

## **Integrating ICT In ESL Classroom: A Survey On Teachers' Perceptions In Using Frog VLE For English Lesson**

**Johan @ Eddy Luaran, Fariha Amalina Zoolkaffi, Jasmine Jain**

*Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi MARA,  
UiTM Puncak Alam Campus, 42300 Puncak Alam, Selangor, Malaysia  
farihaamalina05@yahoo.com  
School of Education, Taylor's University*

*Abstract: Information and Communication Technology (ICT) is a medium that can be utilised in English lesson. Frog VLE comes into the picture to embrace the use of ICT in Malaysian education. Hence, this research studied the perception in using Frog VLE in English lesson amongst English language teachers in nine secondary schools in Melaka Tengah district. This study employed quantitative research design whereby questionnaires were distributed to the desired sampling in the selected secondary schools. There were 42 respondents who were English language teachers and it was carried out as an online survey. The instrument was a combination of Likert-scale items and one open-ended question. The quantitative data was analysed using SPSS software whilst the open-ended question was analysed using thematic coding analysis. The results revealed that the English language teachers' level of knowledge was moderately high ( $M=2.59$ ,  $SD=0.77$ ). Meanwhile, the teachers' perceptions in terms of Frog VLE usefulness, ease of use, and students' motivation in English lesson was moderate ( $M=3.44$ ,  $SD=0.56$ ). In addition, the issues or challenges in Frog VLE integration was also rated moderate ( $M=2.98$ ,  $SD=0.74$ ). The suggestions to overcome the issues or challenges were grouped into organisational level, 87% and individual level 13% respectively. To conclude, the study explored the gaps in which the previous literature did not address which was the integration of Frog VLE in ESL lesson amongst the secondary schools. The suggestions of ways would also be insightful for MOE to develop suitable solutions for the arising issues as the suggestions were proposed by the teachers who were the direct users of Frog VLE.*

**Keywords:** *English language teachers, Frog VLE, ICT, perception, survey*

## INTRODUCTION

Humans have to cope with the fast development of the world as it is changing rapidly. For the generation of today, it is not a problem for them since they are born with it. ICT has been an integral part in today's era and Budhedeo (2016) asserted that ICT is valuable in education and has a direct role especially in digital literacy. In addition, Ministry of Education (2012) stated in Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025 that the 7th shift is to "leverage ICT to scale up quality of learning across Malaysia" (p. E-28). Various measures have been taken by MOE to step up the use of ICT for instance Smart Schools, virtual learning environments, distance and self-paced learning, and video library of best teaching practices. ICT is too wide that it covers many aspects. It includes software, hardware, media tools, social media networks, internet, and the list goes on. This is supported by Melor et al. (2013), as they said that radio, television, computers, Internet, social networks and others are technologies.

With the growing demand of technology in Malaysia, many schools are incorporating Frog VLE through the 1BestariNet project. According to Frog Asia (2016), Frog VLE is available to all 10000 schools in Malaysia and it was designed by Frog Education to make teaching simpler and improve teaching and learning, communication, and administration. When it was first introduced, it received a mixed reaction from teachers all over Malaysia. Some agreed with the idea and some felt that it was an additional burden to the workloads that teachers were facing. Termit and Noorma (2015) supported this and claimed that work load was a probable factor that influenced the teachers' negative perception towards the program. To implement a new thing in a norm really takes time. They further stated that the Frog VLE Project under 1BestariNet was initiated in MOE schools in 2011 but only 351 schools were involved and were categorised as Champion Schools. So, it has been 7 years now after its first introduction but the impact on the learners is not really apparent on how it changes the educational system. Moreover, schools are provided with computers and high-speed 4G internet connectivity but the implementation of Frog VLE is still questionable. Although Frog VLE is now made compulsory for teachers to use in some schools, there is an issue to use it due to the lack of facilities and a few barriers.

