruction, where students engage in grammar translation rather than interactive discussions. To bridge this gap, educators should incorporate CLT into curricula, emphasizing role-playing, debates, and practical conversations. Tourism, hospitality, and business sectors in Thailand also offer opportunities for students to use English in real-world settings, highlighting the importance of workplace-based language programs.

### 3.3 Socio-Economic Status and Family Support

Socio-economic background plays a crucial role in students' access to education, quality of instruction, and overall language achievement. Research indicates that students from higher socio-economic backgrounds tend to outperform their lower-income peers in English proficiency due to better educational resources, financial support, and parental involvement (Adams, 1996).

Higher-income families can afford private English tutoring, international school education, and study-abroad experiences, all of which provide immersive language exposure. Parents with strong English proficiency are also more likely to support their children's learning by practicing English at home, providing English-language books, and encouraging engagement with English media (El-Omari, 2022). These factors create an environment where students view English as an essential skill and receive reinforcement beyond formal schooling.



In contrast, students from lower-income backgrounds may face limited access to quality instruction, lack of technological resources, and fewer opportunities for extracurricular English practice. Public schools in underprivileged areas often struggle with overcrowded classrooms, outdated curricula, and a shortage of trained English teachers, making it difficult for students to develop proficiency. Additionally, families where parents do not speak English may provide little reinforcement at home, reducing students' exposure to the language outside school.

To bridge this socio-economic gap, government initiatives and educational reforms are necessary. Scholarship programs, free language workshops, and community-based English activities can help underprivileged students gain access to better learning opportunities. The One Tablet Per Child initiative in Thailand, for instance, aimed to provide students with digital devices for online learning, though its impact has been mixed due to implementation challenges (Office of the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education, 2015). Universities and private organizations can also support English education through mentorship programs, language immersion camps, and partnerships with international institutions.

Another key factor is parental involvement. Studies show that students whose parents actively support their education tend to perform better in English proficiency tests (Small, 2010). Even in non-English-speaking households, parents can encourage children by reading English books together, watching English-language movies, or providing positive reinforcement for language learning efforts. Schools should engage parents through workshops, newsletters, and bilingual resources to create a more supportive home learning environment.

To summarize, environmental factors play a crucial role in shaping students' English language achievement by influencing their access to learning resources, exposure to English outside the classroom, and socio-economic background. Students with greater access to digital tools, textbooks, and well-equipped libraries tend to develop stronger language skills, while those in resource-limited settings face challenges in acquiring proficiency. Real-world exposure to English, whether through travel, media, or social interactions, enhances fluency and confidence, but many Thai students lack such opportunities due to the country's predominantly monolingual environment.



Socio-economic disparities further impact learning outcomes, as students from wealthier backgrounds benefit from private tutoring and immersive experiences, while those from lower-income families struggle with limited educational support. Addressing these inequalities requires investment in digital learning tools, community programs, and policies that provide all students with equitable access to quality English education.

#### **4. Summary of Factors Influencing English Language Achievement**

English language achievement is shaped by the interplay of learner, teacher, and environmental factors, each of which significantly contributes to students' ability to develop and apply English proficiency. These factors influence not only students' motivation and learning strategies but also their overall success in real-world language use.

Learner factors, such as cognitive abilities, motivation, learning styles, and self-efficacy, play a fundamental role in English language acquisition. Students with strong cognitive skills, including memory retention and problem-solving abilities, often excel in learning English, while those who experience language anxiety or lack motivation struggle to engage with the subject. Motivated learners tend to take an active approach, using diverse learning strategies and seeking real-world applications of English.

Teacher factors, including pedagogical approaches, teacher-student relationships, and teacher proficiency, directly impact student engagement and achievement. Communicative and interactive teaching methods, such as CLT and Task-TBL, have been shown to enhance student participation and fluency. Teachers who promote positive relationships with students and provide constructive feedback create a supportive classroom environment, boosting students' confidence in using English. However, in Thailand, many teachers still rely on grammar-translation methods, limiting students' ability to develop communicative competence. Furthermore, teacher proficiency in English remains a concern, particularly in rural areas where access to professional development is limited.

Environmental factors, such as access to learning resources, exposure to English in real-world contexts, and socio-economic background, also play a crucial role in language achievement. Students with access to digital learning tools, English-

language media, and opportunities for real-life communication are more likely to develop fluency and confidence. However, socio-economic disparities create unequal learning opportunities, with students from well-resourced backgrounds benefiting from private tutoring, study-abroad programs, and English-rich environments, while those in rural or underprivileged communities face significant limitations.

These factors do not operate independently but rather interact dynamically to shape students' English learning experiences. A motivated learner may struggle in a low-resource environment, just as a skilled teacher may be limited by outdated curricula or large class sizes. Addressing these challenges requires a holistic approach, integrating policy reforms, teacher training, investment in digital resources, and community engagement to enhance English education at all levels. Table 3 below summarizes the key factors influencing English language achievement and their impact:

**Table 3 Summary of Factors Influencing English Language Achievement**

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Key Components</b>	<b>Impact on English Achievement</b>
<b>Learner Factors</b>	Cognitive abilities, motivation, learning styles, self-efficacy	Strong cognitive skills and motivation improve learning, while anxiety and lack of engagement hinder progress.
<b>Teacher Factors</b>	Teaching strategies, teacher-student relationships, teacher proficiency	Student-centered teaching methods and supportive teachers enhance engagement; poor teacher proficiency limits learning.
<b>Environmental Factors</b>	Access to learning resources, real-world English exposure, socio-economic status	Greater access to resources and English-rich environments improves proficiency; socio-economic disparities affect learning opportunities.

### **Previous Studies Related to Factors Influencing English Language Achievement**

English language proficiency is a crucial determinant of academic and professional success in Thailand, as it plays a key role in employment opportunities, socio-economic mobility, and participation in global knowledge exchange (Graddol, 2006; Kirkpatrick, 2012). Despite the Thai government's efforts to integrate English into the national curriculum from primary to higher education, students' overall English achievement remains low, particularly in speaking and listening skills (Foley, 2005; Noom-ura, 2013). The persistent gap between policy objectives and actual learning outcomes is influenced by various factors, including learner characteristics, instructional methodologies, and environmental conditions.

Motivation and self-regulated learning strategies significantly impact English language achievement. Research suggests that high achievers tend to exhibit both intrinsic motivation, where they find learning English enjoyable and intellectually stimulating, and instrumental motivation, where they recognize its practical benefits for academic and career success (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Dörnyei, 2009). These learners often employ metacognitive strategies such as goal setting, time management, and active engagement with English media to enhance their learning (Oxford, 2003; Milton, 2009). Additionally, self-efficacy; the belief in one's ability to succeed, has been found to correlate strongly with language achievement, as confident students are more likely to persevere through challenges and actively participate in learning activities (Bandura, 1997; Gardner, 1985). In contrast, low achievers often lack both intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy, perceiving English as irrelevant to their personal goals, which results in minimal engagement and reliance on passive learning techniques such as rote memorization (Swatevacharkul & Boonma, 2020). Language anxiety is another major barrier, as fear of making mistakes and negative past experiences often discourage students from actively using English, especially in oral communication (Horwitz, et al., 1986; Choomthong, 2014). In previous example studies, El-Omari (2016) stated Factors Affecting Students' Achievement in English Language Learning. This study used quantitative surveys, distributing yes/no questionnaires to high school students in Jordan to measure the impact of factors such as social attitudes, socioeconomic status, and extracurricular activities. The

findings revealed significant correlations between these factors and students' English language learning success. Students with positive attitudes towards learning English and strong family support tend to achieve higher levels of success.

Teacher-related factors also play a crucial role in English language achievement. Effective English teachers are characterized by their language proficiency, pedagogical knowledge, and ability to create an engaging learning environment (Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Nation, 2009). However, in Thailand, particularly in rural areas, many English teachers lack the necessary fluency and training to effectively model correct language use (Baker, 2012). This limitation contributes to students' poor speaking and listening skills, as they are often exposed to inaccurate pronunciation and rigid, exam-oriented teaching approaches. Traditional teacher-centered methodologies, such as the grammar-translation method, remain dominant in Thai classrooms, focusing on grammatical rules and translation rather than interactive and communicative competence (Noom-ura, 2013). Research has shown that more student-centered approaches, such as CLT and TBL, enhance language proficiency by encouraging meaningful language use and real-world application of skills (Ellis, 2003; Rodsawang, 2017). However, the successful implementation of these methodologies requires well-trained teachers, which remains a challenge in Thailand due to limited access to professional development programs and ongoing reliance on outdated instructional practices.). In previous example studies, Hanus (2016) explained Factors That Influence Learning by English Language Learners (ELLs). This study employed qualitative analysis, including interviews with teachers and parents, as well as classroom observations to gather data on factors influencing English language learning success. The research found that teacher-student relationships, parental support, and socioeconomic status significantly impact English language learning success. The result found that teachers who foster positive relationships and tailor their teaching methods to students' needs contribute to higher achievement levels.

Environmental factors, including access to learning resources and socio-economic background, also significantly influence English language achievement. Students from higher socio-economic backgrounds often have access to private English tutoring, international school education, and English-speaking environments, all of

which contribute to higher proficiency levels (El-Omari, 2022; Adams, 1996). In contrast, students from lower-income backgrounds face challenges such as overcrowded classrooms, outdated textbooks, and a lack of qualified teachers, which hinder their ability to develop English proficiency (Baker, 2015; Hayes, 2010). Additionally, parental involvement plays a crucial role in students' English learning. Studies indicate that students with parents who actively support their education, by providing English-language books, encouraging media exposure, or engaging in conversations in English, tend to achieve higher proficiency levels (Liang, et al., 2024; Small, 2010). However, in families where parents do not speak English, students receive little reinforcement at home, further widening the proficiency gap between socio-economic groups. In previous research, Shi (2021) presented *Environmental Factors Affecting the English Language Learning Process*. This study focused on qualitative analysis, including observations and interviews with English language students to identify principal environmental factors affecting attentiveness and performance during the learning process. The research emphasized the importance of a conducive learning environment, highlighting factors such as classroom management, noise levels, and physical classroom conditions. A well-maintained and supportive environment was found to enhance students' learning outcomes.

Although previous research has provided valuable insights into the factors affecting English language achievement in Thailand, several gaps remain. There is a need for more contemporary studies that examine the effectiveness of modern teaching methodologies, such as blended learning and the flipped classroom approach, in improving English proficiency. Additionally, while technology has been widely recognized as a tool for language learning, further research is required to explore its impact on students in underprivileged areas where digital inequality remains a concern. Future studies should also investigate strategies to enhance intrinsic motivation and reduce language anxiety among low-achieving students, as these psychological factors significantly influence learning outcomes. Addressing these research gaps will contribute to a deeper understanding of how to improve English education in Thailand and ensure that students develop the necessary language skills for academic and professional success.

## Chapter Conclusion

This chapter has examined the key factors influencing English language achievement, including learner characteristics, teacher-related factors, and environmental conditions. Motivation, self-efficacy, and learning strategies were identified as critical contributors to student success, with high achievers displaying greater autonomy and engagement in their learning process. Teacher proficiency and instructional methodologies significantly impact student outcomes, with traditional grammar-translation approaches proving ineffective in promoting communicative competence. Environmental factors such as access to learning resources and socio-economic background further contribute to disparities in English proficiency, particularly between urban and rural students. Despite ongoing efforts to improve English education in Thailand, challenges remain in implementing student-centered methodologies, enhancing teacher training, and ensuring equal access to quality learning materials. These insights highlight the need for further research on effective teaching strategies and policy reforms to enhance English language achievement.

The next chapter will discuss the research methodology employed in this study, detailing the research design, data collection methods, sampling techniques, and analytical procedures used to investigate the factors influencing English language achievement among undergraduate students.



## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the research methodology employed in this study to examine the factors influencing English language learning achievement among non-English major students in Thailand. It provides a structured framework for investigating the key factors; learner-related, teacher-related, and environmental; that impact students' English proficiency. Additionally, the study aims to compare the differences in influencing factors between high-achieving and low-achieving students to better understand the challenges and advantages experienced by different learner groups. The chapter is organized into five main sections. The research design describes the overall approach and methodological framework of the study. The population and sample section explains the selection criteria and characteristics of participants. The research instruments section details the tools and techniques used for data collection. The data collection process outlines the steps taken to gather information, ensuring reliability and validity. Finally, the data analysis section discusses the statistical methods applied to interpret the findings. By systematically addressing these components, this chapter ensures a clear and comprehensive explanation of the research process used in this study.

#### **Research design**

This study employed a mixed-methods research design, integrating both quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive analysis of the factors influencing English learning achievement among non-English major students in Thailand. The quantitative approach was used to gather numerical data through a structured questionnaire, which allowed for statistical analysis and identification of patterns across a larger sample of students. The qualitative approach was employed through semi-structured interviews, enabling an in-depth exploration of students' perspectives, experiences, and challenges related to English language learning.



