# E-Learning Readiness in Language Learning: Students' Readiness Survey and Normalization Process (語言學習中的電子學習準備度：學生準備度調查和正常化過程)

Lee, Siu-lun
(李兆麟)
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
(香港中文大學)
slee@cuhk.edu.hk

**Abstract:** This paper presented a case study concerning students' e-learning readiness in a tertiary institution in Hong Kong. The study used questionnaire survey and focus-group discussions to elicit students' expectations towards using information technology in language learning. Students' expectations were compared with institutional targets; which were analyzed through institutional documents and meetings with teachers and course leaders. The result showed that the characteristics, habits and expectations of students; though may subject to change with the advancement of computer technologies; may not always match with institutional targets. If such mismatch happened, institution/teachers needed to understand students' IT habits and expectations, on one hand; and on the other hand, instructional strategies, trainings for teachers and students are needed to be developed in order to smooth the normalization process.

**摘要：**本文是一個案例分析，討論了香港高等教育機構學生的電子學習準備程度。文中的研究使用了問卷調查和焦點小組討論，探討學生使用信息科技學習語言時的期望。本文亦通過文本研究和與教師及課程負責人面談分析學院期望及所訂立的電子輔助語言教學目標。本文將學生的期望與學院教學目標進行比較。結果顯示，學生的特點，學習習慣和期望雖然可能隨著計算機技術的進步而改變，但不一定能匹配學院或教師所訂立的教學目標。如果這種不匹配的情況發生，學院或課程主管需要了解學生對於使用科技產品學習的習慣和期望，從而製定教學策略及為教師提供培訓。另外教師也需要為學生提供適當的培訓和為學生訂立清晰的學習目標，以便順利完成正常化進程。

**Keywords:** e-learning readiness, students' expectation, institutional targets, normalization

**關鍵詞：**電子學習準備度，學生期望，學院目標，正常化

 

## 1. Introduction: Institutional background and targets

I would like to give my readers some background information of this paper. I am currently working in one of the tertiary institutions in Hong Kong. My university caters hundreds of exchange students every year from all over the world. Exchange students are interested in learning Chinese and selected Hong Kong as their exchange destination. Apart from Chinese (Putonghua and Cantonese) courses for exchange students, university provides Putonghua trainings for local Hong Kong undergraduates and Cantonese trainings for non-local undergraduates. Non-local undergraduates constitute about 13.3% of the university enrolment (The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2015). These students came from Mainland China, Taiwan, Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia and India etc. It is because of the "Trilingual and Biliteracy official language policy" stipulated by the *Basic Law of Hong Kong* since 1997, both Putonghua and Cantonese are two official spoken languages in Hong Kong. University undergraduates can take Putonghua or Cantonese courses from beginning level to advanced levels depending on their language background and academic needs.

Each Putonghua/Cantonese course constitutes 3 credits with 3 contact hours. Since 2009, Hong Kong education had gone through a series of education reform. One of which was to extend the 3-year university curriculum to 4 years. A general belief, in view of this, considered that university needed to cater a lot more students with existing resources. Since then, university senior management suggested to implement e-learning in language courses offered to university undergraduates. Because of the implementation of these e-learning projects, language centers and language teachers were very "excited", but in fact, nervous about the change. Teachers had to follow the instructions and finish the task on time. Since it is a top-down administrative policy, university administration provided teacher training on computer literacy and on the use of educational technologies on university and on departmental level.

## 2. Institutional targets and linguistic theories behind the language curriculum

From official documents from the university, university language courses focuses on outcome-based learning and on the pragmatic use of language in real life contexts. Program outcomes (PO1 to PO3) of the courses were set forth by senior management of the university according to this principle. The learning outcomes indicated that the language courses need to focus on language use, such as, the abilities "to ask and respond to questions" (in PO1), "to communicate personal meanings" (in PO2), "to participate actively in conversations on various topics in some formal and most informal settings" (in PO3). Detailed descriptions of major programme outcomes (PO) are listed below.

- (PO1: for levels 1-2) Able to ask and respond to simple questions, convey minimal meaning and satisfy a very limited number of immediate needs.
- (PO2: for levels 3-4) Able to participate in simple conversations on predictable topics, obtain information by asking and answering questions, combine learned materials to communicate personal meanings, can satisfy basic personal needs and

 

social demands.