Currently, a new move by the government has been made to ensure teachers fully use Frog VLE in lesson and that is to provide school teachers with smartphones. A few states have been given the smartphones like Melaka, Kuala Lumpur, and Selangor. Being in the education system itself, the researcher personally feels that teachers need a lot of guidance to use Frog VLE in lesson. In order to use Frog VLE in a lesson, teachers have to undergo training and do preparation since there are many widgets and updates that teachers need to be familiarised with. GM1M (Guru Muda 1 Malaysia) is also created for young teachers to be skilful at using Frog VLE. As supported by Lee (2016) that GM1M is aimed to upgrade the skill of young teachers across Malaysia with the use of Frog VLE in teaching and learning in which it is a programme between the MOE, YTL Communications, and Frog Asia. However, the problem is the impact of Frog VLE is still doubted and makes some teachers ponder whether this is a good move by the ministry. Despite many efforts have been made by MOE and 1BestariNet, it is deemed as a failure by Public Accounts Committee (PAC). This is supported by Fernando (2016) who said that the project was considered a failure from user-end experience to supplying internet access to schools.

Other than this, the world has changed and so do the learners. Dealing with learners in those days were very much different with millennial learners. They are raised with many developments of technology. They are even too exposed to online gaming or spending too much time playing games and this is a major problem with teenagers nowadays. It is the job of the teachers to turn technology into a positive tool. We are living in the age of electronic communication and technology and children nowadays are very literate with technology. Frog VLE is a tool that can make students be fully engaged in learning as Prensky (2001) claimed that the students' thinking is evolving in parallel with modernity. So, it is not surprising that some students are no longer responding to the traditional teaching method like chalk and talk or rote learning. Learning lesson in a traditional way can also be interactive but not as interactive and engaging as using ICT because students can experience a lot more with it. Hence, if we ignore technology, learners' future may be at stake and damage the quality of learning that students can explore. Teachers should be able to see what Frog VLE can offer and this research tried to look at their openness to teaching method using Frog VLE.

Thus, this study looked into the English language teachers' perceptions on the use of Frog VLE in English lesson and the issues or challenges that hinder the low usage of Frog VLE. At the end, suggestions to overcome the issues or challenges were provided.


## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Structure Within a Learning Management System: Frog VLE**

Frog Asia has structured Frog VLE to involve school administrators, teachers, students, and parents. The basic features of Frog VLE are as follows (Frog Asia, 2016):

- 1.Content creation
- 2.Content management
- 3.Administration
- 4.Assessment
- 5.Reporting
- 6.Communication
- 7.Personalise
- 8.Content
- 9.Revision
- 10.Quizzes
- 11.Portals

As Frog VLE is also a learning management system (LMS), it follows the same structure of LMS but with slight differences. Figure 1 is the structure within a Frog VLE adapted from LMS:



**Fig. 1 Structure Within Frog VLE. Adapted from: Khine (2006)**

## Comparison Between Traditional Teaching and Frog VLE

Table 1 shows the comparison between Frog VLE and traditional teaching method. This table was revised for this study to suit Frog VLE platform.

**Table 1. Comparison between Traditional Teaching and Frog VLE**

Considering Factors	Traditional Teaching Method	Frog VLE
Resources	Resources available within a library or information centre unit. More expensive because you may take a lot of time searching for it.	Learning materials and resources available within the system are less expensive or free, partly because you do not have to pay for facilities.
Classroom discussion	The teacher usually talks more than the students	The students talk at least as much as or more than the teacher
Scheduling	Require you to attend class a certain number of times every week, at specific times during school days.	User-driven time and learning schedule
Course matter	The teacher conducts the lessons according to the syllabus and existing curriculum	The studying is based on various sources of information such as web data banks and teacher can carry out lesson according to the syllabus and curriculum
Learning process	The learning is conducted with whole class participating	Most of the learning process takes in groups or by an individual student
Location of learning	In the classroom, the learning takes place within the school and classroom	Discussion forum, video conference, chat rooms, the learning takes place with no fixed location
Motivation	The student's motivation is low, and subject matter is distant from them	The student's motivation is high, due to the involvement in matters that are related to them and with the use of technology
Interaction	Spontaneous, student can interact with other students	Structured, student can interact with other students and teachers virtually

Adapted from: Abdirahman, Nor Hidayati and Ahmed Hussein (n.d.)