The mixed-methods approach was particularly valuable in educational research, as it allowed for a more nuanced understanding of complex learning phenomena that could not be captured through a single research method (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). While quantitative data provided measurable trends and correlations between learner, teacher, and environmental factors, qualitative insights helped contextualize these findings by revealing personal experiences, attitudes, and external influences that impacted students' English achievement (Dörnyei, 2007). Combining these methods ensured triangulation, which enhanced the validity and reliability of the research findings by cross-verifying data from multiple sources (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

By employing both questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, this study ensured that findings were not only statistically significant but also contextually meaningful, allowing for a richer interpretation of the factors that influenced English learning success and the differences between high- and low-achieving students.

### **Population and sample**

The target population for this study consisted of 4th-year undergraduate students from three faculties at Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna, Lampang: The Faculty of Business Administration and Liberal Arts, the Faculty of Science and Agricultural Technology, and the Faculty of Engineering. The total number of students across these faculties was 509, as shown in Table 4. Given the constraints of time and resources. This method enabled efficient data collection while ensuring that students who had extensive experience learning English throughout their university years were included.

A total of 125 students were selected to participate in the questionnaire survey, representing a diverse group from all three faculties, the study employed convenience sampling, selecting participants based on accessibility and willingness to participate. Additionally, 18 students were chosen for semi-structured interviews to provide in-depth qualitative insights into their experiences with English language learning. As outlined in Table 5, the Faculty of Business Administration and Liberal Arts had the highest number of participants (64 survey respondents, 6 interviewees),

followed by the Faculty of Science and Agricultural Technology (43 survey respondents, 6 interviewees) and the Faculty of Engineering (18 survey respondents, 6 interviewees).

Convenience sampling was widely used in educational research due to its practicality and efficiency in data collection, particularly in institutional settings where random sampling may not be feasible. This method allowed the study to gather valuable insights from readily available students, making it an appropriate choice for exploratory research on English language achievement. While convenience sampling did not provide the same level of representativeness as random sampling, it effectively identified key factors influencing students' English proficiency (Etikan, et al., 2016). Additionally, focusing on final-year students ensured that participants had substantial exposure to English learning throughout their academic journey, making their responses more informed and relevant. Despite its limitations, this approach enabled a comprehensive analysis of learner, teacher, and environmental factors influencing English language achievement among non-English major students in Thailand (Cohen, et al., 2018).

**Table 4 Research population**

Faculty	Population
1. Faculty of Business Administration and Liberal Arts	185
2. Faculty of Science and Agricultural Technology	191
3. Faculty of Engineering	133
<b>Total</b>	<b>509</b>

To ensure a balanced and proportional representation of students across faculties, the sample size was distributed according to the total student population in each faculty. Table 5 presents the breakdown of the research sample for both quantitative (questionnaire survey) and qualitative (semi-structured interview) data collection methods.

The study employed proportional stratified sampling, it is based on the idea of dividing a population into subgroups (strata) with similar characteristics and sampling from each subgroup in proportion to the population in that group so that the sample

better reflects the entire population to determine the number of students selected for the questionnaire survey from each faculty. Since the total population across the three faculties was 509 students, the sample size for the questionnaire was set at 125 students. The proportion of students from each faculty in the total population was used to calculate the corresponding number of questionnaire respondents. The formula used for the sampling procedure was adapted from Yamane (1967). The formula for determining the sample size for each faculty was:

$$n_i = \frac{N_i}{N} \times n$$

where:

- $n_i$  is the sample size from faculty  $i$
- $N_i$  is the population size from faculty  $i$
- $N$  is the total population size
- $n$  is the total sample size

Using this formula:

Faculty of Business Administration and Liberal Arts:

$$\frac{185}{509} \times 125 \approx 45$$

Faculty of Science and Agricultural Technology:

$$\frac{191}{509} \times 125 \approx 47$$

Faculty of Engineering:

$$\frac{133}{509} \times 125 \approx 33$$

For the semi-structured interviews, purposive sampling was used to select 18 students, with 6 students by divided in to 3 high-achievers and 3 low achievers from each faculty. Purposive sampling was applied to ensure a diverse representation of high-achieving and low-achieving students to explore different perspectives on English learning achievement. The selection criteria included academic performance in English courses and self-reported confidence in using the language. This approach ensured that the study had a representative distribution of students across faculties for the questionnaire while allowing for in-depth qualitative insights from targeted interview participants.

Table 5 The size of research sample

Faculty	Sample (Questionnaire)	Sample (Semi-structured interview)	
		High achievers	low achievers
Faculty of Business Administration and Liberal Arts	64	3	3
Faculty of Science and Agricultural Technology	43	3	3
Faculty of Engineering	18	3	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>18</b>	

### Research instrument

To address the research objectives and investigate the types of factors influencing English language learning among non-English major students, as well as the common types of factors influencing English language learning among high-achieving and low-achieving students, the researcher will utilize two types of research instruments: the questionnaire and semi-structured interviews.

#### 1. The questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed as the primary instrument for gathering quantitative data on the factors influencing English language learning among non-English major students. It consisted of structured questions with predetermined response options, allowing for a systematic and statistical analysis of students' perceptions and experiences. By using a standardized format, the questionnaire enabled the collection of data from a large sample, ensuring consistency and comparability across respondents. This approach was particularly beneficial for identifying patterns, trends, and differences in learning experiences between high-achieving and low-achieving students (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

To ensure comprehensive coverage of the factors affecting English achievement, the questionnaire was divided into four main sections. The first section collected personal information, including demographic data such as age, gender, faculty, and prior English learning experiences. The second section focused on learner factors, exploring aspects such as motivation, learning strategies, cognitive abilities, and

language anxiety, all of which have been shown to impact language acquisition (Dörnyei, 2009; Horwitz, et al., 1986). The third section examined teacher factors, including teacher effectiveness, instructional methods, feedback, and teacher-student relationships, which play a crucial role in student engagement and performance (Hattie, 2009). Finally, the fourth section addressed environmental factors, such as access to English learning resources, real-world exposure to English, and socio-economic conditions, which are known to shape language proficiency (Baker, 2012; Krashen, 1985).

To measure respondents' attitudes and perceptions accurately, a 5-point Likert scale was used, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The Likert scale is widely recognized in educational research for its ability to quantify subjective responses, making it an effective tool for analyzing attitudes and behavioral tendencies in language learning (Likert, 1932). The structured nature of the questionnaire facilitated statistical analysis, allowing for the identification of key trends and significant differences in English language learning experiences across different student groups (Boone & Boone, 2012). The scoring interpretation for the Likert scale was as follows: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Disagree, and 1 = Strongly Disagree.

This design ensured that quantitative responses could be systematically analyzed, facilitating meaningful comparisons between different learner groups. The questionnaire was validated through expert review and pilot testing to enhance its reliability and clarity, ensuring that all items were appropriately worded and relevant to the study's objectives. The Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC) values for the research instruments were evaluated by three experts with relevant knowledge and expertise in English language education and educational research. The IOC scores ranged from 0.67 to 1.00, indicating satisfactory content validity for data collection according to the standard criteria (IOC values should be 0.50 or higher). Additionally, ethical considerations were upheld, with participants informed of the study's purpose, anonymity, and voluntary participation, in line with ethical guidelines for educational research (Bryman, 2016). This structured approach to questionnaire design provided a robust and empirical foundation for understanding the diverse factors influencing English language achievement among non-English major students in Thailand.

## 2. Seme-structured interview

The semi-structured interview was employed as a qualitative research instrument to obtain in-depth insights into the experiences and perceptions of students regarding English language learning. Unlike structured interviews, which follow a rigid question format, semi-structured interviews provided the flexibility to explore participants' responses in greater detail while maintaining consistency in key discussion topics (Bryman, 2016). This approach allowed the researcher to probe deeper into specific areas of interest, uncovering nuanced perspectives that could not be captured through the questionnaire alone.

A semi-structured interview guide was developed to ensure that all core topics related to learner factors, teacher influences, and environmental conditions were systematically addressed while allowing participants to elaborate on their personal experiences. This method was particularly useful for identifying differences in learning challenges, motivation levels, and access to resources between high-achieving and low-achieving students. The interview questions focused on students' learning strategies, interactions with teachers, classroom experiences, self-confidence in using English, and exposure to English outside the classroom. By encouraging open-ended responses, the researcher was able to gain a deeper understanding of the barriers and facilitators influencing English language achievement.

The selection of interview participants was conducted through purposive sampling, ensuring a diverse representation of students from different faculties and academic performance levels. A total of 18 students participated in the interviews, with six students from each faculty. This approach ensured balanced representation and provided insights into the variations in English learning experiences across different academic disciplines.

By employing both the questionnaire and semi-structured interviews, the study leveraged the strengths of mixed-methods research. The quantitative data collected through the questionnaire provided a broad, statistical overview of the key factors influencing English language learning, while the qualitative insights from the interviews enriched the findings by uncovering students' personal experiences and attitudes. This triangulation of data sources enhanced the validity and depth of the



study's conclusions, ensuring a more comprehensive understanding of the factors affecting English language achievement among non-English major students in Thailand (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

### **Data collection**

Before data collection, official permission was obtained from the Deputy Dean of the Faculty of Business Administration and Liberal Arts, Faculty of Science and Agricultural Technology and Faculty of Engineering RMUTL Lampang. The data collection process for this study involved both quantitative and qualitative methods to provide a comprehensive analysis of the factors influencing English language achievement among non-English major students. Quantitative data were collected through a questionnaire and students' cumulative English course grades, while qualitative data were obtained through semi-structured interviews to explore students' learning experiences in depth. This mixed-methods approach ensured a well-rounded understanding of how learner, teacher, and environmental factors affected English proficiency (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

For the quantitative data, the study utilized an online questionnaire, which was distributed via Google Forms. The questionnaire link was sent to the selected sample, allowing participants to conveniently complete it. This digital approach streamlined the data collection process, minimized errors, and ensured efficient data management (Evans & Mathur, 2018). Additionally, students' cumulative English course grades from their first to fourth year were collected as an objective measure of their English proficiency. These grades provided a longitudinal perspective on students' language development and were used to classify participants into high-achieving and low-achieving groups. Academic performance was considered a reliable indicator of English language achievement, consistent with previous studies that have used grades to assess language proficiency (Vibulphol, 2016). The collected data were organized and analyzed using Microsoft Excel, which facilitated preliminary statistical analysis and data visualization.

For the qualitative data, semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected participants to gain deeper insights into their experiences, perceptions, and



challenges related to English learning. The interviews in this section were approved by the administrators of each faculty by action. Participants were classified into two groups based on their academic performance: high achievers (students with grades B, B+, and A) and low achievers (students with grades C, C+, and D+). A total of 18 students participated in the interviews, with an equal number (9) from each achievement group. The interviews were conducted individual online via Microsoft Teams or other platforms such as Facebook Messenger and LINE, depending on participants' preferences by using Thai language. Each interview lasted no longer than 30 minutes and was audio- and video-recorded for transcription and analysis. Conducting interviews online provided greater flexibility and increased participation, particularly for students with scheduling constraints (Janghorban, et al., 2014). The distribution of interview participants across faculties and achievement levels is shown in Table 6.

**Table 6 Distribution of Research Interview Participants**

Faculty	Sample (Semi-structure interview)		
	Total	High Achievers	Low Achievers
	Participants	(B, B+, A)	(D+, C, C+)
Faculty of Business Administration and Liberal Arts	6	3	3
Faculty of Science and Agricultural Technology	6	3	3
Faculty of Engineering	6	3	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>

The semi-structured interview format allowed for flexibility in questioning while maintaining a structured framework to ensure comparability across responses. This approach enabled the researcher to explore key themes such as students' learning strategies, motivation levels, teacher-student interactions, and exposure to English outside the classroom. The qualitative data provided rich, contextual insights that complemented the findings from the questionnaire, enhancing the overall validity of the study.

### **Data analysis**

The data analysis for this study incorporated both quantitative statistical methods and qualitative content analysis, ensuring a robust and multi-dimensional examination of the factors influencing English language achievement. This mixed-methods approach strengthened the study's validity and depth by capturing both measurable trends and individual student experiences (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017).

For the quantitative data analysis, responses from the questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, to identify patterns and trends in learner-related, teacher-related, and environmental factors influencing English proficiency. Descriptive statistics provided an overview of students' perceptions and experiences, allowing for meaningful comparisons between high-achieving and low-achieving students (Pallant, 2020).

To further examine the impact of different factors on English language achievement, a multiple regression analysis was conducted. This statistical method determined the relative contributions of learner, teacher, and environmental factors in predicting students' English proficiency. The regression analysis followed key statistical assumptions, including normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity, which were validated using diagnostic tests such as the Shapiro-Wilk test for normality and residual plots for variance consistency. Ensuring these assumptions were met increased the reliability of the statistical results and strengthened the validity of the findings. To interpret the mean scores from the Likert-scale responses, the study adopted Best's (1970) classification criteria, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7 The criteria for interpretation of (Best, 1970)

Mean score	Interpretation
4.49–5.00	Very high
3.50–4.49	High
2.50–3.49	Medium
1.50–2.49	Low
0.00–1.50	Very low

Using these criteria, the study categorized students' responses to evaluate the level of agreement or importance assigned to various learner, teacher, and environmental factors. The SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) program of multiple regression analysis and mean score interpretation provided a clear understanding of how different variables influenced English language achievement.