- (PO3: for Advanced levels) Able to participate actively in conversations on various topics in some formal and most informal settings, handle a wide variety of speaking tasks with communicative strategies, deal effectively with unanticipated complications in oral communication, can satisfy the requirements of school and work situations.

## 3. Teachers' design of e-learning materials

From several formal and informal discussions organized with language teachers at the university, all teachers put lots of efforts to create e-learning materials and courseware after the official implementation documents had been published. All teachers tried to use their knowledge of linguistic theories as well as teaching methodologies to design the e-materials and pilot them in their courses. With this urgent and important task, teachers just used their best knowledge to accomplish it. This came to a situation that teachers with structural linguistic trainings focused designing e-learning materials based on linguistic structures, such as correct usage of vocabulary items learnt, syntactic correctness, etc. To use the term in Xu (2015), these are behaviouristic/structural CALL or restricted CALL. Behaviouristic/structural E-learning courseware consisted of listening comprehension questions, listen-and-respond question and answer, based on grammaticality and correct use of lexical items. E-learning question types are mainly multiple-choice, true/false and matching.

On the other hand, teachers believing language as a communicative tool focused to design interactive CALL or communicative CALL (Xu, 2015). Interactive E-learning courseware included speaking tasks, express-your-opinion tasks and small report task. E-learning task types are mainly open-ended speaking questions.

Institutional documents and meeting records showed that teachers all worked hard to fulfill the tasks set out by the university. E-learning materials designed and used by teachers for students' weekly practice at the pilot stage of e-learning implementation were collected. Table 1 below summarized and analyzed the general picture of e-learning tasks prepared by teachers teaching Cantonese to non-local students as well as teachers teaching Putonghua to local students at the piloting stage of e-learning implementation. The e-learning materials shown in Table 1 was categorized according to teachers own categorization.

**Table 1: Collection of e-materials designed by course teachers of Cantonese courses for non-local students (CCAN) and Putonghua courses for local students (CPTH) from beginning to advanced level**

| Course codes and course titles | E-learning materials for weekly listening skills practices | E-learning materials for weekly speaking skills practices |
|---|---|---|
| CCAN1703 Elementary | **Recognition of speech sounds** (20 multiple choice questions) | **Pronunciation practices** (1 reading aloud exercise) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Cantonese for non-local students | **Listening comprehension**<br>(10-12 multiple choice questions)<br>(10 true/false questions) | **Vocabulary exercises**<br>(5-10 multiple choice questions)<br>(5-10 matching questions)<br>(10 fill-in-the-blanks questions)<br><br>**Speaking exercises**<br>(1 Question-&-answer question)<br>(1 situational topic)<br>(1-3 picture descriptions questions) |
| CCAN2703 Intermediate Cantonese for non-local students | **Pronunciation recognition**<br>(2 multiple choice questions)<br><br>**Listening comprehension**<br>(5-10 multiple choice questions)<br>(10 question-&-answer questions) | **Vocabulary exercises**<br>(5-10 picture description questions)<br>(6-10 multiple choice questions)<br>(5 matching questions)<br><br>**Speaking exercises**<br>(10 question-&-answer questions)<br>(1-4 question-&-answer questions based on video viewing)<br>(2 situational topics)<br>(1 picture description speaking question) |
| CCAN3703 Advanced Cantonese for non-local students | **Not available** | **Vocabulary exercises**<br>(3 translation questions)<br>(10 matching questions)<br>(5 multiple choice questions)<br><br>**Speaking exercises**<br>(3 question-&-answer questions)<br>(1-2 situational topic)<br>(4 question-&-answer questions based on video viewing) |
| CPTH1703 Beginning Putonghua for local students | **Pronunciation recognition**<br>(20 multiple choice questions)<br><br>**Listening comprehension**<br>(2 multiple choice questions) | **Vocabulary exercises**<br>(10 multiple choice questions) |
| CPTH2703 Intermediate Putonghua for local students | **Pronunciation recognition**<br>(20 multiple choice questions)<br><br>**Reading comprehension**<br>(3 multiple choice questions) | **Vocabulary exercises**<br>(15 multiple choice questions)<br>(3-4 fill-in-the blanks questions)<br><br>**Speaking exercises**<br>(1 situational topic) |

 

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| CPTH3703 Advanced Putonghua for local students | **Pronunciation recognition**<br>(5-9 multiple choice questions)<br>(10 matching questions)<br><br>**Listening comprehension**<br>(30 questions) | **Pronunciation exercises**<br>(10 multiple choice questions)<br><br>**Vocabulary exercises**<br>(10 multiple choice questions) |

Table 1 summarizes different types of e-learning materials prepared by teachers teaching Cantonese to non-local students and teachers teaching Putonghua to local students from beginning level to advanced level. If we look at e-learning materials prepared by teachers, we can see that there were different emphases with different task types. However, majority of the exercises focused on language structures. Structural CALL was used as a mean to the communicative end. The implementation of Structural CALL is understandable for its easiness to administrate and to quantify students learning results.