## **Perceived Usefulness and Ease of Use of Frog VLE**

Perceived usefulness and ease of use of a technology tool are taken from Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) by Davis (1989). “Perceived Usefulness (PU) is defined as the degree to which person believes that using a particular system would enhance his or her job performance. Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU) refers to the degree to which a person believes that using a particular system would be free of effort” (Siaw & Agatha, 2015, p. 6). The TAM is an information systems theory that models how users come to accept a technology and how they use that technology. In TAM model, there are two factors that are relevant in computer use behaviours. For this study, it is the Frog VLE use behaviours. According to TAM, ease of use and perceived usefulness are the most important determinants of actual system use.

In this present study, PU helps to explore the English Language teachers’ beliefs whether Frog VLE could enhance the job performance. On the other hand, PEOU explores whether the teachers believe that the use of Frog VLE in lesson would make it easy for the teachers and it is free of effort.

## **Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences Theory and the Integration of Frog VLE in Teaching and Learning Process**

Logical/mathematical: Teachers can assign logical-based problems or quizzes and let students complete the task in Frog VLE.

Spatial/visual: Students can answer readily-available quizzes in Frog VLE at their own pace and space. The quizzes include diagrams, colours, arts, and graphs.

Intrapersonal: Students can build their own blog in Frog VLE as each student has a personal site and dashboard. They can treat that as their own personal space to write their thoughts.

Interpersonal: Students can use the forum or chat tools to have a discussion among them on a certain topic. This allows collaborative learning done in online manner.

Bodily-kinaesthetic: Videos and project can be embedded into Frog VLE platform which allow for the enjoyment of activities that involve movement. Students can do ‘scavenger hunts’ activity on the web while completing the task in Frog VLE.

Musical: Teachers can share link of videos or music and let students complete the task relating to the videos or music. Teachers can teach grammar through songs or videos in Frog VLE.

Verbal/linguistic: Teacher can give written assignments in Frog VLE in any topic on any skills; speaking, writing, reading, and listening.

These are only suggestions of activities that are linked to MI and Frog VLE whereby there are a lot more that can be done. The suggestions are based on Fose’s (n.d.) article on exploring technology to address students’ multiple intelligence and learning styles. Fisher (2005) suggested that in order to help learners in every lesson, teachers have to put attention on an aspect of thinking or intelligence. Indirectly, MI theory in Frog VLE links to students’ motivation in learning.

Jones (2002) studied on ICT and learning theories. One of the theories he explained in relation to ICT is multiple intelligence theory. He stated that teachers can develop many activities to enhance students’ multiple intelligences by giving them the opportunity to use content-free software like word processors. In another study by Kunjal (2015), he investigated the role of MI in e-learning and found out that students who had different intelligence were required to use an efficient manner of e-learning. Hence, a controlled usage of Frog VLE should be made known to the students so that they know what can help them to enhance learning.

### **Issues or Challenges in Using Frog VLE**

Issues and challenges in Frog VLE should be taken into consideration as these limits its usage in the class. With the purpose of apprehending this further, a lot of studies have been done to examine the challenges in full adoption of technology and Frog VLE in classrooms.

Albirini (2006) identified a few challenges in ICT usage in Syrian



education. The issues were teachers' lack of computer competence and computer access. The researcher further claimed that the major hindrance of the integration of technology in education was the scarcity of computer resources available for teachers and this had been extensively reported in the literature. Siti Nazuar (2014) distinctively studied on the barriers influencing teacher's technology integration. The barriers were classified into two groups that were first-order barriers and second-order barriers. It is understood that the first-order barriers were "limited access to computer and technical support, lack of technology training, and lack of time", whilst the second-order barriers were "teacher's knowledge, attitude, perception, beliefs and commitment towards technology" (p. 353). More interestingly, the researcher listed a few researchers who had studied on factors influencing integration of technology among teachers in Malaysian schools. They were Bakar and Mohamed, 2001; Darus and Luin, 2008; Lau and Sim, 2008; Mahmud and Ismail, 2010; Samuel and Abu Bakar, 2006; Wan Ali et al., 2009. Based on the factors found from the previous literatures, Siti Nazuar (2014) categorised the frequently-mentioned barriers into first-order and second-order barriers reported from these studies.