The qualitative data analysis in this study followed Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) as outlined by Schreier (2012). This method provided a structured yet flexible framework for systematically interpreting participants' responses. The process began with **transcription**, where recorded interviews were converted into written text to ensure accuracy and completeness. This was followed by **initial coding**, in which key phrases and recurring themes were identified based on their relevance to the study. Next, the data were **categorized into broader themes** related to learner, teacher, and environmental factors, allowing for systematic organization of findings. The **summarization stage** involved refining these categories, highlighting significant differences between high-achieving and low-achieving students. Finally, the **interpretation phase** linked the findings to existing literature, ensuring a deeper understanding of the factors influencing English language achievement. To enhance reliability, **researcher triangulation** was employed, where multiple researchers reviewed the coding to ensure consistency, and **member checking** was conducted by sharing preliminary findings with participants to validate the accuracy of interpretations. This structured approach ensured a rigorous analysis of qualitative data, complementing the quantitative results from the questionnaire and providing a

more comprehensive perspective on English language learning challenges and achievements

### **Ethical Considerations**

This study was conducted in accordance with ethical research standards to ensure the rights, privacy, and well-being of all participants. Prior to data collection, the research proposal was submitted to the University of Phayao Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) for ethical review and approval. The committee assessed the study's methodology, data collection procedures, and ethical safeguards to ensure compliance with internationally recognized ethical guidelines for human research. Approval was granted under Ethics Approval Code: [HREC-UP-HSS 2.2/007/67] (See Appendix D, confirming adherence to ethical standards regarding informed consent, confidentiality, and participant protection.

To uphold these ethical principles, informed consent was obtained from all participants before their involvement in the study. Each participant was provided with a detailed information sheet outlining the study's objectives, procedures, potential risks, and benefits. They were informed that participation was entirely voluntary and that they had the right to withdraw at any stage without any consequences. Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained, with participants' personal information replaced by pseudonyms, and all data securely stored and accessible only to the researcher.

Additional data protection measures were implemented to ensure that all questionnaire responses and interview recordings were securely stored and used exclusively for research purposes. Interview recordings were transcribed and anonymized to prevent the identification of individuals, and the data were analyzed collectively rather than on an individual basis. Furthermore, the study's research instruments, including the questionnaire and interview guide, were reviewed and approved by the University of Phayao Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) to ensure they were appropriate, culturally sensitive, and respectful to participants.

By obtaining ethical clearance from the University of Phayao HREC and adhering to these ethical standards, this study ensured that participants' rights, dignity, and privacy were protected throughout the research process. These measures reinforced

the integrity, transparency, and credibility of the study while safeguarding the well-being of all individuals involved.

## Chapter Conclusion

This chapter outlined the research methodology employed in this study to investigate the factors influencing English language achievement among non-English major students in Thailand. The study utilized a mixed-methods approach, integrating quantitative data collected through structured questionnaires with qualitative insights gained from semi-structured interviews. The research design ensured that statistical analysis provided measurable trends, while qualitative data offered a deeper understanding of students' experiences and challenges.

The population and sample consisted of 4th-year undergraduate students from three faculties at Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna, Lampang. A proportional stratified sampling method was used to determine the questionnaire sample, while purposive sampling was applied to select interview participants, ensuring a diverse representation of high- and low-achieving students.

The research instruments included a questionnaire, structured into four key sections; learner factors, teacher factors, environmental factors, and personal information, measured using a 5-point Likert scale. The semi-structured interviews provided qualitative insights into students' perspectives on English learning. The data collection process involved the distribution of the questionnaire via Google Forms and the classification of participants based on cumulative English course grades. Interviews were conducted via online platforms to enhance accessibility.

The data analysis combined descriptive and inferential statistics for the quantitative data, utilizing mean scores, standard deviations, and multiple regression analysis to examine the relationships between influencing factors and English proficiency. QCA following Schreier (2012) was used to categorize interview responses, ensuring a systematic and reliable interpretation of qualitative findings. Triangulation techniques were applied to enhance the validity of the results.

Finally, the study adhered to ethical research principles, with approval obtained from the University of Phayao Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC).

Ethical considerations included informed consent, data confidentiality, anonymity, and participant protection, ensuring compliance with research ethics guidelines.

By integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches, this study provides a comprehensive analysis of the learner, teacher, and environmental factors influencing English language achievement. The next chapter will present and analyze the research findings, highlighting key trends, patterns, and significant differences between high-achieving and low-achieving students.



## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

This chapter presents the findings on factors influencing English language learning achievement among non-English major students at Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna, Lampang. It addresses two research questions: the first identifies key factors; student-related, teacher-related, and environmental, analyzed through descriptive statistics, regression analysis, and qualitative insights. The second examines differences between high-achieving and low-achieving students, highlighting variations in motivation, teaching perceptions, and study habits. Quantitative data provide statistical trends, while qualitative findings offer deeper personal insights. The chapter concludes with key findings, which will be further discussed in Chapter V in relation to existing theories and studies.

#### **Answer to RQ1: What are the types of factors that influence English language learning among non-English major students?**

This section presents findings from both quantitative and qualitative analyses to address the first research question regarding the key factors influencing English language learning among non-English major students. The study classified these factors into three main categories: student factors, teacher factors, and environmental factors. The quantitative analysis provides statistical insights, while the qualitative data from semi-structured interviews offer deeper perspectives on students' experiences.

##### **1. Quantitative Results from Questionnaires**

To identify the factors influencing English language learning, descriptive statistics were used to analyze students' responses. Table 8 presents the mean scores and standard deviations for each category.



**Table 8 Descriptive Statistics of Factors Influencing English Language Learning**

Factor	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
<b>Student Factor</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>125</b>
I enjoy learning English.	3.88	0.76	125
*I agree that English is quite difficult.	4.05	0.82	125
I feel satisfied and happy every time I study English.	3.98	0.80	125
I pay attention to English every time I study.	4.02	0.76	125
I feel anxious when I enter English class.	3.50	1.14	125
I have English knowledge from my previous educational institution.	3.40	0.88	125
I have taken extra English classes before.	3.11	1.36	125
I have learned English from watching and listening to various media.	3.46	0.96	125
When attending classes, I listen attentively and complete assigned tasks diligently.	4.06	0.72	125
I allocate time for reading and reviewing lessons.	3.62	0.83	125
I am confident to ask questions when I do not understand the lesson with the teacher and classmates.	3.66	0.87	125
I attend every English class and am punctual.	4.22	0.81	125
*I feel bored and lazy to study English.	3.10	1.19	125
I think English will create opportunities for my career.	4.49	0.71	125
I think being good at English gives me an advantage over others.	4.38	0.73	125
I think English is very useful in today's era.	4.49	0.69	125
*I think English is not necessary for me in my career opportunities.	3.10	1.42	125
*I think getting good English grades is not useful.	3.18	1.32	125
<b>Teacher Factor</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>125</b>
The teacher explains the lesson clearly and understandably.	4.03	0.68	125
The teacher has good knowledge of the subject being taught.	4.19	0.72	125
The teacher informs me of the teaching plan.	4.18	0.73	125
The teacher has the skills to teach me effectively.	4.14	0.76	125
The teacher has polite and pleasant manners.	4.33	0.72	125

Table 8 (Cont.)

Factor	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
The teacher creates a friendly atmosphere with the students.	4.36	0.71	125
*I think the teacher is fierce and unfriendly, which makes me not want to attend the class.	3.17	1.40	125
The teacher has a modern personality and is not outdated.	4.02	1.04	125
I think the English teacher is a good teacher.	4.21	0.74	125
Teachers organize activities to develop diverse and useful knowledge.	4.12	0.78	125
The teacher uses appropriate and interesting media that is easy to understand.	4.14	0.73	125
The teacher has prepared a teaching plan for each lesson very well.	4.30	0.70	125
*The teacher's teaching methods are boring and uninteresting.	3.58	1.27	125
The teacher opens opportunities for questions and opinions.	4.32	0.76	125
*The teacher does not open opportunity for expressing opinions.	2.80	1.48	125
*The teacher shows dissatisfaction when students express their opinions.	2.72	1.48	125
<b>Environmental Factor</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>125</b>
*The classroom is not comfortable.	3.14	1.32	125
The classroom has equipment that facilitates English learning.	3.98	0.89	125
The teacher creates a good and engaging classroom atmosphere.	4.13	0.83	125
The teacher and students have good relationships.	4.32	0.75	125
My family/guardians provide consistent financial support, which motivates me to study.	4.17	0.82	125
My family encourages and advises me when I have problems.	4.18	0.85	125

Table 8 (Cont.)

Factor	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
My family supports and promotes my learning development.	4.27	0.79	125
My family monitors my academic performance.	4.07	0.90	125
*Online learning makes it difficult for me to understand.	3.87	0.92	125
*Online learning does not allow interaction with the teacher and classmates.	3.90	0.85	125
Online learning gives me the opportunity to study and research additional knowledge by myself.	3.83	0.81	125
Online learning makes it easier for me to complete assigned tasks than in the classroom.	3.77	0.94	125

**Note:** \* marks indicate negative questions.

The results indicate that environmental factors received the highest mean score ( $M = 3.96$ ), suggesting that students generally had a favorable perception of their learning environment. This finding implies that students felt supported by external conditions such as access to learning materials, classroom resources, and opportunities for language exposure outside of formal instruction. A well-equipped learning environment, including modern facilities, digital tools, and peer support, may have contributed to this positive perception. However, while environmental factors were rated highly, their actual influence on English proficiency required further statistical validation.

Teacher factors followed with a mean score of 3.79, indicating that students held a generally positive view of their instructors' effectiveness, teaching methods, and the support they provided. This suggests that students appreciated their teachers' efforts in delivering lessons and facilitating English learning. However, despite this favorable perception, challenges related to instructional methods, feedback, and classroom engagement might still exist, particularly in relation to how well teachers adapt their approaches to different learning needs. The qualitative findings further explored these aspects, shedding light on how students responded to various teaching strategies.

Student factors received the lowest mean score ( $M = 3.65$ ), although it was still within the “high” range. This result suggests that while students acknowledged their personal role in English learning, they might have faced challenges related to self-motivation, study habits, and confidence in using English. Factors such as learning strategies, goal setting, and attitudes toward language acquisition could have influenced this score. Additionally, differences between high-achieving and low-achieving students might explain the relatively lower rating, as some students demonstrated strong self-directed learning skills, while others struggled with motivation and engagement.

To further explore the significance of these factors in predicting English language achievement, a regression analysis was conducted. This statistical approach helped determine the strength and direction of relationships between student, teacher, and environmental factors and their impact on language proficiency. The results, presented in Table 9, provided deeper insights into which factors had the most substantial influence on English learning success.

**Table 9 Regression Analysis of Factors Influencing English Language Learning**

Factor	Standardized Coefficient (Beta)	Significance (p-value)
Student Factors	0.47	< 0.001
Teacher Factors	-0.54	< 0.001
Environment Factors	0.15	0.192

The regression results indicate that student factors had a significant positive impact ( $Beta = 0.47$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), highlighting the critical role of motivation, self-discipline, and effective study habits in English language achievement. This suggests that students who actively engaged in self-directed learning, practiced English outside the classroom, and exhibited higher levels of confidence tended to perform better in their language studies. The strong correlation between student factors and English proficiency aligns with existing research emphasizing the importance of learner autonomy and motivation in second language acquisition.

Interestingly, teacher factors showed a significant negative effect ( $\text{Beta} = -0.54$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), which contradicts the generally positive perception observed in the descriptive analysis. This suggests that, despite students rating their teachers favorably, certain teaching methods or instructional approaches may not have aligned with their learning preferences. One possible explanation is that traditional, lecture-based or grammar-focused instruction, which remains prevalent in many Thai classrooms, might not effectively support students in developing their communicative skills. This misalignment between teaching strategies and student needs highlights the necessity for more interactive and student-centered approaches to English instruction.

Although environmental factors received the highest mean score, they did not significantly predict English achievement ( $\text{Beta} = 0.15$ ,  $p = 0.192$ ). This indicates that while students generally appreciated their learning environment, including access to resources and support systems, these factors alone were not strong enough to drive improvements in language proficiency. A possible interpretation is that the mere availability of language-learning opportunities does not automatically lead to success unless students actively engage with and utilize these resources. This finding reinforces the idea that intrinsic factors, such as student motivation and effective learning strategies, play a more decisive role in language achievement than external conditions alone.

## **2. Qualitative Results from Semi-Structured Interviews**

Following the quantitative analysis, qualitative findings from semi-structured interviews provided deeper insights into how student, teacher, and environmental factors influenced English language learning among non-English major students. Participants from different faculties and academic performance levels shared their perspectives, revealing both commonalities and key differences in their experiences. To maintain clarity, each participant was assigned an abbreviation corresponding to their faculty and achievement level. For example, high-achieving students from the Faculty of Engineering were labeled HEng1, HEng2, HEng3, while their low-achieving counterparts were labeled LEng1, LEng2, LEng3. A similar approach was used for students from the Faculty of Business Administration and Liberal Arts (HBBA1–HBBA3, LBBA1–LBBA3) and the Faculty of Science and Agricultural Technology (HSci1–HSci3, LSci1–LSci3).

Table 10 presents background information on the 18 interview participants, including their major, faculty, GPA, and achievement level. High-achieving students had GPAs above 3.50, while low-achieving students had GPAs below 2.50. The diversity in academic backgrounds ensured a well-rounded representation of different perspectives on English learning challenges and successes.