By observation and from informal feedback from students, it is discovered that some e-learning materials were more popular or claimed by students more helpful and useful. Then I started to develop some research questions concerning the implementation of the e-learning project. These questions included, Are our students ready to e-learning in language learning? Are our students' expectations matching with the current e-learning courseware design? Are our students' satisfied with the e-learning design?

## 4. Literature review: "E-learning readiness"

In the literature, there were articles or research reports talking about e-learning readiness on different levels. There were articles discussing information and communication technology (ICT) readiness on national level (Aydin & Tasci, 2005; Schreurs, Ehlers, & Sammour, 2008; Laohajaratsang, 2009; Omoda-Onyait & Lubega, 2011; and Hashim & Tasir, 2014). These studies mainly focused on developing assessment tools to review the readiness to e-learning in education on a national level. Aydin & Tasci (2005) discussed the availability of human resources when developing e-learning projects, emphasis were given to institutional cultures and stressed the importance of staff training. Laohajaratsang (2009) analyzed the situations in Thailand and discussed the infrastructure related to e-learning development; the readiness of educational institutions in terms of hardware availability and staff arrangement as well as promotion strategies of e-learning projects. Omoda-Onyait & Lubega (2011) analyzed the Ugandan situations and revealed that awareness, culture, technology available, pedagogy

 

and content needed are important in assessing e-learning readiness.

There were also some research focusing on institutional readiness towards e-learning in different parts of the world at educational settings. Mafenya (2013) researched institutions providing distance learning in South Africa. Oketch (2013) did their research in Nariobi, Kenya focusing on tertiary education. Tubaishat & Lansari (2011) studies a university in the Gulf Region. These studies concluded that students in these regions think that e-learning contribute positively to learning in general. Kaurs & Abas (2004) studied an Open University in Malaysia and found out that policy makers and regulatory bodies have to take into account the degree of e-readiness of the students and teachers in order to design and implement efficient e-learning programmes. Mercado (2008) and Saekow & Samson (2011) focused on tertiary education in Thailand and discussed that the common successful factors included, clear and well-defined goals of the e-learning programmes as well as systematic teachers training. Ouma & Awuor (2013) studied some secondary schools in Kenya and analyzed teachers' and students' computer literacy and their perception towards the use of e-learning. Their results showed that there was a positive correlation between computer literacy and e-learning acceptance in the secondary schools. Nisperos (2014) studied tertiary education in Sudan and pointed out that successful implementation depended on the assessment of organizational readiness which helped to determine how best the e-learning project can be implemented with the available recourses and culture. Hetty Rohayani, Kurniabudi & Sharipuddin (2015) studied higher education in Indonesia and highlighted that e-readiness is one of the most vital aspect for achieving successful implementation of e-learning programmes.

Some research targeted at teachers' readiness to new e-learning environment (Eslaminejad, Masood, & Ngah, 2010; Paturusi, Chisaki, & Usagawa, 2014), while some focused on students' perceptions and expectations towards e-learning learning model (Hung, Chou, Chen, & Owen, 2010; Paechter, Maier, & Macher, 2010; Wu, Tennyson, & Hsia, 2010; Vilonis, Bakanoviene, & Turskiene, 2013). In the literature, some studies (Hung, Chou, Chen, & Owen, 2010; Eslaminejad, Masood, & Ngah, 2010; Paturusi, Chisaki, & Usagawa, 2014) attempted to build up a framework to assess e-readiness from teachers' and students' perspectives and most studies emphases that apart from hardware and physical resources availability, factors such as computer self-efficacy (Hung, Chou, Chen, & Owen, 2010; Paturusi, Chisaki, & Usagawa, 2014), motivation for learning (Hung, Chou, Chen, & Owen, 2010), design of e-learning based courses (Eslaminejad, Masood, & Ngah, 2010; Paturusi, Chisaki, & Usagawa, 2014) were important factors in e-learning implementation. On teachers' side, willingness to teach by adopting new technology, ability to deliver e-materials and to provide e-content for teaching, willingness to use the virtual environment and utilization of computer and internet, familiarity with online teaching principle became the most important factors. On students' side, e-learning system functionality, content feature, amount of interaction, learning climate, achievement goals and performance expectations significantly affected learning satisfaction (Wu, Tennyson, & Hsia, 2010). In addition, students' assessments of teachers' expertise in e-learning as well as teachers' supports and peer-support in collaborative learning were related to learning achievement and course satisfaction (Paechter, Maier, & Macher, 2010).