In a pilot study done by Siaw and Agatha (2015), they asserted that the main determinant factor is the lecturers' attitudes in using Frog VLE. It is noteworthy that the lecturers in this study had positive attitude to use Frog VLE and they were not negatively influenced by "technological complexity, facilitating conditions, and self-efficacy." (p. 15). In another research by Chipps, Kerr, Brysiewicz, and Walters (2015) on the LMS use of university students, they categorised the factors influencing LMS use to individual, organisational, and learning management factors. Individual factors involved having a computer, computer literacy, and individual attitudes towards technology. Meanwhile, organisational factors included training and support provided by instructors and the university. On the other hand, LMS factors that were examined were not relatively compatible to the issues or challenges in this study, hence this is omitted. The findings from this study showed that computer literacy was a significant factor for the implementation of LMS. Age and computer literacy affected the LMS use.

In another study to utilise Frog VLE by Termit and Noorma (2015), the challenges were insufficient duration of training and supply, inefficient internet access, time-consuming efforts to create teaching material online, and teachers' workload. Shahfiezul and Fariza (2015) studied on implementation and challenges in using Frog VLE among Malaysian schools. It is undisputable that there were a few challenges that were notifiable. The challenges were lack of teachers' knowledge, lack of time to prepare teaching materials online, inadequate ICT and internet access, and inadequate computer supply to cater to a large number of students.

All the researches were done in Malaysia except Albirini (2006). The similarity of all the studies was insufficient number of computer resources and access be it in Malaysian or foreign schools. Regarding technology, teachers and students need training to integrate technology or Frog VLE fully in lesson. This is the main reason that lack of training and support was considered as a factor that affected Frog VLE use from studies by Siti Nazuar, 2014; Chipps et. al., 2015; Termit and Noorma, 2015; Shahfiezul and Fariza, 2015. Nor Fadzleen, Halina, and Haliza (2013) affirmed that "in the context of Malaysian schools, the ineffective and limited ICT mastery of teachers and learners has always been identified as the main argument for the project success in Malaysian schools. This is accurate seeing that a few of the mentioned studies detected ICT or computer literacy as a challenge as well.

#### RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the English language teachers' level of knowledge of Frog VLE?
2. What are the English language teachers' perceptions towards the usage of Frog VLE in terms of the usefulness, ease of use, and motivation of students?
3. What are the English language teachers' issues or challenges when using Frog VLE in English lesson?
4. What are the suggestions to overcome the issues or challenges that English language teachers face when using Frog VLE in English lesson?

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study used quantitative approach for the researcher to address the research objectives and to assess the findings of the research based on the data collected. However, to get a more enriched data, qualitative data was obtained through one open-ended question on suggestions to overcome issues or challenges, in the questionnaire. The survey was conducted using questionnaires to English language teachers from 9 secondary schools in Melaka Tengah district. The questionnaire was prepared online in Google Form and the link was distributed to a representative of English language teachers from each school. Specifically, for the purpose of this research, the questionnaire was adapted from another research, Albirini (2006) because construction of a questionnaire even it is straightforward is always a laborious and challenging task (Fraenkel et. al., 2016). The questionnaire adapted a few sections from the original questionnaire to access information exclusively for section A, B, and C. Section D was developed after going through different literatures on issues or challenges and then were added to the questionnaire. Whilst section E was a self-developed open-ended question. This was also to ensure the validity and reliability of the instrument. The items in the questionnaire were adapted from Albirini's research on teachers' attitudes toward ICT. The instrument had gone through a few changes. Since the existing questionnaire was about ICT, the words computer and ICT were changed to Frog VLE. The questionnaire was designed to be close-ended and the perceptions were measured based on Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree since it is most suitable to be used to assess perceptions and attitudes as supported by Peterson (2000), who said that Likert-type scales are often used to find out the basis of summated opinion of respondents. This is a cross-sectional survey whereby the survey would be carried out one time only.