**Table 10 Background Information of Interview Participants**

Participant ID	Major	Faculty	GPA	Achievement Level
HEng1	Electrical	Engineering	3.75	High
HEng2	Electrical		3.93	
HEng3	Electrical		3.76	
HBBA1	Accounting	Business Administration and Liberal Arts	3.88	High
HBBA2	Marketing		3.57	
HBBA3	Management		3.85	
HSci1	Plant science	Faculty of Science and Agricultural Technology	3.50	High
HSci2	Food science		3.75	
HSci3	Animal science		3.65	
LEng1	Industrial	Engineering	2.34	Low
LEng2	Electrical		2.41	
LEng3	Electrical		2.42	
LBBA1	Marketing	Business Administration and Liberal Arts	2.46	Low
LBBA2	Accounting		2.44	
LBBA3	Accounting		2.46	
LSci1	Plant science	Faculty of Science and Agricultural Technology	2.50	Low
LSci2	Food science		2.45	
LSci3	Food science		2.13	

The interview findings revealed that student-related factors played a significant role in language learning success, while teacher-related factors had mixed effects, and environmental factors had minimal direct influence. These qualitative insights provided context to the statistical results, illustrating how students perceived and experienced these factors in real-life learning situations. In addition, also

categorized into four broader themes, including, motivation and engagement, teacher preparedness and instructional clarity, teaching methods and supportive learning environment as follows:

## 2.1 Student factors

Student factors, including motivation, study habits, and perceived relevance of English to future careers, emerged as critical determinants of language learning success. High-achieving students demonstrated strong intrinsic and instrumental motivation, linking English proficiency to their professional aspirations. For instance, HEng1, an engineering student, emphasized the necessity of English for workplace communication and accessing technical resources. Similarly, HBBA3, a business student, highlighted the importance of English in global business interactions and career advancement.

### 2.1.1 Motivation and Engagement theme

#### Excerpt 1 (HEng1):

*“Uses it in the workplace to communicate with supervisors, because in engineering, most of the information is in English, so it is important to have knowledge and skills.*

#### Excerpt 2 (HBBA3):

*“English language proficiency enables better communication with foreigners, including opportunities for employment in large organizations.*

In contrast, low-achieving students displayed lower motivation and engagement, often viewing English as an academic requirement rather than a practical skill. LBBA2, a marketing student, acknowledged the importance of English but admitted a lack of curiosity and effort in improving proficiency.

#### Excerpt 3 (LBBA2):

*“Knowing English is important nowadays, but I have only a basic level because I am not very curious about learning more.”*



## 2.2 Teacher factors

Teacher factors, which showed a significant negative impact in the regression analysis, were further contextualized through the interviews. High-achieving students generally appreciated teacher preparedness and instructional clarity, though they also identified areas for improvement. HEng3 observed that while he could understand and apply knowledge after instruction, the teaching methods used were not always conducive to immediate comprehension.

### 2.2.1 Teacher Preparedness and Instructional Clarity theme

#### Excerpt 4 (HEng3):

*“After receiving knowledge from the teacher, I can understand the lessons, express ideas, and provide examples, but the teaching methods could be clearer.”*

For low-achieving students, challenges related to teaching approaches were more pronounced. LEng2 reported difficulties in understanding lessons taught entirely in English, suggesting that occasional explanations in Thai would enhance comprehension.

### 2.2.2 Teaching Methods theme

#### Excerpt 5 (LEng2):

*“I hardly understand anything when lessons are conducted entirely in English. It would help if some explanations were given in Thai.”*

## 2.3 Environmental factors

Finally, despite receiving the highest mean score in the quantitative analysis, environmental factors did not significantly predict English language achievement. The interview findings supported this result, as most students acknowledged the importance of a supportive learning environment but did not view it as a decisive factor in their English proficiency. LEng1 expressed adaptability, stating that the learning environment had little impact on his ability to acquire English.

### 2.3.1 Supportive Learning Environment theme

#### Excerpt 6 (LEng1):

*“The learning environment doesn’t really affect me; I believe I can learn in any setting.”*

Meanwhile, LBBA1 emphasized that a positive classroom atmosphere could enhance motivation and engagement, highlighting the role of interactive learning activities and strong teacher-student relationships.

**Excerpt 7 (LBBA1):**

*“A positive classroom atmosphere is important for motivation. Interesting activities, good relationships with teachers, and opportunities to express opinions make students more engaged in learning.”*

In summary, the qualitative findings reinforced the statistical results, showing that student factors had the most significant positive influence on English achievement, while teacher factors presented challenges that impacted learning outcomes. Environmental factors, though positively perceived, did not directly impact proficiency levels. High-achieving students exhibited strong motivation and clear career-oriented goals, whereas low-achieving students struggled with engagement and perceived relevance. These findings highlight the importance of enhancing motivation, improving teaching methodologies, and creating interactive classroom environments to enhance English language learning among non-English major students.

**Answer to RQ2: What are the common types of factors that influence English language learning among high-achieving and low-achieving students?**

In addition to addressing RQ1, which examined general factors affecting English language learning among non-English major students, this section explores the distinctions and commonalities in influencing factors between high-achieving and low-achieving students. A combination of quantitative data from questionnaires and qualitative insights from interviews was used to investigate the differences in how these two groups perceived student, teacher, and environmental factors.

**1. Quantitative Results from Questionnaires**

The quantitative analysis, as presented in Table 11, provides insights into how student and teacher factors influence English language learning among high- and low-achieving students.

**Table 11 Regression Analysis of Factors Influencing English Language Learning**

Factor	High-Achieving Students Mean	Low-Achieving Students Mean	Significance (p-value)
Student Factor	3.33	3.75	.007 (Significant)
Teacher Factor	4.14	3.73	.004 (Significant)
Environmental Factor	4.24	4.11	.402 (Not Significant)

The analysis of the student factor revealed a significant difference between high- and low-achieving students. High achievers reported a lower mean score ( $M = 3.33$ ) compared to low achievers ( $M = 3.75$ ), with a statistically significant difference ( $p = .007$ ). This finding suggests that high-achieving students tend to be more self-critical and reflective about their learning process, recognizing areas for improvement and actively seeking strategies to enhance their English proficiency. Their lower self-assessment scores may indicate a more realistic understanding of their language abilities, which aligns with research suggesting that metacognitive awareness contributes to better language learning outcomes. On the other hand, low-achieving students may perceive themselves as more engaged than they actually are, potentially overestimating their motivation and study habits despite lower academic performance. This discrepancy could stem from a lack of effective learning strategies or a misunderstanding of the level of effort required to improve English proficiency. It also suggests that low achievers may benefit from targeted interventions to develop self-regulated learning strategies, helping them to set realistic goals and actively monitor their progress.

Regarding the teacher factor, high-achieving students reported a higher mean score ( $M = 4.12$ ) compared to low-achieving students ( $M = 3.73$ ), a statistically significant difference ( $p = .004$ ). This result indicates that high achievers generally had a more positive perception of their instructors and teaching methodologies, appreciating well-structured lessons, effective feedback, and engaging instructional techniques. Their higher satisfaction with teaching methods suggests that they may be better at adapting to various instructional styles, making the most of available learning opportunities. Conversely, low-achieving students, who rated teacher factors lower, may

have struggled with teacher-centered approaches that did not align with their preferred learning styles. Many low achievers reported difficulty in engaging with the curriculum, indicating that passive learning methods, such as rote memorization and lecture-based instruction, might not effectively support their English language development. These findings highlight the importance of adopting more student-centered teaching strategies, such as interactive activities, CLT, and personalized feedback, which could enhance engagement and learning outcomes for lower-performing students.

For the environmental factor, both high- and low-achieving students reported relatively high mean scores, with high achievers scoring  $M = 4.24$  and low achievers scoring  $M = 4.11$ . However, the difference was not statistically significant ( $p = .402$ ), suggesting that environmental conditions, such as classroom resources, access to technology, and extracurricular opportunities, were perceived positively by both groups but did not directly contribute to variations in English achievement. This finding implies that while a supportive and well-equipped learning environment is beneficial for all students, it may not be the determining factor in distinguishing between high and low achievers. High-achieving students likely maximize available resources by actively seeking additional learning opportunities, such as engaging with English media, practicing with peers, or using online platforms. In contrast, low-achieving students may not take full advantage of these environmental resources, reinforcing the idea that personal motivation and study habits play a more crucial role in language success than external learning conditions alone.

These findings emphasize that while teacher and environmental factors contribute to language learning, student-related factors, such as motivation, self-regulated learning, and perceived importance of English, are the strongest predictors of success. Therefore, educational interventions should focus on empowering students with effective study habits, promoting engagement through interactive teaching approaches, and promoting a learning environment that encourages both intrinsic and instrumental motivation to bridge the gap between high- and low-achieving students.

## 2. Qualitative Results from Semi-Structured Interviews

Building on the quantitative findings, the qualitative data from the interviews provided deeper insights into the experiences and perspectives of high-achieving and low-achieving students regarding factors influencing their English language learning. The interviews explored students' attitudes, engagement levels, and the perceived importance of English learning, complementing the statistical results from the questionnaires. Furthermore, also categorized into four broader themes, including, motivation and engagement, teacher preparedness and instructional clarity, teaching methods and supportive learning environment as follows:

### 2.1 High-Achieving Students

High-achieving students demonstrated a proactive approach to English learning, emphasizing its relevance to their academic and professional futures. They linked English proficiency to increased confidence, career prospects, and international opportunities, reinforcing the importance of intrinsic and instrumental motivation in language achievement. The findings were comprised into two themes, motivation and engagement and supportive learning environment.

For student factor, many high-achieving students reported that English skills contributed to their self-confidence and professional image. HSci2 emphasized the importance of English as a tool for academic and career advancement, illustrating a goal-oriented mindset that drives engagement in language learning.

#### 1) Motivation and Engagement theme

##### Excerpt 8 (HSci2):

*“English language skills boost confidence and contribute to a positive image. ... English language proficiency provides me with opportunities for educational advancement.”*

Unlike low achievers, these students actively sought ways to apply English in real-life contexts, which enhanced their engagement and retention. Their motivation was primarily fueled by future career prospects, with students recognizing English as a necessary skill for global competitiveness.

In terms of teacher factor, high-achieving students valued teacher preparedness and structured lesson planning, which contributed to their comprehension

and engagement. HSci1 highlighted the importance of well-prepared teaching materials, suggesting that a well-structured lesson plan helps students follow and understand complex content effectively.

**Excerpt 9 (HSci1):**

*“The preparedness involves detailed preparation of the content ... After receiving instruction from the teacher, I have a moderate understanding.”*

Although high-achieving students generally viewed their teachers positively, some noted that more interactive and communicative teaching methods could further enhance learning. This indicates that while structured instruction is beneficial, teachers should incorporate interactive learning techniques to maintain engagement and deepen comprehension.

Finally, regarding environmental factor, while not a dominant factor in their language achievement, high-achieving students recognized that a supportive and resourceful learning environment contributed positively to their experience. HEng2 acknowledged that a well-equipped classroom and effective teaching materials helped facilitate learning.

**2) Supportive Learning Environment theme**

**Excerpt 10 (HEng2):**

*“The classroom environment is conducive to learning, and the teaching materials are good.”*

However, their success was not solely dependent on the environment, as high achievers tended to actively seek out additional learning opportunities beyond the classroom, such as using digital tools, engaging in English media, and participating in extracurricular activities.

**2.2 Low-Achieving Students**

In contrast to high achievers, low-achieving students often struggled with motivation, engagement, and teaching methods. They tended to view English as an academic obligation rather than a valuable skill, which resulted in lower levels of effort and enthusiasm for learning. The findings were comprised into three themes, motivation and engagement, teaching methods and supportive learning environment.



For student factor, low-achieving students frequently lacked the intrinsic motivation to improve their English skills, with some expressing a lack of curiosity or personal interest in the language. LBBA2, for example, acknowledged the necessity of English but admitted that he had little motivation to improve beyond the basics.

### 1) Motivation and Engagement theme

#### Excerpt 11 (LBBA2):

*“Knowing English is very necessary nowadays, [but] ... I have a basic level because I am not very curious.”*

#### Excerpt 12 (LSci2):

*“English is difficult to understand and must memorize many things. Sometimes you don't even use that much.”*

Unlike high achievers, who actively engaged in learning beyond the classroom, low achievers tended to rely solely on formal instruction and lacked self-directed learning strategies. This passive approach to language learning may contribute to their lower achievement levels, reinforcing the need for interventions that encourage independent learning and goal setting. Moreover, English challenging due to its complexity and the extensive memorization required. They often struggle with understanding the language and retaining numerous rules and vocabulary. Additionally, students feel that much of what they learn is not frequently used in practical situations.

Regarding teacher factor, low-achieving students expressed concerns about teaching methods, often citing a lack of interactive learning opportunities as a barrier to comprehension and engagement. LSci3, for example, noted that while teachers provided well-prepared materials, the lessons were too passive, lacking interaction and practical application.

### 2) Teaching Methods theme

#### Excerpt 13 (LSci3):

*“The teacher prepares teaching materials and lesson plans quite well, making it easy to understand. ... [However] they do not provide opportunities for interaction; they only assign exercises and reading and pronunciation practices.”*



This suggests that teacher-centered instruction, without sufficient engagement, may not be effective for all learners. Incorporating more communicative and experiential learning activities, such as discussions, role-plays, and group projects, could help low achievers develop greater confidence and interest in using English actively.