 

From the literature, we can see that e-learning readiness, either in institutional level or in individual level, are of great concern to education policy makers, administrators, curriculum developers as well as frontline teachers. Topics including readiness of administration and management of e-learning project, course design and content, computer self-efficacy of teachers and students, teachers' and students' motivations to use e-learning as well as trainings for teachers and students were emphases. This paper presents a survey with focus group study to look at tertiary students' ICT habits and e-learning expectations in Hong Kong. The research result can provide some relevant data to educators interested in the implementation of e-learning projects in the area and some insights in research methodology and to administrators who are going to implement e-learning in educational contexts.

## 5. The survey

In the implementation of e-learning curriculum, it suggested that educators and teachers need to look at the real situations so as to engineer education process (Colpaert, 2016). Colpaert (2016) suggested that language teachers or institutions needed to make clear which technology to use, which content to use, why, how, when and where as well as the justifications for the choice. This paper investigates how ready students are from a university in Hong Kong about using computer technology in language learning. In the research of this paper, 600 questionnaires were randomly sent out to undergraduate students studying in different faculties in my university. All the students were given a set of pre-course questionnaire and a set of post-course questionnaire. The pre-course questionnaire showed students' learning habit with educational technology and expectations. The post-course questionnaire tried to elicit if there was any change in learning habit, expectations and satisfaction towards e-learning. 533 valid questionnaires were returned with a return rate of about 89%. Of the 533 questionnaires, 365 were from Hong Kong local students and 168 were from non-local undergraduate students who came from different areas, such as America, England, Japan, Korea, Indonesia, India, different parts of Mainland China, etc. At the end of each post-course questionnaire, respondents were invited to focus group discussions. 10 students (including 5 local students and 5 non-local students) attended the focus group discussion arranged in casual settings. Data collected from the focus group study was mainly used to check and to re-confirm the questionnaire survey data.

## 6. Students' readiness to e-learning

From the pre-course questionnaire survey, we can understand the device that students are using. Looking at the ICT device CUHK students are using, majority of the students possess "Windows™" device either desktop (41%) or notebook (84.1%). Only 2.8% uses Macintosh desktop and 9.2% uses Macbooks. For mobile devices, 29.3% of the students possess iphone™, ipad™ or a version of ipods. 10.9% students possess Android device. The data shows that since the number of students possess

 

mobile device (iOS and Android) is quite large 83.8% (58.6% iOS+25.2% Android), there is a potential to develop online materials based on mobile device or with cloud technology.

### 6.1 Students' ICT habit

There are media report saying that youngsters nowadays are addicted to mobile devices, such as tablets and smartphones (Wallace, 2016). It is interesting that the data in the survey data shows that the motivation of using computers and mobile devices to learn languages is just average.

Majority of the CUHK students (63.8%) spend 1 to 4 hours every day for using ICT device for various learning activities including web-based learning, blogging, social networking, web-surfing for information. 97.1% of the CUHK students indicated that they will use ICT device for learning and all the respondents (100%) in the non-local Mainland group indicate a positive answer. 88.4% of CUHK students indicated that they are willing to use ICT devices in language learning activities. Majority of the non-local Mainland students (97.6%) are willing to use ICT in language learning. This is due to the fact that primary and secondary school in Mainland already have systematic plans in e-learning and students from Mainland already get used to this mode of learning (Zheng, Bao, & Chen, 2014).

### 6.2 Students' willingness to use ICT devices in language learning

77.9% of CUHK students are willing to use notebook computers in their language learning activities. 92.3% of non-local Mainland student population indicated that they are willing to use notebook computers in their learning activities while 71.2% of local student population indicates their wishes.