In section A of the instrument, it focused on demographic profiles of the respondents that are of gender, age, years of teaching, type and name of school, highest qualification, Frog VLE training course, experience of computer use, and time of using Frog VLE. In section B, the focus was on the teachers' perceptions in terms of three dimensions that are 1) usefulness, 2) ease of use, and 3) students' motivation when using Frog VLE in English lesson. Section C focused on teachers' level of knowledge of Frog VLE. Section D identified the issues or challenges that the teachers faced when

using Frog VLE. Finally, section E was an open-ended question asking for suggestions of ways to solve the issues or challenges identified in section D.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Section A: Demographic Data of the Respondents

**Table 2. Demographic Data of the Respondents**

Profile	Data	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	11	26.2
	Female	31	73.8
Age Group	20 to 29 years	18	42.9
	30 to 39 years	13	31.0
	40 to 49 years	6	14.3
	50 to 59 years	5	11.9
Years of Teaching Experience	Less than 1 year	3	7.1
	1 to 5 years	15	35.7
	6 to 10 years	12	28.6
	11 to 15 years	4	9.5
	16 to 20 years	1	2.4
	Over 20 years	7	16.7
Type of School	Urban	20	47.6
	Rural	22	52.4
Highest Completed Academic Degree	Bachelor's degree	41	97.6
	Master's degree	1	2.4
Attendance of training course, workshop, or seminar on using Frog VLE	No	8	19.0
	Yes	34	81.0
Experience of computer use	1 to 5 years	5	11.9
	6 to 10 years	11	26.2
	More than 10 years	26	61.9
How long have you been using Frog VLE?	Less than 6 months	4	9.5
	6 months to 1 year	4	9.5
	1 to 3 years	27	64.3
	More than 3 years	7	16.7
	Total	42	100.0

RQ1: What is the English language teachers' level of knowledge of Frog VLE?

It was found out that the overall teachers' level of knowledge of Frog VLE was moderately high ( $M=2.59$ ,  $SD=0.77$ ). This was due to the high mean range scale  $2.50 \leq 2.59 \leq 4.00$ . The findings from this section in Table 3 revealed that the English language teachers had the lowest level of knowledge in creating,  $M=2.51$  and  $SD=0.79$ . The teachers had the highest level of knowledge in assigning,  $M=2.68$  and  $SD=0.82$ . 81% of the respondents had attended training course and 64.3% of them had

1 to 3 years of experience using Frog VLE. However, findings indicated that despite having 1 to 3 years of experience, it was apparent that the teachers in this study did not have very high competence level which they should have acquired after years of using it. They were only good at using certain tools or resources and this was supported by Rosnaini and Mohd Arif (2010, as cited in Moganashwari & Parilah, 2013) that only a small number of teachers were very good in ICT. Thus, this was likewise to this study. This could be due to the constraints in terms of the teachers' perceptions and issues or challenges of Frog VLE which would be discussed in the subsequent sections.

**Table 3. Level of Knowledge of Frog VLE Dimensions**

Dimension	Mean	SD	Level
Creating	2.51	.79	High
Assigning	2.68	.82	High
Using	2.56	.77	High
Overall Level of Knowledge of Frog VLE	2.59	.77	High

1=No competence, 2=Little competence, 3=Moderate competence, 4=Much competence

RQ2: What are the English language teachers' perceptions towards the usage of Frog VLE in terms of its usefulness, its ease of use, and motivating students?

The quantitative findings in Table 4 revealed that the teachers had high level of perception in Frog VLE usefulness compared to the ease of use and students' motivation with the mean score of 3.53 (SD=0.62). This finding seemed to be aligned with Ghavifekr and Ibrahim (2015) that most teachers were aware that ICT was very useful to improve teaching. Most of the teachers believed that using Frog VLE would enhance the job performance in the item “\*I have never seen Frog VLE being used as an educational tool” (M=3.95, SD=0.91). Since this was a reversed score item, the teachers perceived that Frog VLE was used as an educational tool. This perhaps that English language teachers knew that Frog VLE was useful to English lesson and it was a tool in education as it caters to students' multiple intelligences strengths. On the other hand, ease of use and students' motivation obtained the same mean score 3.40 (SD=0.54 and 0.64) respectively. The teachers seemed to have moderate perception of Frog VLE in Frog VLE ease of use and students' motivation. The teachers perceived the highest that Frog VLE created an interest in learning (M=3.69, SD=0.78). The reason for this could be because Frog VLE has plethora of tools and resources. Moreover,

today's generation is closely related to digital media in their lives. Hence, when Frog VLE is relevant to their lives, they would feel interested to learn as supported by Keller (1987). This was also proven to be true by Arumugam and Abdul Halim (2013) as they found out that the Malaysian secondary school teachers agreed that technologies increased students' interest in learning.