Lastly, for environmental Factor, while both high and low achievers reported similar perceptions of their learning environment, low-achieving students were more passive in utilizing available resources. Some described the classroom setting as neutral or uninspiring, suggesting that it did not significantly impact their learning motivation.

### **3) Supportive Learning Environment theme**

#### **Excerpt 14 (LEng2):**

*“The environment is ordinary, it’s the same everywhere you study.”*

This finding aligns with the quantitative results, where environmental factors did not show a statistically significant influence on language achievement. While a supportive learning environment is valuable, it appears that individual engagement and motivation play a more critical role in determining English proficiency.

To summarize, the qualitative findings reinforced the key differences in learning attitudes and behaviors between high- and low-achieving students. High achievers demonstrated higher levels of self-motivation, goal-setting, and proactive engagement, linking English proficiency to future opportunities. They viewed teacher preparedness positively but suggested that interactive methods could further enhance learning. Their perceptions of the learning environment were positive but secondary to personal effort.

In contrast, low-achieving students struggled with motivation and engagement, often viewing English as an academic requirement rather than a valuable skill. They expressed concerns about teaching methods, particularly a lack of interactive learning, and were less likely to take advantage of available learning resources. These findings suggest that low achievers could benefit from targeted support, including strategies to increase motivation, encourage independent learning, and enhance engagement through student-centered instruction.

By addressing these differences, educators can tailor teaching approaches to better support students across different achievement levels, ensuring that both high- and low-achieving students receive the necessary tools and opportunities to succeed in English language learning.

## **Chapter Conclusion**

This chapter presented the findings on the factors influencing English language learning among non-English major students at Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna Lampang. The results from both quantitative and qualitative data highlighted the varying roles of Student, Teacher, and Environmental Factors in shaping learning outcomes. For RQ1, student motivation emerged as the most significant predictor of English proficiency, with high-achieving students demonstrating strong self-directed learning habits and clear career-driven goals. Teacher Factors, however, had a negative impact on learning outcomes, suggesting a disconnect between instructional methods and student needs. While students generally held favorable perceptions of their learning environment, Environmental Factors did not significantly predict English proficiency, reinforcing the idea that external conditions alone are not enough to drive language learning success. For RQ2, comparisons between high-achieving and low-achieving students revealed clear differences in attitudes and learning behaviors. High-achieving students were more proactive, engaged, and motivated by long-term career benefits, whereas low-achieving students struggled with motivation, perceived English as an academic requirement rather than a practical skill, and reported difficulty engaging with teacher-led instruction. Additionally, high achievers were more likely to view their instructors' teaching positively, while low achievers expressed a need for more interactive and supportive learning strategies.

These findings underscore the need for pedagogical adjustments to accommodate diverse learning preferences and ensure that instruction is relevant, engaging, and aligned with student needs. Universities should consider integrating student-centered learning approaches, interactive teaching methods, and additional real-world English exposure opportunities to bridge the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical language use. Despite its valuable insights, this study has

certain limitations, including its focus on a single institution and reliance on self-reported data, which may introduce bias. Future research should explore a broader range of universities and employ longitudinal studies to track students' progress over time. The next chapter will discuss these results in relation to existing theories and previous research, providing a deeper analysis of their implications and offering practical recommendations for improving English language education among non-English major students.



## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

This chapter discusses the key findings of the study on factors influencing English language achievement among non-English major students at Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna Lampang, including discussion of the results in each factor and limitations of the study and recommendations for further studies. It interprets the results in relation to existing research and theoretical frameworks, highlighting differences between high-achieving and low-achieving students. The chapter also presents conclusions drawn from the findings and provides practical recommendations for students, educators, and institutions to enhance English language learning. Lastly, suggestions for future research are outlined to further explore this topic.

#### **Discussion of the Results**

The findings revealed three primary factors influencing English language achievement among non-English major students: student factors, teacher factors, and environmental factors. While student factors had the most significant positive effect, teacher factors showed a surprising negative correlation, and environmental factors, despite high perceived importance, did not significantly predict English proficiency. These results align with and expand upon existing theoretical frameworks in language learning research.

##### **1. Student Factors: Motivation, Self-Regulation, and Learning Attitudes**

The study confirmed that student-related factors played a crucial role in English language achievement, with a significant positive correlation (Beta = 0.467,  $p < 0.001$ ). This finding supports Gardner's (1985) Socio-Educational Model, which emphasizes motivation as a key determinant of success in second language acquisition. High-achieving students exhibited strong intrinsic motivation, linking their English proficiency to professional aspirations and personal growth. For instance, a high-achieving student (HEng1) emphasized the necessity of English for workplace

communication and accessing technical resources, particularly in fields where most resources are in English. This aligns with Dörnyei's (2009) L2 Motivational Self System, which highlights instrumental motivation, where students view English as essential for achieving future career goals.

Conversely, low-achieving students exhibited lower motivation and weaker engagement, often viewing English as merely an academic requirement rather than a practical skill. One low-achieving student (LBBA2) acknowledged English as important but admitted a lack of curiosity and effort in improving proficiency, which hindered their progress. This supports Deci and Ryan's (1985) Self-Determination Theory, which states that a lack of intrinsic motivation results in minimal effort and lower academic performance. Additionally, Noels, et al. (2000) emphasize that self-regulated learners, those who set goals, manage their time effectively, and seek additional learning opportunities, are more likely to succeed in language acquisition. The findings indicate that high-achieving students demonstrated superior self-regulation strategies, proactively engaging with English through extracurricular exposure and self-study, while low achievers depended more on external instruction without independent practice.

Furthermore, attitudes toward English learning were a distinguishing factor between high- and low-achieving students. Gardner and Lambert (1972) argue that learners with positive attitudes integrate more effectively with the target language and persist in their studies. In this study, high achievers generally expressed positive attitudes toward English, emphasizing its global significance, while low achievers often described the subject as difficult or unnecessary for their future careers. This suggests that enhancing students' perceptions of English as a valuable skill beyond academia could improve engagement and achievement.

In summary, the study highlights the importance of student-related factors in English language achievement, showing a significant positive correlation. High-achieving students demonstrated strong intrinsic motivation, linking their English proficiency to professional and personal growth. Self-regulation also played a crucial role, with high achievers employing effective strategies like goal-setting and self-study. Conversely, low-achieving students exhibited lower motivation and engagement, viewing English as

merely an academic requirement and relied more on external instruction. Attitudes towards English learning further distinguished high achievers, who expressed positive views on its global significance, from low achievers, who saw it as difficult or unnecessary for their future careers.

## **2. Teacher Factors: Teaching Strategies and Student Perceptions**

Although teacher factors were perceived positively in the descriptive analysis ( $M = 3.79$ ), the regression analysis showed a negative correlation ( $\text{Beta} = -0.541$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). This finding suggests that, despite students appreciating their teachers' efforts, teaching methods may not be effectively addressing diverse student needs. The results align with Lightbown and Spada (2013), who argue that effective teaching is not solely about delivering content but also about engaging students through interactive methods.

Some high-achieving students acknowledged that their understanding improved after receiving instruction but noted that certain teaching strategies lacked clarity. One student (HEng3) mentioned that they could grasp the material after instruction but found initial explanations unclear, suggesting that teaching methods could be more structured to facilitate comprehension from the start. This is consistent with Vygotsky's (1978) Sociocultural Theory, which emphasizes scaffolded learning—where instructional support is gradually reduced as students gain independence. If students require additional explanation after instruction, this may indicate that teachers are not adequately scaffolding content for different learning levels.

For low-achieving students, traditional teaching approaches were particularly challenging. One student (LEng2) reported difficulty understanding lessons taught entirely in English, suggesting that blended instruction incorporating L1 (Thai) explanations could improve comprehension. This aligns with Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis, which argues that comprehensible input is critical for language learning, instruction should be slightly above students' current proficiency level but still accessible. If content is too difficult, without sufficient scaffolding or native language support, students may disengage.

Additionally, the findings suggest that the traditional, teacher-centered model may not effectively support students with different learning preferences. According to Richards and Rodgers (2014), CLT, which emphasizes interaction and

meaningful communication, is more effective than rote memorization, particularly for students struggling with traditional instruction. This aligns with feedback from low-achieving students who found passive learning methods (e.g., lectures, textbook-based teaching) less engaging and less effective. Given the negative correlation between teacher factors and English achievement, the study suggests that rigid instructional approaches may inadvertently hinder students rather than support them.

In summary, although teacher factors were positively perceived ( $M = 3.79$ ), regression analysis showed a negative correlation with English achievement. This suggests teaching methods may not effectively address diverse student needs. High-achieving students improved post-instruction but found initial explanations unclear, indicating a need for more structured methods. Low-achieving students struggled with traditional approaches, suggesting blended instruction with L1 (Thai) explanations could enhance comprehension. Traditional, teacher-centered models may not support varied learning preferences effectively, as passive learning methods were less engaging for low-achieving students.

### **3. Environmental Factors: Learning Context and Classroom Atmosphere**

Despite having the highest mean score in descriptive analysis ( $M = 3.96$ ), environmental factors did not significantly predict English achievement ( $\text{Beta} = 0.151$ ,  $p = 0.192$ ). This contradicts studies that emphasize the importance of learning environments in shaping language proficiency (Dörnyei, 2009; Farooq, et al., 2011). However, qualitative findings help clarify this discrepancy. Some students (LEng1) stated that the learning environment had little direct impact on their English learning, as they could adapt to any setting. Others (LBBA1) highlighted that a supportive classroom atmosphere with interactive activities and good teacher-student relationships helped maintain motivation.

These mixed perceptions suggest that while environmental factors contribute to engagement and comfort, they do not directly influence English proficiency unless actively integrated into learning strategies. This aligns with Bronfenbrenner's (1994) Ecological Systems Theory, which posits that the environment influences learning only in interaction with personal and social factors. Students with



high self-regulation skills were less dependent on environmental conditions, while those lacking self-motivation relied more on external structure.

Additionally, Milton (2009) argues that access to English media, extracurricular exposure, and technology-enhanced learning contribute more to proficiency than the physical classroom setting alone. In this study, students who actively sought out English materials beyond the classroom (e.g., watching English videos, reading English articles) tended to report higher achievement, while those relying solely on formal instruction were more likely to struggle. This suggests that providing structured opportunities for students to engage with English outside the classroom, such as digital learning platforms or immersive activities, could enhance overall achievement.

In summary, despite the highest mean score, environmental factors did not significantly predict English achievement. Students had mixed views: some adapted easily, while others benefited from a supportive classroom. Environmental factors aid engagement but don't directly impact proficiency unless integrated into learning strategies. Access to English media and extracurricular activities were more influential on proficiency than the physical classroom setting.

### **Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Further Studies**

While this study provides valuable insights into the factors influencing English language achievement among non-English major students, several limitations must be acknowledged. These limitations highlight areas for refinement in future research and suggest directions for further investigation to build upon the findings of this study.

#### **1. Limitations of the Study**

One key limitation of this study was the sample size and sampling method. The study focused on 125 fourth-year students from three faculties at Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna, Lampang, using convenience sampling. While the sample provided meaningful insights, it may not fully represent the broader population of non-English major students across different universities in Thailand. Future research

could employ random or stratified sampling across multiple institutions to enhance the generalizability of the findings.

Another limitation was the self-reported nature of the questionnaire and interviews. Participants' responses were based on their perceptions and experiences, which may have been influenced by personal biases or social desirability. While qualitative insights provided deeper context to the quantitative findings, objective measures of English proficiency, such as standardized English test scores, could strengthen future studies by offering more empirical evidence of language achievement.

Additionally, the study primarily examined student, teacher, and environmental factors but did not explore other potential influences on English learning, such as peer interaction, parental support, and cultural attitudes toward English. Future research could adopt a broader socio-educational perspective, incorporating factors related to family background, socioeconomic status, and social networks to gain a more comprehensive understanding of English language achievement.

A further limitation was the cross-sectional research design, which captured student perspectives at a single point in time. Language learning is a long-term developmental process, and factors influencing achievement may evolve over time. Longitudinal studies tracking students' English learning progress over multiple academic years could provide deeper insights into how motivation, instructional approaches, and environmental conditions shape language acquisition over time.

Finally, the study primarily focused on quantitative analysis, with qualitative data serving as a supplementary component. While the semi-structured interviews provided valuable context, a more balanced mixed-methods approach, such as classroom observations or teacher interviews, could provide a more holistic perspective on the learning process.

In conclusion, the study's limitations include the sample size and sampling method, focusing on 125 students from Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna Lampang which may not represent the broader population. Self-reported data may be influenced by biases, and future studies could benefit from objective measures like standardized test scores. The study did not explore other influences such as peer interaction and parental support. A cross-sectional design captured perspectives at one

point in time, suggesting longitudinal studies for deeper insights. Finally, a more balanced mixed-methods approach could provide a holistic view of the learning process.