The university targeted most of the piloting designs in the e-learning project on Cantonese courses for non-local Mainland students and on Putonghua courses for local students. We can take a look at students' preference in using ICT devices for their language learning in terms of language skills when we put the language skills in rank order which the students are willing to use ICT devices to practice. Among the different language skills, listening skills are in the highest rank of the list that students are willing to use ICT device to practice. 73.5% of CUHK students are willing to use ICT devices in practicing listening skills. The second and third in the rank are pronunciation practice (55.5%) and reading comprehension practice (49.7%). The fourth in the rank is speaking skills (25.9%). The lowest in the rank is writing skills (18.2%). The willingness between local and non-local Mainland students are similar however, the percentage of non-local students indicate that they are willing to use ICT devices to practice the different language skills is overall higher than that of the local students. This result reflects that the non-local Mainland students group is more ready to use ICT device in language learning.

 

In terms of e-exercises or e-activities formats, CUHK students like "multiple choice" and "interactive Q/A" most. Non-local Mainland students are in favour of "interactive Q/A". However, "fill in the blanks" and "short answers" are less favorite e-activities types. 28.7% of CUHK students (44% of CU non-local Mainland students) indicate that e-learning should be linked to classroom activities.

### 6.3 Students' expectations of e-learning in the context of second/foreign language learning

About expectation of effectiveness in e-learning, 68.5% thinks that the effectiveness is average. When asking what kind of language skills students thinks ICT devices/e-learning can help, the highest rank is listening skills. The second is pronunciation improvement. The third is speaking ability. The fourth is reading skills and the lowest is writing skills. This result echoes with the results from the questions asking which skills students are willing to practice with ICT devices.

The questionnaire data provides important information for e-learning designers. According to the data, of course e-learning developers or teachers can develop some pilot courses and implement e-learning step by step. However, we can see that there are some mismatch among students' expectations, teachers' e-learning design and the institutional targets. Students ranked high for practicing listening skills with ICT technology while relative low for practicing speaking skills. The expectations and expected effectiveness of students showed similar result. However, in the analysis of institutional documents and teachers' meeting minutes, speaking skills is of top priority in language courses. Looking at the e-materials designed, there were a large variety of CALL tasks, including structural CALL and communicative CALL. From students' perspective, students are willing to work on multiple choice questions in listening e-tasks and interactive Q/A in speaking tasks. In view of these differences, if e-learning developers emphasized "customer's" or "user's" views, the e-learning design will lean on the questionnaire data. On the other hand, if the e-learning developers look more at the institutional targets, the design will become a top-down approach. Under such approach, both teachers and students needed to be trained to accommodate and follow the instruction from the "higher authority". In such a situation, language teachers will struggle among the different forces, which is "learners' habits and expectation", "teachers' training" and "institutional orientation". In many cases, an equilibrium point is hard to reach because such equilibrium depends on the relative strengths and interplays of the different forces and relies on so many factors. In such cases, it is useful to look at the "normalization" process in the e-learning implementation.

## 7. Normalization process: Matching Institutional expectations, teachers' beliefs and students' expectation

"Normalization" refers to social process through which ideas and actions come to be seen as "normal" and "natural" in everyday life (Foucault, 1990; May et al., 2009). Foucault (1990) used the term "normalization" to describe an idealized norm of conduct.

He used the standard ways that soldiers should stand and march as an example. Conforming to or deviating from this ideal will be rewarded or punished. Foucault (1975) described the power of "normalization" in a community as "disciplinary power" and suggested that "the power of normalization imposes homogeneity; but it individualizes by making it possible to measure gaps, to determine levels, to fix specialties and to render the differences useful by fining them one to another" (Foucault 1975, P.184). Normalization process had its root in technological innovation in healthcare. May et al. (2009) suggested a framework for understanding the social process by which news ways of thinking, working as well as technology become routinely incorporated in everyday work. They discussed three major issues in normalization process, namely "implementation", "embedding', and "integration". "Implementation" in normalization process refers to a social organization that brings a practice or practices into action. "Embedding" means "the process through which a practice or practices become. (or do not become), routinely incorporated in everyday works of individuals and groups" (May et al. 2009, p.2) and "integration" means "the process by which a practice or practices are reproduced and sustained among the social matrices of an organization or institution" (May et al 2009, p.2). When discussing the use of technology in language teaching and learning, such normalization process is of utmost important. Whether students and teachers are treating the innovation or implementation of technological aspects in teaching by the university as "natural" routine affects the success and result of the implementation. On teachers' side, teachers' trainings and meetings in e-learning projects narrows the gaps between the teaching ideology teachers and the institutions they are working at. On the students' side, training and well-planned curriculum can help students "normalize" the innovation into their learning habits.