**Table 4. Perception of Frog VLE Dimensions**

Dimension	Mean	SD	Level
Usefulness	3.53	.62	High
Ease of Use	3.40	.54	Moderate
Students' Motivation	3.40	.64	Moderate
Overall Perception	3.44	.56	Moderate

1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree

RQ3: What are the English language teachers' issues or challenges when using Frog VLE in English lesson?

The findings highlighted that the teachers had the highest level of issue in the First-Order Issues (M=3.08, SD=0.70) compared to Second-Order Issues (M=2.88, SD=0.88) (refer to Table 5). First-order issues were identified as the external factors of Frog VLE like limited access to computer, lack of training, and technical support. Meanwhile, second-order issues were identified as internal factors within an individual like teachers' knowledge, attitude, beliefs, and perception. Hence, the findings showed that the teachers had the highest level of issues with the external factors; first-order issues or challenges.

This finding was paralleled to a study conducted by Siti Nazuar (2014) who revealed that the lack of technology facilities was the main reason teachers did not integrate technology. Several studies had also shown internet access seemed to be the dominant problem when it came to integrating technology (Frog VLE) in Malaysian classroom (Ghavifekr & Ibrahim, 2015; Melor et. al, 2013; Mohamed Azmi, Zeehan, Fahad, Maryam, & Hisham, 2012; Nor Akma & Norizan, 2014; Shafiezul & Fariza, 2015; Siti Nazuar, 2014; Termit & Noorma, 2015). This has been the greatest hindrance when teachers integrated technology in the lesson. Arumugam and Abdul Halim (2013) attained the same result that teachers agreed that the obstacles were mainly lack of technical support, lack of professional development on how to integrate technology, lack of funding, and lack of time.

**Table 5. Overall Mean Score of Items in Issues or Challenges in Frog VLE**

No.	Dimension and Item	Mean	SD	Level
<b>Dimension 1: First-Order Issues</b>				
8.	There is internet instability and reduced speed connectivity at school	3.60	1.01	High
4.	There is a lack of facilities at schools. E.g.: Chrome books and computers	3.48	1.13	Moderate
5.	There is a lack of technical support	3.48	1.02	Moderate
7.	There are flaws/instability of servers of Frog VLE	3.38	1.08	Moderate
9.	There is lack of maintenance on Frog VLE from YTL communication	3.33	1.00	Moderate
6.	There is a lack of ready-to-use contents and good practices examples of Frog VLE	3.17	1.15	Moderate
3.	There is insufficient covering of Wireless internet connection at home	3.14	1.28	Moderate
10.	I do not get enough training to be skilled in using Frog VLE	3.14	1.03	Moderate
2.	I do not have Internet access at home.	2.12	1.04	Low
1.	I do not have a computer at home that I can use.	1.93	.75	Low
<b>Overall First-Order Issues Score</b>		<b>3.08</b>	<b>.70</b>	<b>Moderate</b>
<b>Dimension 2: Second-Order Issues</b>				
11.	I have limited knowledge on how to make full use of Frog VLE	3.05	.96	Moderate
15.	It is difficult to manage Frog VLE	3.00	1.15	Moderate
13.	I do not have time during school hours to use Frog VLE	2.95	1.23	Moderate
14.	I have limited understanding on how to integrate Frog VLE into teaching	2.86	1.12	Moderate
12.	Frog VLE is too hard and complicated to use.	2.52	.92	Moderate
<b>Overall Second-Order Issues Score</b>		<b>2.88</b>	<b>.88</b>	<b>Moderate</b>

1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree

RQ4: What are the suggestions to overcome the issues or challenges that English language teachers face when using Frog VLE in English lesson?

Findings in Table 6 had shown that suggestions were proposed more in the organisational level than the individual level with the total frequency of 40 and the percentage of 87%. Meanwhile, the suggestions for the individual level had the frequency of six and the percentage of 13%. The second highest suggestion given by the teachers was to provide a stable server for the site to run smoothly (F=11, P=27.5%) and this seemed to be related with the main issue in Table 5 which was the instability of internet and reduced speed connectivity at school. Budhedeo (2016) supported this suggestion that government should ensure that schools and educational institutions are equipped with high quality of internet access.