## **2. Recommendations for Further Studies**

Based on the study's findings and limitations, several recommendations are proposed for future research to further understand and enhance English language achievement among non-English major students. First, future studies could integrate multiple qualitative data sources, including student learning diaries, teacher perspectives, and classroom interaction analyses, to triangulate findings and enhance research validity. Second, expanding the study to other university contexts would improve generalizability by examining English proficiency across multiple universities, including rural and urban institutions, public and private universities, and students from diverse socio-economic backgrounds. This broader approach would help identify common trends and contextual differences in English learning experiences.

Second, future research should incorporate standardized English proficiency tests, such as TOEFL, IELTS, or CEFR-based assessments, to provide more objective measures of language achievement. Relying solely on self-reported academic grades may not accurately reflect students' actual language proficiency, as grades can be influenced by institutional grading policies and subjective evaluation criteria. Using standardized tests would allow for more precise comparisons across different student groups and institutions.

Additionally, further studies could investigate additional influencing factors beyond student, teacher, and environmental aspects. Exploring the impact of peer influence, parental involvement, digital learning tools, and extracurricular activities on English language learning would provide deeper insights into the broader social and technological dimensions of language acquisition. Understanding how students engage with English media, social networks, and online learning platforms could also reveal modern trends in autonomous language learning and informal exposure to English outside the classroom.

A longitudinal research design is also recommended for future studies to track students' English development over multiple semesters or academic years. Since language learning is a continuous process influenced by evolving motivation,

instructional strategies, and external factors, a long-term study would provide a more dynamic understanding of how these variables interact over time. Observing students' progress longitudinally could offer more reliable insights into the effectiveness of different teaching methods and learning strategies.

Moreover, enhancing the mixed-methods approach by integrating classroom observations, teacher interviews, and student learning portfolios would provide a more comprehensive perspective on English learning experiences. While this study combined quantitative and qualitative methods, future research could strengthen data triangulation by directly observing classroom interactions, collecting teacher perspectives, and analyzing students' self-reported learning experiences over time. This approach would help identify gaps between instructional delivery and student expectations.

Finally, developing and testing pedagogical interventions would be a valuable direction for future research. Given the study's findings on motivation and teaching effectiveness, future studies could experiment with innovative instructional strategies, such as gamification, task-based learning, flipped classrooms, or AI-assisted learning tools, to assess their impact on students' engagement and proficiency. By implementing and evaluating new teaching methodologies, researchers could offer practical recommendations for educators and policymakers to enhance English language instruction in Thai universities and beyond.

By addressing these areas, future research can contribute to a more comprehensive and evidence-based approach to improving English language learning, ensuring that teaching practices align with students' needs, learning preferences, and evolving educational environments.

In conclusion, future research should integrate multiple qualitative data sources to enhance validity and expand to various university contexts for better generalizability. Incorporating standardized English proficiency tests like TOEFL or IELTS would provide objective measures of language achievement. Studies should also explore additional factors such as peer influence, parental involvement, and digital learning tools. A longitudinal design is recommended to track students' progress over time. Enhancing mixed - methods approaches with classroom observations and teacher

interviews would provide a comprehensive perspective. Testing innovative pedagogical interventions like gamification and AI-assisted learning tools could improve engagement and proficiency. Addressing these areas will contribute to a more comprehensive approach to improving English language learning.

### **Chapter Conclusion**

This chapter discussed the key findings of the study, highlighting the significant role of student factors in English language achievement, the surprising negative correlation between teacher factors and learning outcomes, and the minimal direct impact of environmental factors. The discussion integrated these findings with relevant theories and previous studies, emphasizing the importance of motivation, self-regulated learning, and adaptive teaching strategies in improving English proficiency. Additionally, the chapter outlined the limitations of the study, including the scope of the sample, reliance on self-reported grades, and the cross-sectional research design, which may limit the generalizability of the results. Recommendations for future research were provided, suggesting expanding the study to different university contexts, incorporating standardized proficiency tests, investigating additional influencing factors, adopting longitudinal research designs, and exploring innovative pedagogical interventions. These insights contribute to a deeper understanding of English language learning among non-English major students and offer practical implications for language education in Thailand.

### **Conclusion of the Study**

This study aimed to investigate the factors influencing English language achievement among non-English major students at Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna, Lampang and to compare the differences in influencing factors between high-achieving and low-achieving students. Using a mixed-methods approach, the research incorporated quantitative data from questionnaires and qualitative insights from semi-structured interviews to examine how student, teacher, and environmental factors shaped students' English learning experiences and outcomes.

The findings revealed that student factors, particularly motivation and self-regulated learning, were the strongest predictors of English achievement. High-achieving students demonstrated intrinsic and instrumental motivation, setting clear learning goals and actively engaging in English language practice. In contrast, low-achieving students exhibited lower motivation and struggled with engagement, often perceiving English as an academic requirement rather than a practical skill.

Teacher factors showed a negative correlation with English achievement, indicating that certain instructional approaches may not fully align with students' learning needs. While some students appreciated teacher preparedness and structured lessons, others, particularly low achievers, struggled with teaching methods that did not accommodate varied learning preferences and language proficiency levels. This suggests a need for more adaptive and interactive teaching strategies to support students at different proficiency levels.

Environmental factors, though perceived positively by students, did not significantly predict English achievement. While a supportive classroom atmosphere and access to learning resources contributed to engagement, students' individual motivation and learning habits played a more decisive role in determining success. This finding underscores the importance of learner autonomy and self-directed learning in English language acquisition.

Overall, the study emphasizes the need for pedagogical adjustments that align with students' motivational drivers, cognitive needs, and learning contexts. Future research should explore personalized teaching approaches, the integration of digital learning tools, and strategies to enhance student autonomy in English learning. By addressing these areas, educators and policymakers can develop more effective and student-centered English language programs, ultimately improving language proficiency and academic success among Thai university students.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, M. J. (1996). **Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print.** New York: MIT Press.
- Arora, N., & Singh, N. (2017). Factors affecting the academic performance of college students. **i-manager's Journal of Educational Technology**, 14(1), 47-53. <https://doi.org/10.26634/jet.14.1.13586>.
- Awla, H. A. (2014). Learning styles and their relation to teaching styles. **International Journal of Language and Linguistics**, 2(3), 241–245. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20140203.23>.
- Baker, W. (2012). From cultural awareness to intercultural awareness: Culture in ELT. **ELT Journal**, 66(1), 62-70. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr017>.
- Baker, W. (2015). **Culture and identity through English as a lingua franca: Rethinking concepts and goals in intercultural communication.** New York: Routledge.
- Baker, W., & Jarunthawatchai, W. (2024). English language education and educational policy in Thailand. In **The Oxford Handbook of English Language Teaching** (pp. 557–574). <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780192855282.013.30>
- Bandura, A. (1997). **Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.** New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Best, J. W. (1970). **Research in education.** New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Boone, H. N., & Boone, D. A. (2012). Analyzing Likert data. **Journal of Extension**, 50(2). Retrieved from <https://www.joe.org/joe/2012april/tt2.php>.
- Bryman, A. (2016). **Social research methods** (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Choomthong, D. (2014). Preparing Thai students' English for the ASEAN Economic Community: Some pedagogical implications and trends. **International Journal of Educational Research**, 12(1), 59–72.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). **Research methods in education** (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Routledge.



- Council of Europe. (2001). **Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). **Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches** (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). **Designing and conducting mixed methods research** (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Sage Publications.
- Crystal, D. (1997). **English as a global language**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2003). **English as a global language** (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). **Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior**. New York: Springer.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. **Psychological Inquiry**, 11(4), 227–268. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01).
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). **The psychology of second language acquisition**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Educational Testing Service, & Norris, J. M. (2020). *Validity evidence supporting the interpretation and use of TOEFL iBT scores* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). **TOEFL Research Insight Series**, 4(1).
- EF English Proficiency Index. (2021). **EF EPI 2020–Thailand**. Education First. Retrieved May 25, 2024, from <https://www.ef.com/wwen/eipi/regions/asia/thailand/>.
- Ellis, R. (2003). **Task-based language learning and teaching**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- El-Omari, A. H. (2022). The effectiveness of using a flipped classroom strategy in enhancing EFL students’ grammar performance and motivation. **Journal of Language Teaching and Research**, 13(1), 1–10.

- Erarslan, A. (2021). COVID-19 and online language teaching: A case study of higher education instructors in Turkey. **International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology**, 17(1), 182–193.
- Farooq, M. S., Chaudhry, A. H., Shafiq, M., & Berhanu, G. (2011). Factors affecting students' quality of academic performance: A case of secondary school level. **Journal of Quality and Technology Management**, 7(2), 1–14.
- Farrell, T. S. C., & Richards, J. C. (2007). **Reflective practice in language teaching: Research-based principles and practices**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foley, J. A. (2005). English in Thailand. **RELJ Journal**, 36(2), 223–234.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688205055578>.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). **Attitudes and motivation in second language learning**. New York: Newbury House Publishers.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). **Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation**. New York: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. (2007). Motivation and second language acquisition. **Porta Linguarum**, 8, 9–20.
- Graddol, D. (2006). **English Next: Why global English may mean the end of 'English as a foreign language'**. British Council.
- Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use. **System**, 31(3), 367–383.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(03\)00048-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00048-4).
- Habók, A., & Magyar, A. (2022). Investigating the relationship among English language learning strategies, language achievement, and attitude. **Frontiers in Psychology**.  
<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.953600/full>.
- Hanus, K. (2016). Factors that influence learning by English language learners (ELLs). **BU Journal of Graduate Studies in Education**, 8(2).
- Hasa, H. (2019). Why English is the global language?. **Linguistics Journal**, 14(1), 42–55.
- Hattie, J. (2009). **Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement**. New York: Routledge.

- Hayes, D. (2010). Language learning, teaching and educational reform in rural Thailand: An English teacher's perspective. **Asia Pacific Journal of Education**, 30(3), 305–319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2010.495843>
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. **The Modern Language Journal**, 70(2), 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x>.
- Janghorban, R., Roudsari, R. L., & Taghipour, A. (2014). Skype interviewing: The new generation of online synchronous interview in qualitative research. **International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being**, 9(1), 24152. <https://doi.org/10.3402/qhw.v9.24152>.
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. **Educational Researcher**, 33(7), 14-26. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033007014>.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). **English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education**. New York: Springer.
- Knapp, K., & Seidlhofer, B. (Eds.). (2009). **Handbook of foreign language communication and learning**. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). **The input hypothesis: Issues and implications**. New York: Longman.
- Liang, J., Pu, Y., Chen, J., et al. (2024). **Global prevalence, trend, and projection of myopia in children and adolescents from 1990 to 2050: A comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis**. *British Journal of Ophthalmology*. New York: Advance online publication.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). **How languages are learned** (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. **Language Teaching**, 40(3), 243–249. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004363>.
- Martirosyan, N. M., Hwang, E., & Wanjohi, R. (2015). Impact of English proficiency on academic performance of international students. **Journal of International Students**, 5(1), 60–71.

- McKinley, J., Yuksel, D., Soruç, A., & Horzum, B. (2023). Examining the role of English language proficiency, language learning anxiety, and self-regulation skills in EMI students' academic success. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 13(2), 399–426. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.38280>
- Mercer, S., & Ryan, S. (2010). Self-concept and language learning: Comparing language learners and non-language learners. *Innovations in Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(3), 219–232.
- Milton, J. (2009). **Measuring second language vocabulary acquisition**. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847692092>.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2009). **Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing**. New York: Routledge.
- Nishanthi, R. (2018). The importance of learning English in today's world. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, 3(1), 871-874.
- Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clément, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning*, 50(1), 57–85. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00111>.
- Noom-ura, S. (2013). English-teaching problems in Thailand and Thai teachers' professional development needs. *English Language Teaching*, 6(11), 139–147. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n11p139>.
- Office of the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education. (2015). **Thailand's Basic Education Core Curriculum (2008)**. Bangkok: Ministry of Education.
- Oxford, R. L. (2003). Language learning styles and strategies: An overview. *Proceedings of GALA*, 1–25.
- Pallant, J. (2020). **SPSS survival manual: A step-by-step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS (7<sup>th</sup> ed.)**. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Allen, J. P. (2012). **Handbook of early childhood education**. New York: Guilford Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). **Approaches and methods in language teaching (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667305>.

- Rodsawang, S. (2017). The development of English-speaking skills using the communicative approach for Grade 6 students. **Journal of Education, Mahasarakham University**, 11(4), 67–76.
- Rudd, M., & Honkiss, L. (2020). Analysing the correlation between English proficiency and academic performance among Thai university students. **Athens Journal of Education**, 7(1), 122–138. <https://doi.org/10.30958/aje.7-1-6>.
- Samperio, N. (2019). Learning strategies used by high and low achievers in the first level of English. **Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development**, 21(1), 75–89.
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. SAGE Publications.
- Sengkey, G., & Galag, H. (2018). The influence of learning motivation and learning environment on students' English learning achievement. **Journal of Educational Method and Technology**, 1(2), 45–52.
- Shi, H. (2021). English language learners' strategy use and self-efficacy beliefs in English language learning. **World Journal of Education**, 11(1), 86–97. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v11n1p86>.
- Small, H. (2010). Unpacking the suitcase: Learning styles and strategies in adult migrant education. **TESOL in Context**, 20(1), 5–19.
- Soland, J. (2019). English language learners, self-efficacy, and the achievement gap: Understanding the relationship between academic and social-emotional growth. **The Collaborative for Student Growth at NWEA Working Paper**.
- Sukavatee, P., & Khlaisang, J. (2023). A survey of research into English teaching approaches and instructional media in Thailand. **LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network**, 16(2), 752–769. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/266984>.
- Swatevacharkul, R., & Boonma, N. (2020). Learner Autonomy: Attitudes of Graduate Students in English Language Teaching Program in Thailand. **LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network**, 13(2), 176–193. retrieved from <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/243703>.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2010). **SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research** (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: SAGE Publications.