Many e-learning research shows that teachers are struggling with the implementation of e-learning project due to heavily daily teaching load (Eslaminejad, Masood, & Ngah, 2010) and that teachers have different professional training on linguistic theories which shaped their e-learning task designs (Eslaminejad, Masood, & Ngah, 2010; Paechter, Maier, & Macher, 2010). Teachers' e-learning task design may or may not match with institutional targets or learning outcomes. Systematic teachers' training and periodic meetings are necessary to guide teachers in designing the e-learning task as well as to implement the e-learning project by conveying the designated targets and purposes to the students. Such trainings and periodic meetings are important both in the e-learning designing and preparation phase and during the implementation phase. Trainings and periodic meetings can help balance the different language skills, such as listening, speaking, reading and writing according to the teaching and learning targets set by the institution and by the university. Trainings and periodic meetings can also help standardization of question types, such as multiple choice questions, vocabulary item matching and open-ended speaking questions, etc, according to institutional targets and balance the weights of different CALL types (structural CALL, communicative CALL and interactive CALL) according to institutional targets and students' expectation. In the case of my university, adjustment and restructuring of e-learning materials through meetings, internal workshops had come up with a revised version which put emphases on speaking proficiency and balance the weight among different CALL types. The revised versions, shown in Table 2, regulated question types, amount of questions and balanced

 

of skills according to the institutional targets discussed in teachers' meetings and trainings.

**Table 2: Finalized e-materials used in Cantonese courses for non-local students (CCAN) and Putonghua courses for local students (CPTH) from beginning to advanced level**

| Course codes and course titles | E-learning materials for weekly listening skills practices | E-learning materials for weekly speaking skills practices |
|---|---|---|
| CCAN1703 Elementary Cantonese for non-local students | **Recognition of speech sounds (pre-class exercises)**<br>(10 multiple choice questions)<br><br>**Listening comprehension (post-class exercises)**<br>(10 multiple choice questions) | **Pronunciation drills (pre-class exercises)**<br>(1 reading aloud exercise)<br><br>**Vocabulary exercises (pre-class exercises)**<br>(10 fill-in-the-blanks questions)<br><br>**Vocabulary exercises (post-class exercises)**<br>(10 multiple choice questions)<br><br>**Speaking exercises (post-class exercises)**<br>(1 situational topic) |
| CCAN2703 Intermediate Cantonese for non-local students | **Listening exercises (post-class exercise)**<br>(1 speaking topic responding to video viewing) | **Pronunciation drills (pre-class exercises)**<br>(1 reading aloud exercise)<br><br>**Vocabulary exercises (pre-class exercises)**<br>(10 fill-in-the-blanks questions)<br><br>**Speaking exercises (post-class exercises)**<br>(1 situational topic) |
| CCAN3703 Advanced Cantonese for non-local students | **Listening exercises (post-class exercise)**<br>(1 speaking topic responding to video viewing) | **Pronunciation drills (pre-class exercises)**<br>(1 reading aloud exercise)<br><br>**Vocabulary exercises (pre-class exercises)**<br>(10 fill-in-the-blanks questions)<br><br>**Speaking exercises (post-class exercises)** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | (1 situational topic) |
| CPTH1703 Beginning Putonghua for local students | **Recognition of speech sounds (pre-class exercises)**<br>(10 multiple choice questions)<br><br>**Listening comprehension (post-class exercises)**<br>(10 multiple choice questions) | **Pronunciation drills (pre-class exercises)**<br>(1 reading aloud exercise)<br><br>**Vocabulary exercises (pre-class exercises)**<br>(10 fill-in-the-blanks questions)<br><br>**Vocabulary exercises (post-class exercises)**<br>(10 multiple choice questions)<br><br>**Speaking exercises (post-class exercises)**<br>(1 situational topic) |
| CPTH2703 Intermediate Putonghua for local students | **Listening exercises (post-class exercise)**<br>(1 speaking topic responding to video viewing) | **Pronunciation drills (pre-class exercises)**<br>(1 reading aloud exercise)<br><br>**Vocabulary exercises (pre-class exercises)**<br>(10 fill-in-the-blanks questions)<br><br>**Speaking exercises (post-class exercises)**<br>(1 situational topic) |
| CPTH3703 Advanced Putonghua for local students | **Listening exercises (post-class exercise)**<br>(1 speaking topic responding to video viewing) | **Pronunciation drills (pre-class exercises)**<br>(1 reading aloud exercise)<br><br>**Vocabulary exercises (pre-class exercises)**<br>(10 fill-in-the-blanks questions)<br><br>**Speaking exercises (post-class exercises)**<br>(1 situational topic) |

In the process of normalization, not only teachers' trainings are important. Students' trainings are also needed. As we can see from the student readiness survey data, there are some mismatches between students' expectations and institutional targets.