The individual level for the suggestions to overcome issues or challenges of Frog VLE had five proposed ways. The highest number of suggestion was to learn and identify other ways to accept Frog VLE system (F=2, P=33.3%). Despite suggesting this way, it was not made clear what kind of way is suitable for the teachers and students to accept Frog VLE system. In addition, there was a paucity of research and studies done on the suggestion of ways at individual level. Hence, this section was not able to be supported

with any previous works.

**Table 6. Suggestions to Overcome Issues or Challenges of Frog VLE**

No.	Dimension and Item	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<b>Organisational Level</b>			
1.	Give more training, support and resources (eg: module of Frog VLE)	12	30
2.	Provide a stable server for the site to run smoothly	11	27.5
3.	Supply enough computers at school (eg: netbooks, Chromebook, PC)	7	17.5
4.	Revert to traditional teaching	2	5
5.	Provide conducive environment	2	5
6.	Update and simplify Frog VLE interface	2	5
7.	Provide smartphone or Tab for students	2	5
8.	Make Frog VLE more accessible on the phone	1	2.5
9.	Vary materials in Frog VLE related to the curriculum	1	2.5
<b>Overall Organisational Level Total</b>		<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Individual Level</b>			
1.	Learn and identify other ways to accept Frog VLE system	2	33.3
2.	Search for information of Frog VLE in Google	1	16.7
3.	Make extra time to learn and use in class	1	16.7
4.	Add more out of school time exposure of Frog VLE	1	16.7
5.	Improve computer skills	1	16.7
<b>Overall Individual Level Total</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\*This totals 46 rather than 42 because a few respondents provided more than one answer

## CONCLUSION

Frog VLE has the advantages to improve and transform teaching and learning in the classroom. Khine (2006) asserted that it gives “flexibility for both teacher and student” (p. 183). She then affirmed that it has “plethora of tools that are built in the system” and will provide a dynamic learning environment with ample support to make sure learning objectives are achieved. Using ICT in education is a methodology that is seen as a need in the global world today. Nonetheless, in order to achieve the maximum usage of Frog VLE in English lesson, support and contributions are needed from MOE to teachers.

Based on the responses given by the respondents, majority of them viewed Frog VLE positively and agreed that it is useful in students’ learning even though a lot of improvements have to be carried out by the MOE, State Education Department (JPN), and schools since majority of the challenges were in term of first-order issues like limited access to computer and internet and lack of training which ultimately impacted the use of Frog VLE amongst the teachers. Thus it is hoped, the results from this study could contribute to the betterment of Malaysian education system, regarding Frog VLE



integration in the teaching of English language amongst school teachers in Malaysia.

## **REFERENCES**

- Abdirahman, A. A., Nor Hidayati, Z., & Ahmed Hussein, E. (n.d.). An Evaluation of Virtual Learning Environment Readiness in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). *Journal of Information Systems Research and Innovation*, 1(4), 86-94.
- Albirini, A. (2006). Teachers' attitudes toward information and communication technologies: the case of Syrian EFL teachers. *Computers & Education*, 47(4), 373-398. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2004.10.013
- Arumugam, R., & Abdul Halim, M. (2013). Issues of ICT Usage among Malaysian Secondary School English Teachers. *English Language Teaching*, 6(9), 74-82. doi:10.5539/elt.v6n9p74
- Budhedeo, S. H. (2016). Issues And Challenges in Bringing ICT Enabled Education To Rural India. *International Journal Of Scientific Research And Education*, 4(1), 4759-4766. doi:10.18535/ijrsre/v4i01.01
- Chippis, J., Kerr, J., Brysiewicz, P., & Walters, F. (2015). A Survey of University Students' Perceptions of Learning Management Systems in a Low-Resource Setting Using a Technology Acceptance Model. *CIN: Computers, Informatics, Nursing*, 33(2), 71-77. doi:10.1097/cin.0000000000000123
- Davis, F.D. (1989). Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13 (3), 319-340.
- Fernando, F. (2016, November 1). PAC wants review of RM4b 1BestariNet project. *New Straits Times Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.nst.com.my/news/2016/11/184917/pac-wants-review-rm4b-1bestarinet-project>
- Fisher, R. (2005). *Teaching Children to Learn*. Cheltenham: Nelson Thornes Ltd.