- Teng, L. S. (2022). Self-regulated learning and language learning strategies. In *Self-regulated learning and second language writing* (Vol. 26). Springer.  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99520-1\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99520-1_2)
- UNESCO. (2022). **The impact of digital learning on education in Southeast Asia**. New York: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Vibulphol, J. (2016). Students' motivation and learning and teachers' motivational strategies in English classrooms in Thailand. *English Language Teaching*, 9(4), 64–76. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n4p64>.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). **Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes**. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Waluyo, B., & Panmei, B. (2021). English proficiency and academic achievement: Can students' grades in English courses predict their academic achievement? *MEXTESOL Journal*, 45(4).
- Waluyo, B., Zahabi, A., & Ruangsung, L. (n.d.). **Language assessment at a Thai university: A CEFR-based test of English proficiency development**. Bangkok: School of Languages and General Education, Walailak University; School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi.
- Wu, X., Yang, H., Liu, J., & Liu, Z. (2022). English use anxiety, motivation, self-efficacy, and their predictive effects on Chinese top university students' English achievements. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 953600.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.953600>
- Yamane, T. (1967). **Statistics: An Introductory Analysis**. New York: Harper and Row.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 82–91. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1016>.

APPENDIX





## APPENDIX A

แบบสอบถาม เรื่อง ปัจจัยที่ส่งผลต่อผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษเชิงวิชาการของนักศึกษาระดับปริญญาตรี: กรณีศึกษามหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลล้านนา ลำปาง
Questionnaire for Factors Affecting Academic English Achievement of Undergraduate Students: A case study of Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna Lampang
ส่วนที่ 1 ข้อมูลส่วนบุคคล
1. รหัสนักศึกษา.....
2. คณะ.....
3. สาขา.....
4. เพศ.....
5. GPA .....
6. สถานศึกษาและแผนการเรียนเดิม.....

ส่วนที่ 2 ข้อมูลปัจจัยด้านการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ		5 (มากที่สุด)	4 (มาก)	3 (ปานกลาง)	2 (น้อย)	1 (น้อยที่สุด)
1. ปัจจัยด้านผู้เรียน						
1.1 เจตคติต่อการเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ						
	1) ฉันมีความชื่นชอบวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ					
	2) ฉันเห็นด้วยที่วิชาภาษาอังกฤษค่อนข้างยาก					
	3) ฉันรู้สึกพอใจและยินดีทุกครั้งที่ได้เรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ					
	4) ฉันตั้งใจเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษทุกครั้ง					
	5) ฉันรู้สึกกังวลเมื่อเข้าเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ					
1.2 ความรู้พื้นฐานเดิมของผู้เรียน						
	1) ฉันมีความรู้ด้านภาษาอังกฤษจากสถานศึกษาเดิม					
	2) ฉันเคยได้เรียนพิเศษวิชาภาษาอังกฤษมาก่อน					
	3) ฉันมีความรู้ภาษาอังกฤษจากการดูและฟังจากสื่อต่าง ๆ					

ส่วนที่ 2 ข้อมูลปัจจัยด้านการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ		5 (มากที่สุด)	4 (มาก)	3 (ปานกลาง)	2 (น้อย)	1 (น้อยที่สุด)
1.3 ความพร้อมของผู้เรียน						
	1) เวลาเข้าเรียนฉันตั้งใจฟัง และปฏิบัติตามที่ได้รับมอบหมายอย่างตั้งใจ					
	2) ฉันแบ่งเวลาการอ่านหนังสือและทบทวนบทเรียน					
	3) ฉันกล้าซักถามเมื่อไม่เข้าใจบทเรียนกับอาจารย์ผู้สอนและเพื่อนในห้องเรียน					
	4) ฉันเข้าเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษทุกคาบและตรงต่อเวลา					
	5) ฉันรู้สึ้อึดและขี้เกียจเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ					
1.4 แรงจูงใจในการเรียน						
	1) คิดว่าภาษาอังกฤษจะสร้างโอกาสในการประกอบอาชีพได้					
	2) ฉันคิดว่าการเก่งภาษาอังกฤษทำให้ฉันได้เปรียบกว่าผู้อื่น					
	3) ฉันคิดว่าภาษาอังกฤษมีประโยชน์มากในยุคปัจจุบัน					
	4) ฉันคิดว่าภาษาอังกฤษไม่ได้จำเป็นสำหรับฉันในโอกาสทางอาชีพ					
	5) ฉันคิดว่าการได้เกรดภาษาอังกฤษที่ดีไม่มีประโยชน์อะไร					
2 ปัจจัยด้านผู้สอน						
2.1 ความรู้ความเข้าใจในเรื่องที่สอน						
	1) อาจารย์อธิบายบทเรียนได้อย่างเข้าใจง่ายและชัดเจน					
	2) อาจารย์มีความรู้ในวิชาที่สอนเป็นอย่างดี					
	3) อาจารย์ชี้แจงแผนการสอนให้ฉันทราบ					
	4) อาจารย์มีทักษะในการสอนให้ฉันเกิดการเรียนรู้อย่างดี					
2.2 บุคลิกภาพผู้สอน						
	1) อาจารย์ผู้สอนมีท่วงทีกริยาจาที่สุภาพ น่าฟัง					
	2) อาจารย์ผู้สอนสร้างบรรยากาศความเป็นกันเองกับผู้เรียน					
	3) ฉันคิดว่าอาจารย์ดู ไม่เป็นมิตร ทำให้ฉันไม่ยอมเข้าเรียน					
	4) อาจารย์มีบุคลิกที่ทันสมัยไม่ล้าหลัง					

ส่วนที่ 2 ข้อมูลปัจจัยด้านการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ		5 (มากที่สุด)	4 (มาก)	3 (ปานกลาง)	2 (น้อย)	1 (น้อยที่สุด)
	5) ฉันคิดว่าอาจารย์ผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษฉันสอนเก่ง					
2.3 ความพร้อมในการเตรียมการสอน						
	1) อาจารย์จัดกิจกรรมเพื่อพัฒนาความรู้ที่หลากหลายและเป็นประโยชน์					
	2) อาจารย์ใช้สื่อที่เหมาะสม และน่าสนใจ เข้าใจง่าย					
	3) อาจารย์มีการเตรียมแผนการสอนในแต่ละบทเรียนมาเป็นอย่างดี					
	4) อาจารย์มีวิธีการสอนที่น่าเบื่อ ไม่น่าสนใจ					
2.4 การยอมรับความคิดเห็นของผู้เรียน						
	1) อาจารย์เปิดโอกาสให้ซักถามและแสดงความคิดเห็น					
	2) อาจารย์ไม่เปิดช่องทางให้แสดงความคิดเห็น					
	3) อาจารย์แสดงอาการไม่พอใจเมื่อผู้เรียนแสดงความคิดเห็น					
3. ปัจจัยด้านสภาพแวดล้อม						
3.1 สภาพแวดล้อมในห้องเรียน						
	1) ห้องเรียนไม่มีความสะดวกสบาย					
	2) ภายในห้องเรียนมีอุปกรณ์ที่เอื้อต่อการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษ					
	3) อาจารย์สร้างบรรยากาศในห้องเรียนที่ดี น่าเรียน					
	4) อาจารย์และผู้เรียนมีมิตรไมตรีที่ดีต่อกัน					
3.2 การสนับสนุนทางการเรียนของครอบครัว						
	1) ครอบครัว/ ผู้ปกครองสนับสนุนด้านการเงินอย่างสม่ำเสมอ ทำให้ฉันมีกำลังใจและตั้งใจในการเรียน					
	2) ครอบครัวให้กำลังใจและให้คำปรึกษาฉันเมื่อฉันมีปัญหา					
	3) ครอบครัวสนับสนุน ส่งเสริมให้ฉันพัฒนาการเรียนรู้ของฉัน					
	4) ครอบครัวติดตามดูผลการเรียนของฉัน					
3.3 ด้านการเรียนออนไลน์						
	1) การเรียนออนไลน์ทำให้ฉันเรียนไม่เข้าใจ					

ส่วนที่ 2 ข้อมูลปัจจัยด้านการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ		5 (มากที่สุด)	4 (มาก)	3 (ปานกลาง)	2 (น้อย)	1 (น้อยที่สุด)
	2) การเรียนออนไลน์ทำให้ฉันไม่ได้ปฏิสัมพันธ์กับอาจารย์และเพื่อน					
	3) การเรียนออนไลน์ทำให้ฉันได้มีโอกาสศึกษาค้นคว้าความรู้เพิ่มเติมด้วยตนเอง					
	4) การเรียนออนไลน์ทำให้ฉันทำงานที่ได้รับมอบหมายง่ายมากขึ้นกว่าในห้องเรียน					



## APPENDIX B

### แบบสัมภาษณ์เพื่อการวิจัยแบบกึ่งโครงสร้าง (Semi-structured Interview)

เรื่อง ปัจจัยที่ส่งผลต่อผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาระดับปริญญาตรี: กรณีศึกษา  
มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลล้านนา ลำปาง

ชื่อผู้วิจัย นางสาวณัฐพรรณ งามสม นักศึกษาระดับปริญญาโท หลักสูตรศิลปศาสตรมหาบัณฑิต  
สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยพะเยา

อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษา ดร.รัฐภาคย์ หัตถาวิชัยพรณ

สาขาวิชาผู้ให้สัมภาษณ์.....

GPA.....

เริ่มสัมภาษณ์เวลา..... สิ้นสุดการสัมภาษณ์เวลา.....

#### ส่วนที่ 1 ข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับผู้สัมภาษณ์

กรุณาเล่าประวัติโดยย่อเกี่ยวกับข้อมูลส่วนตัวในด้านต่อไปนี้

- 1) ประวัติการศึกษา (สถานศึกษา แผนการเรียน ผลการเรียน).....
- 2) ประสบการณ์ในการเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษที่ผ่านมา.....
- 3) ประสบการณ์ด้านการทำกิจกรรม/แข่งขันเกี่ยวกับทักษะภาษาอังกฤษ.....

#### ส่วนที่ 2 ปัจจัยที่ส่งผลต่อผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ

(แนวประเด็นคำถาม)

##### 1. ปัจจัยด้านผู้เรียน

- 1) ท่านมีเจตคติ/ความคิดเห็น อย่างไร ต่อการเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษสำหรับนักศึกษา

- 2) ท่านมีประสบการณ์/ความรู้ ด้านภาษาอังกฤษเป็นพื้นฐานเดิมมาแล้วอย่างไรบ้าง

- 3) ท่านคิดว่าท่านมีความพร้อมมากน้อยเพียงใดในการเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ

4) แรงจูงใจอะไร ที่มีส่วนทำให้ท่านคิดว่าการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นเรื่องที่สำคัญ

.....

.....

## 2. ปัจจัยด้านผู้สอน

1) ท่านมีความรู้ ความเข้าใจในเนื้อหาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษที่เรียนในห้องเรียนมากน้อยเพียงใด หลังจากได้รับการถ่ายทอดจากอาจารย์ผู้สอน

.....

.....

2) คุณลักษณะของอาจารย์ผู้สอนมีผลต่อการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษของท่านหรือไม่ อย่างไร

.....

.....

3) อาจารย์ผู้สอนมีความพร้อมในการเตรียมการสอน รวมไปถึงการเตรียมสื่อการสอน เนื้อหาสาระที่สอน รูปแบบการสอนหรือไม่ อย่างไร

.....

.....

4) อาจารย์ผู้สอนเปิดโอกาสให้มีการแลกเปลี่ยนเรียนรู้ หรือแสดงความคิดเห็นกับผู้เรียนในห้องเรียนหรือไม่อย่างไร

.....

.....

## 3. ปัจจัยด้านสภาพแวดล้อม

1) สภาพแวดล้อม หรือบรรยากาศในห้องเรียนมีความน่าเรียน จูงใจให้อยากมาเรียนหรือไม่ อย่างไร

.....

.....

2) ครอบครัว/ผู้ปกครอง สนับสนุน ส่งเสริม และให้กำลังใจในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษของท่านหรือไม่ อย่างไร

.....

.....

3) การเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษในช่วงโรคระบาดโควิด 2019 ที่ผ่านมา ส่งผลต่อการเรียนของท่านหรือไม่ อย่างไร

.....

.....

4. ปัจจัยอื่น ๆ

.....

.....





## APPENDIX C

### แบบสัมภาษณ์เพื่อการวิจัยแบบกึ่งโครงสร้าง (Semi-structured Interview)

เรื่อง ปัจจัยที่ส่งผลต่อผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาระดับปริญญาตรี : กรณีศึกษา  
มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลล้านนา ลำปาง

ชื่อผู้วิจัย นางสาวณัฐพรณ งามสม นักศึกษาระดับปริญญาโท หลักสูตรศิลปศาสตรมหาบัณฑิต  
สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยพะเยา

อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษา ดร.รัฐภาคย์ หัตถาวิสัยพรณ

สาขาวิชาผู้ให้สัมภาษณ์..... วิศวกรรมไฟฟ้า ..... GPA..... 3.75  
เริ่มสัมภาษณ์เวลา..... 18.00 น. .... สิ้นสุดการสัมภาษณ์เวลา..... 18.16 น.