In the pre-course survey data, more students are willing to use IT device in practicing listening skills (73.5%) and pronunciation practice (55.5%) than learning other language skills, such as reading (49.7%), speaking (25.9%) and writing (18.2%). However, speaking skills of Cantonese/Putonghua in different contexts, "speaking skill to satisfy immediate needs" (in PO1), "speaking skill to satisfy basic personal needs and social demands" (in PO2) and "speaking skill to satisfy the requirements of school and work situations" (in PO3) are the targeted learning outcomes. Such a mismatch resulted in an average rating of expected effectiveness. Majority of the students (68.5%) feel that the expected effectiveness of e-learning towards language learning. In view of this, the institution re-designs the language curriculum and puts e-learning modules as part of the teaching curriculum and teaching activities.

| Online/ Classroom Activities | Online practice (Pre-classroom activities) | | Classroom teaching activities | Online practice | Online assessments | Classroom tasks | Course assessments & learning outcomes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Purposes of tasks & teaching activities** | **Semi-authentic language inputs** | **Analyzing & Mimicking semi-authentic inputs** | **Vocabulary usage with pragmatic focuses** | **Reinforcement** | **Diagnostic** | **Feedback & Learning outcomes 1** | **Learning outcomes 2** |
| | | | | | | | |
| Tasks and teaching activities | - Listening to texts (audio/video) | - Read aloud tasks and speaking drills | - Voc. Usage<br>- Voc. Activities<br>- Question-and-Answer<br>- Sentence making | - Pronunciation practices<br>- Listening comprehension practices | - Text reading<br>- Speaking tasks (with language situations) | - Situational role-plays<br>- Presentations | - Mid-term presentation<br>- Final presentation<br>- Oral Exam |

**Figure 1: Curriculum integrating e-learning and classroom teaching in a blended mode**

Figure 1 shows the curriculum design which incorporate e-learning modules with classroom teaching. E-learning modules in the curriculum are not only part of the grading requirements, but e-learning tasks also become part of the classroom activities as pre-task activities. Before the implementation of e-learning project, drilling exercises focusing on pronunciation accuracy as well as practices on vocabulary items and language structures were done in classroom. After the implementation of e-learning project, these exercises were placed online for students to work on before the class. Adopting the flipped classroom concept (Greg, 2011; Abeysekera & Dawson, 2015), the language classroom focuses on language. Activities, such as topical discussions, role-plays and debates can be organized in classroom. These activities not only foster actual language use in authentic or semi-authentic settings, but also encourage team work and collaborative learning. This flipped classroom and blended learning mode becomes a weekly routine of students.

## 8. Conclusion

The present study attempts to investigate the readiness of university students

toward the use-learning/information technology in language teaching and learning. Survey on e-learning readiness is important for teachers and administrators understand students' ICT habits and expectations. Students' expectations do not always match with teachers' expectations as well as the pedagogical beliefs of the institution. To implement CALL, normalization process is an important aspect for administrators to investigate when analyzing e-readiness and efficiency in implementation. For effective implementation, not only teachers need training, students also need adjustments and trainings in terms of computer efficacy, motivation for e-learning and self-directed learning, learners' learning habit and culture in order to naturalize or normalize e-learning in their academic life.

## References

Abeysekera, L., & Dawson, P. (2015). Motivation and cognitive load in the flipped classroom: definition, rational and a call for research. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *34*(1), 1-14.

Aydin, C. H., & Tasci, D. (2005). Measuring readiness for e-learning: reflections from an emerging country. *Educational Technology & Society*, *8*(4), 244-257.

Colpaert, J. (2016). Big content in an educational engineering approach. *Journal of Technology and Chinese Language Teaching*, *7*(1), 1-14.

Eslaminejad, T., Masood, M., & Ngah, N. A. (2010) Assessment of instructors' readiness for implementing e-learning in continuing medical education in Iran. *Medical Teacher*, *32*(10), 407-412.

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, New York: Random House.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An introduction*. New Yok: Vintage.