- Fose, L. E. (n.d.). Exploring Technology: To Address Student Multiple Intelligences and Learning Styles. Retrieved from ITS Technology & Learning Services, Cal Poly State University, San Luis Obispo website: [https://web.calpoly.edu/~lfose/articles/Exploring\\_Technology.pdf](https://web.calpoly.edu/~lfose/articles/Exploring_Technology.pdf)
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2016). How to design and evaluate research in education (9th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Frog Asia. (2016). Frog VLE | FrogAsia Sdn Bhd. Retrieved from <https://frogasia.com/en/frog-vle/>
- Ghavifekr, S., & Ibrahim, M. S. (2015). Effectiveness of ICT Integration in Malaysian Schools: A Quantitative Analysis. *International Research Journal for Quality in Education*, 2(8), 1-12.
- Jones, A. J. (2002, September). Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association, University of Exeter, England. Paper presented at British Educational Research Association, University of Exeter, England. Retrieved from <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00002496.doc>
- Keller, J. M. (1987). Strategies for stimulating the motivation to learn. *Performance + Instruction*, 26(8), 1-7. doi:10.1002/pfi.4160260802
- Khine, M. S. (Ed.). (2006). *Teaching with Technology: Strategies for Engaging Learners*. Jurong: Prentice Hall Pearson Education South Asia Pte Ltd.
- Kunjal, B. M. (2015). The Role of Multiple Intelligence in E-Learning. *International Journal for Scientific Research & Development*, 3(5), 1076-1081. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281550248>
- Lee, C. (2016, February 14). Learning beyond the classroom. The Star Online. Retrieved from <http://www.thestar.com.my/news/education/2016/02/14/learning-beyond-the-classroom/>

- Melor, M. Y., Norazah, N., Hadi, S., Choo, H. S., & Mohamed, A. E. (2013). Pros and Cons of Using ICT in Teaching ESL Reading and Writing. *International Education Studies*, 6(7), 119-130. doi:10.5539/ies.v6n7p119
- Ministry of Education, (2012). Preliminary report - executive summary: Malaysia education blueprint 2013-2025
- Moganashwari, K., & Parilah, M. S. (2013). Knowledge, Attitude and Use of ICT Among ESL Teachers. *GSE Journal of Education*, 1(1), 185-199
- Mohamed Azmi, H., Zeehan, S. I., Fahad, S., Maryam, F., & Hisham, A. (2012). Assessment Of Students' Perceptions Towards E-Learning Management System (E-LMS) In A Malaysian Pharmacy School: A Descriptive Study. *Malaysian Journal of Public Health Medicine*, 12(1), 14-20.
- Nor Akma, M., & Norizan, A. R. (2014). The Use of Malaysia Netbook in English Language Learning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 302-309. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.041
- Nor Fadzleen, S., Halina, M. D., & Haliza, Z. (2013). Derivation for design of Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) framework for Malaysian schools. 2013 International Conference on Research and Innovation in Information Systems (ICRIIS). doi:10.1109/icriis.2013.6716772
- Peterson, R. A. (2000). *Constructing effective questionnaires*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1-6. doi:10.1108/10748120110424816
- Shahfiezul, S., & Fariza, K. (2015). Persekitaran Pembelajaran Maya Frog (VLE-FROG) Di Sekolah-Sekolah Di Malaysia: Pelaksanaan Dan Cabaran. Paper presented at Prosiding Seminar Kebangsaan Pendidikan Negara Kali Ke-5, Malaysia.

- Siaw, N. H., & Agatha, F. U. (2015). A Pilot Study on Factors Affecting the Use of Frog Virtual Learning Environment. *Jurnal Penyelidikan IPG KBL*, 12, 1-17.
- Siti Nazuar, S. (2014). Barriers influencing teacher's technology integration in their teaching practice. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 8(23), 352-358.
- Termit, K., & Noorma, H. (2015). Teachers' Readiness to Utilize Frog VLE: A Case Study of a Malaysian Secondary School. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science*, 5(1), 20-29. doi:10.9734/bjesbs/2015/11965