#### ส่วนที่ 1 ข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับผู้สัมภาษณ์

กรุณาเล่าประวัติโดยย่อเกี่ยวกับข้อมูลส่วนตัวในด้านต่อไปนี้

- 1) ประวัติการศึกษา (สถานศึกษา แผนการเรียน ผลการเรียน)..... จบการศึกษามัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 6  
จากรร.หอพระวิทยาคม แผนการเรียน วิทยาศาสตร์-คณิตศาสตร์ เกรดเฉลี่ย 3.75
- 2) ประสบการณ์ในการเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษที่ผ่านมา..... มีประสบการณ์หลักสูตรจบโรงเรียน  
ไม่เคยเรียนพิเศษ
- 3) ประสบการณ์ด้านการทำกิจกรรม/แข่งขันเกี่ยวกับทักษะภาษาอังกฤษ..... ไม่เคยในระดับโรงเรียน  
แต่พอมีเวลาว่างก็ทำกิจกรรมภายในโรงเรียน

#### ส่วนที่ 2 ปัจจัยที่ส่งผลต่อผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ

(แนวประเด็นคำถาม)

##### 1. ปัจจัยด้านผู้เรียน

- 1) ท่านมีเจตคติ/ความคิดเห็น อย่างไร ต่อการเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษสำหรับนักศึกษา  
มหาวิทยาลัย มีภาพจำเป็นอย่างไรในอนาคต เร็วหรือช้าเกินไปในอนาคต  
การทำงาน เพศภาษาอังกฤษในที่ทำงาน มีจุดมุ่งหวังใช้ภาษาอย่างไร

- 2) ท่านมีประสบการณ์/ความรู้ ด้านภาษาอังกฤษเป็นพื้นฐานเดิมมาแล้วยังไรบ้าง  
รู้ศัพท์พื้นฐานทั่วไป / ที่เน้นหรือ ใช้เป็นประจำ
- 3) ท่านคิดว่าท่านมีความพร้อมมากน้อยเพียงใดในการเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ  
เข้าใจความพร้อมในระดับหนึ่งก่อนมีทดสอบ หรือ อบรมภาษาอังกฤษ
- 4) แรงจูงใจอะไร ที่มีส่วนทำให้ท่านคิดว่าการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นเรื่องที่สำคัญ  
นำไปใช้ในสังคมการทำงาน สื่อสารกับเพื่อนร่วมงาน ในที่ทำงาน เพราะงาน  
ด้านวิศวกร ของผลงานเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ จึงเป็นเรื่องสำคัญที่ต้องมีความรู้และทักษะ

## 2. ปัจจัยด้านผู้สอน

- 1) ท่านมีความรู้ ความเข้าใจในเนื้อหาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษที่เรียนในห้องเรียนมากน้อยเพียงใด  
หลังจากได้รับการถ่ายทอดจากอาจารย์ผู้สอน  
มีความรู้ เพราะ หลังจากได้รับบทเรียนถ่ายทอดจากอาจารย์ผู้สอน ก็มีความรู้  
มากขึ้นในระดับหนึ่ง
- 2) บุคลิกภาพของอาจารย์ผู้สอนมีผลต่อการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษของท่านหรือไม่ อย่างไร  
เหมาะสมดี
- 3) อาจารย์ผู้สอนมีความพร้อมในการเตรียมการสอน รวมไปถึงการเตรียมสื่อการสอน  
เนื้อหาสาระที่สอน รูปแบบการสอนหรือไม่ อย่างไร  
มีการแลกเปลี่ยนเรียนรู้การสื่อสาร สนทนาในห้องเรียน และ มีบรรยากาศ  
ที่สนุกสนาน เป็นกันเอง มีการเตรียมสื่อการสอน และรูปแบบการสอนมาเป็นอย่างดี
- 4) อาจารย์ผู้สอนเปิดโอกาสให้มีการแลกเปลี่ยนเรียนรู้ หรือแสดงความคิดเห็นกับผู้เรียนใน  
ห้องเรียนหรือไม่อย่างไร  
ในห้องเรียน อาจารย์เปิดโอกาสให้แลกเปลี่ยนความคิดเห็นกัน  
มีการโต้ตอบ สื่อสาร สนทนากัน บรรยากาศเป็นกันเอง

## 3. ปัจจัยด้านสภาพแวดล้อม

- 1) สภาพแวดล้อม หรือบรรยากาศในห้องเรียนมีความน่าเรียน จูงใจให้อยากมาเรียนหรือไม่ อย่างไร

จัดที่นั่งกลาง

- 2) ครอบครัว/ผู้ปกครอง สนับสนุน ส่งเสริม และให้กำลังใจในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษของท่านหรือไม่ อย่างไร

ครอบครัว สนับสนุนตลอดเวลา ทุกๆ เรื่อง

- 3) การเรียนวิชาภาษาอังกฤษในช่วงโรคระบาดโควิด 2019 ที่ผ่านมา ส่งผลต่อการเรียนของท่านหรือไม่ อย่างไร

ส่งผลมากเพราะไม่ได้สื่อสารกัน ทำให้ประสิทธิภาพในการเรียนลดลง ทำให้ไม่มีความสนใจ อยู่กับตนเองเยอะเกินไป ส่งผลให้เป็นเรียนยากกว่าเวลาจริง

## 4. ปัจจัยอื่นๆ

ไม่มี



## APPENDIX D



### บันทึกข้อความ

หน่วยงาน กองบริหารงานวิจัย งานมาตรฐานการวิจัยและสารสนเทศ โทร. 1049

ที่ อว 7308/ว 2438

วันที่ 21 พฤศจิกายน 2566

เรื่อง ขอแจ้งเลขที่โครงการและผลการพิจารณาโครงการจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์

เรียน นางสาวณัฐพรณ งามสม (นิสิตปริญญาโท สาขาภาษาอังกฤษ คณะศิลปศาสตร์)

ตามที่ ท่านได้ส่งเอกสารเพื่อขอรับการพิจารณารับรองจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์ ด้านมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ เรื่อง “ปัจจัยที่ส่งผลต่อผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ ของนักศึกษาระดับปริญญาตรี : กรณีศึกษามหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลล้านนา ลำปาง” (Factors Affecting English Language Achievement of Undergraduate Students: A case study of Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna Lampang) นั้น

ในการนี้ คณะกรรมการจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์ได้พิจารณาและมีมติรับรอง และได้ส่งเอกสารรับรองโครงการพร้อมทั้งขอแจ้งเลขที่โครงการของท่าน คือ HREC-UP-HSS 2.2/007/67 เพื่อความสะดวกรวดเร็วในการค้นหาข้อมูลและติดตามโครงการของท่าน ขอให้ท่านดำเนินการ ดังนี้

1. แจ้งเลขที่โครงการทุกครั้ง ที่มีการติดตามและสอบถามรายละเอียดเกี่ยวกับโครงการดังกล่าว
2. กรณีมีการส่งเอกสารใด ๆ เกี่ยวกับโครงการนี้ กรุณาระบุเลขที่โครงการดังกล่าว ทุกครั้ง

คณะกรรมการจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์ ใคร่ขอความร่วมมือท่านปฏิบัติตามข้อ 1 และข้อ 2 ไมเช่นนั้นทางคณะกรรมการจริยธรรมฯ จะต้องใช้เวลานานพอสมควรในการสืบค้นหาต้นฉบับ หรือรายละเอียดโครงการของท่านและอาจทำให้โครงการของท่านล่าช้าได้

จึงเรียนมาเพื่อโปรดทราบ

(ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ดร.นันทิพย์ เสมอเชื้อ)

ประธานคณะกรรมการจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์  
ด้านมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยพะเยา





คณะกรรมการจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์ ด้านมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยพะเยา  
The Human Research Ethics Committee of University of Phayao on Humanities and Social Sciences  
19 หมู่ 2 ตำบลแม่กา อำเภอเมือง จังหวัดพะเยา 56000 เบอร์โทรศัพท์ 05446 6666

#### เอกสารรับรองโครงการวิจัย

คณะกรรมการจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์ มหาวิทยาลัยพะเยา ดำเนินการให้การรับรองโครงการวิจัยตามแนวทางหลักจริยธรรมการวิจัยในคนที่เป็นมาตรฐานสากลได้แก่ Declaration of Helsinki, The Belmont Report, CIOMS Guideline และ International Conference on Harmonization in Good Clinical Practice หรือ ICH-GCP

**ชื่อโครงการ** : ปัจจัยที่ส่งผลต่อผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาระดับปริญญาตรี : กรณีศึกษา มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลล้านนา ลำปาง  
: Factors Affecting English Language Achievement of Undergraduate Students: A case study of Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna Lampang

**เลขที่โครงการวิจัย** : HREC-UP-HSS 2.2/007/67

**ผู้วิจัยหลัก** : นางสาวณัฐพรณ งามสม

**สังกัดหน่วยงาน** : คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยพะเยา

**ที่ปรึกษา** : ดร.รัฐภาค หัตถวิไลพรณ

**สังกัดหน่วยงาน** : คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยพะเยา

**วิธีทบทวน** : แบบเร่งรัด (Expedited)

**รายงานความก้าวหน้า** : ส่งรายงานความก้าวหน้าอย่างน้อย 1 ครั้ง/ปี หรือส่งรายงานฉบับสมบูรณ์หากดำเนินโครงการเสร็จสิ้นก่อน 1 ปี

ลงนาม

(ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ดร.น้ำทิพย์ เสมอเชื้อ)

ประธานคณะกรรมการจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์  
ด้านมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์

วันที่รับรอง : 17 พฤศจิกายน 2566

วันหมดอายุ : 17 พฤศจิกายน 2567

ทั้งนี้ การรับรองนี้มีเงื่อนไขดังที่ระบุไว้ด้านหลังทุกข้อ (ดูด้านหลังของเอกสารรับรองโครงการวิจัย)

นักวิจัยทุกท่านที่ผ่านการรับรองจริยธรรมการวิจัยต้องปฏิบัติตามดังต่อไปนี้

1. ดำเนินการวิจัยตามที่ระบุไว้ในโครงการวิจัยอย่างเคร่งครัด
2. ใช้เอกสารแนะนำอาสาสมัคร ใบยินยอม (และเอกสารเชิญเข้าร่วมวิจัยหรือใบโฆษณาถ้ามี) แบบสัมภาษณ์ และหรือแบบสอบถาม เฉพาะที่มีตราประทับของคณะกรรมการจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์ เท่านั้น
3. รายงานเหตุการณ์ไม่พึงประสงค์ร้ายแรงที่เกิดขึ้นหรือการเปลี่ยนแปลงกิจกรรมวิจัยใดๆ ต่อคณะกรรมการจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์ มหาวิทยาลัยพะเยา ภายในระยะเวลาที่กำหนด ในวิธีดำเนินการมาตรฐาน (SOPs)
4. ส่งรายงานความก้าวหน้าต่อคณะกรรมการจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์ ตามเวลาที่กำหนดหรือเมื่อได้รับการร้องขอ
5. การรับรองโครงการวิจัยของคณะกรรมการฯ มีกำหนด 1 ปี หลังจากวันที่คณะกรรมการมีมติให้การรับรอง ถ้าโครงการวิจัยยังไม่สิ้นสุด หรือดำเนินการไม่ทันตามกำหนด ผู้วิจัยสามารถเสนอขยายการรับรองโครงการวิจัยต่อไปได้ ตามแบบเสนอขอต่ออายุการรับรองโครงการที่ได้กำหนดไว้ก่อนอย่างน้อย 1 เดือน ก่อนวันหมดอายุตามที่กำหนดไว้ในหนังสือรับรอง
6. หากการวิจัยเสร็จสมบูรณ์ผู้วิจัยต้องแจ้งปิดโครงการตามแบบฟอร์มของคณะกรรมการจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์ มหาวิทยาลัยพะเยา

\*รายชื่อของคณะกรรมการจริยธรรมการวิจัยในมนุษย์ (ชื่อและตำแหน่ง) ที่เข้าร่วมประชุม ณ วันที่พิจารณารับรองโครงการวิจัย (หากร้องขอล่วงหน้า)

## BIOGRAPHY

NAME	Nattapan Ngamsom
DATE OF BIRTH	14 September 1994
PLACE OF BIRTH	Lampang, Thailand
INSTITUTIONS ATTENDED	2018 B.A. (English for International Communication), Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna Lampang, Lampang, Thailand
HOME ADDRESS	25 Moo.4, Nikompattana Subdistrict, Muang District, Lampang Province.
PUBLICATION	Ngamsom, N., & Huttayavilaiphan, R. (2025). Understanding English achievement differences among undergraduate students: Influencing factors and comparative insights. European Journal of Educational Research, 14(1), 267-282. <a href="https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.13.4.267">https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.13.4.267</a>
AWARD RECEIVED	-