Greg, T. (2011). Flipped classrooms take advantage of technology. *USA Today*, 6 October, 2011.

Hashim, H., & Tasir, Z. (2014). E-learning readiness: a literature review. In *Proceedings of the 2014 International Conference on Teaching and Learning in Computing and Engineering* (pp 267-271). Malaysia, April 11-13, 2014.

Hetty Rohayani. A. H., Kurniabudi, & Sharipuddin (2015). A literature review: readiness factors to measuring e-learning readiness in higher education. *Procedia Computer Science*, *59*(2015), 230-234.

Hung, M., Chou, C., Chen, C., & Own, Z. (2010) Learner readiness for online learning: scale development and student perceptions. *Computers & Education*, *55*(2010), 1080-1090.

Kaurs, K., & Abas, Z. W. (2004). An assessment of e-learning readiness at Open University Malaysia. Paper presented in *International Conference on Computers in Education 2004*, Kuala Lumpur, 1017-1022

Laohajaratsang, T. (2009). E-learning readiness in the academic sector of Thailand. *International Journal on e-Learning*, *8*(4), 539-547.

Mafenya, P. N. (2013). An investigation of first-year students' pedagogical readiness t e-learning and assessment in open and distance learning: an university of South

 

Africa context. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *4*(13), 353-360.
May, C., Mair, F. S., Finch, T., MacFarlane, A., Dowrick, C., Treweek, S., et al. (2009). Development of a theory of implementation and integration: Normalization Process Theory. Implementation Science. 2009; 4 art 29
Mercado, C. A. (2008). Readiness assessment tool for an eLearning environment implementation. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on eLearning for Knowledge-Based Society*, Thailand, December 11-12, 2008.
Nisperos, L. S. (2014). Assessing the e-learning readiness of selected Sudanese universities. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences & Education*, *3*(4), 45-59.
Oketch, H. A. (2013). *E-learning readiness assessment model in Kenyas' higher education institutions: a case study of university of Nairobi* (Unpublished M.B.A. dissertation). University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya.
Omoda-Onyait, G., & Lubega, J. T. (2011). E-learning readiness assessment model: a case study of higher institutions of learning in Uganda. In R. Kwan et al. (Eds.) *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 6837, 200-211.
Ouma, G. O., & Awuor, F. M. (2013). E-learning readiness in public secondary schools in Kenya. *European Journal of Open, Distance and e-learning*, *16*(2), 97-110.
Paechter, M., Maier, B., & Macher, D. (2010). Students' expectations of, and experiences in e-learning: their relation to learning achievements and course satisfaction. *Computers & Education*, *54*(2010), 222-229.
Paturusi, S., Chisaki, Y., & Usagawa, T. (2014). Assessing lecturers and students' readiness for e-learning. In *Proceedings of the 4th Annual International Conference on Education & e-Learning*, 132-137.
Saekow, A., & Samson, D. (2011). E-learning readiness of Thailand's universities comparing to the USA's cases. *International Journal of e-Education, e-Business, e-Management and e-Learning*, *1*(2), 126-131.
Schreurs, J., Ehlers, U., & Sammour, G. (2008). E-learning readiness analysis (ERA): an e-health case study of e-learning readiness. *International Journal of Knowledge and Learning*, *4*(5), 496-508.
The Chinese University of Hong Kong (2015). *Facts and Figures 2015*. The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
Tubaishat, A., Lansari, A. (2011). Are students ready to adopt e-learning? A preliminary e-readiness study of a university in the Gulf Region. *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Research*, *1*(5), 210-215.
Vilonis, R., Bakanoviene, R., & Turskiene, S. (2013). Readiness of adults to learn using E-learning, M-learning and T-learning technologies. *Informatics in Education*, *12*(2), 181-190.
Wallace, K. (2016). Half of teens think they're addicted to their smartphones. *CNN*, 29 July, 2016. Retrieved from http://edition.cnn.com/2016/05/03/health/teens-cell-phone-addiction-parents/
Wu, J., Tennyson, R. D., & Hsia, T. (2010). A study of student satisfaction in a blended e-learning system environment. *Computers & Education*, *55*(2010), 155-164.
Xu, D. B. (2015). Issues in CALL studies. *Journal of Technology and Chinese Language Teaching*, *6*(2), 1-16.
Zheng, H., Bao, H. & Chen, G. (2014). *E-learning in China*. London: SAGE.

 