

E-Learning Implementation: Its Opportunities and Drawbacks Perceived by EFL Students

Fitria Rahmawati, S.Pd., M.Hum.

Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Jl. Lingkar Selatan, Tamantirto, Kasihan,
Bantul, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Corresponding e-mail: fitriarahmawati@umy.ac.id

Abstract

Technology provides numerous assistances for education, particularly for language learning. By the presence of technology, students get exposures to Internet which enables them to interact and communicate with native speakers, the experience of which may not be available for in-class activities in general. In other words, students are given chances to be exposed to a more interesting and interactive learning instruction. The implementation of e-learning, thus, becomes one alternative to teaching techniques which empowers students to be more active language users. This study highlights the integration of e-learning into language teaching and learning. It aims to investigate students' perceptions on what opportunities and drawbacks e-learning brings to their language learning. This study involved a private university which offered some courses implementing e-learning. During the courses, the students were required to participate in e-learning inside and outside the classroom. The activities included commenting on a thread, analysing a specific topic or case, submitting assignments, responding to other students' comment or work, taking polls, doing quizzes, and accomplishing a project. The findings from interviewing the six participants revealed some issues related to how they perceived the opportunities that e-learning provided and also the drawbacks that e-learning created.

Keywords: E-learning, Internet-based language learning, web-based activity, opportunities and drawbacks.

Background

Over the past few years, educational researchers have been investigating the impacts the technology offers to language learning (Arkorf & Abaidoo, 2014; Dargham, Saeed, & Mcheik, 2012; Lam, Lee, Chan, & McNaught, 2011). One of significances the technology brings into language learning is that teachers are able to deliver lessons more effectively. The development of technology has also significantly encouraged teachers to be more creative in utilizing technology to reach students' learning outcomes. Additionally,

technology together with the advent of the Internet, known as information communication and technology (ICT), creates new opportunities for language students. There is a widespread belief that ICT transforms teaching and learning processes from being highly teacher-dominated to student-centered. The transformation the ICT brings will then result in students' increased learning achievements, which creates and allows opportunities for students to develop their language skills, communication skills, problem solving abilities, and critical thinking skills (Ganderton, 1999; Levy & Kennedy, 2005; Levy, 2010).

The rapid development of ICT, Internet technologies, and Web-based applications has initiated some efforts in universities all around the world to implement e-learning strategies. Similarly, there has been a growing interest in developing an e-learning system in universities in Indonesian contexts. University administrators design policies that strongly encourage teachers to incorporate e-learning in their subjects, although traditional ways of learning (e.g. face-to-face class meetings) are still popular. In addition, departments pay more attention and allocate bigger fund to support the implementation of e-learning within the departments.

Although there is much enthusiasm to fully develop e-learning systems, e-learning implementation, in general, is still very much in its infancy. The implementation of e-learning has not received an equal portion comparing to the face-to-face learning. It happens because e-learning in most classes is used only for additional learning which means that it is used as a supplementary learning tool for the traditional face-to-face learning. With regard to the fact, there is a need for university administrators to increase their understanding and knowledge on the successful adoption and diffusion of e-learning (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007). This article, therefore, aims to present students' perception on the implementation of

e-learning in a language learning context. Students' perceptions are mainly related to opportunities and drawbacks of the e-learning implementation. Reviews of related studies, theories underlining this study, and the findings of the study are discussed too later.

Literature Review

The concept of e-learning is subject to constant change. The followings are definitions of e-learning proposed by some scholars. Lee and Lee (2006) define e-learning as a self-paced or real-time delivery of training and education over the Internet to a user device. Liao and Lu (2008) define e-learning as education delivered or learning conducted by Web techniques, while Alonso, López, Manrique, and Viñes (2005) believe that e-learning is the use of new multimedia technologies and the Internet to improve the quality of learning by facilitating access to resources and services, as well as collaboration. The other definition of e-learning is proposed by Burdette, Greer, and Woods (2013) who state that “e-learning is defined as a program or course in which students receive some or all of their education over a networked system such as internet” (p. 65). Accordingly, e-learning could be defined as any use of Web and Internet technologies to create learning experiences.

The literature acknowledges five types of e-learning in educational context: *learner-led e-learning*, *facilitated e-learning*, *instructor-led e-learning*, *embedded e-learning*, and *telementored e-learning or e-coaching* (Horton & Horton, 2003). The first type called learner-led e-learning is also known as “standalone or self-directed e-learning” (Horton & Horton, 2003, p. 14) which provides course materials to students and allows them to experience independent learning. The next type of e-learning is facilitated e-learning, which involves collaborative learning. This type of e-learning provides facilities which allow

students to discuss with other students as well as teachers via Forums and Chats that are related to an assignment. The third e-learning type, according to Horton & Horton (2003), is instructor led e-learning which consists of instructors' presentations via real-time webcast technology, and could include audio and video conferences, speaking, screen sharing and whiteboard applications. Students' direct participation here is via audio, video or instant messages. The other type is embedded e-learning. It is when teachers embed videos and web pages to enhance students' learning. Last but not least is the telementored e-learning which involves a combination of distance learning and the use of technology. For example, students are given printed material, and then instructors provide them with extra guidance and information about this material via video conferences, instant messages, and internet phones (Gulbahar, 2009).

E-learning is being implemented today in various forms and through various tools or software which have been enormously created and offered. Some of the tools are ranging from emails, blogs, wikis, e-portfolios, animation, video links, to social networkings, like Yahoo Messenger, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Moodle, Edmodo, Yammer, and Schoology. Email is a web feature which enables students to communicate with the teacher and other students and also enables students to submit completed assignments. A blog is essentially a web page with regular diary or journal entries (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007). It is increasingly being used by innovative teachers to place educational materials, visuals, exercises, and assignments. The other tool is Wiki. Dudeney and Hockly (2007) define Wiki as a public website, or public web page, which visitors can add, edit, or modify the existing content as they wish. In a learning context, wiki can be used to set up collaborative writing

project where students work in group to create a content of a specific topic and other groups revise or modify it (Hu & Johnston, 2011).

In recent years, several studies have been published exploring perceptions of e-learning implementation in language learning context. Studies regarding e-learning implementation in Taiwan (Pituch & Lee, 2004), in Hong Kong (Lam, Lee, Chan & McNaught, 2011), in Oman (Tanveer, 2011), in Egypt (Gamal & Aziz, 2011), and in Ghana (Tagoe, 2012), confirm that the vast majority of the students have a ready access to web-enabled personal computers and web features and have their own personal digital devices. They also use a wide range of digital features and web features in their everyday lives, either for communication or for forming social networks. A study by Tanveer (2011) reveals that e-learning allows students to be autonomous, offers various activities, promotes intrinsic motivation to learn, facilitates introvert students to interact better, permits gaining meaningful study experience and time management skills, and allows teachers to have a more student-centered form of learning.

E-learning, in spite of its significances, it also has some drawbacks. A study conducted by Ku and Lohr (2003) reveals that one of the frequently reported disadvantages of e-learning is on technical problems faced by students while trying to access the Web. The problems include frequent disruption to the Internet connection, slow loading, and incompatibility of software and hardware. Moreover, Keller and Cernerud (2002) argued that the most observable weaknesses related to the use of e-learning are inconsistent use of e-learning in different courses, technical problems, too much dependence on computers, and lack of human contact.

Theoretical Framework

Since students' perception might be influenced by several factors, hence, there are several theories that can be applied regarding the infusion of technology in language learning context, particularly e-learning. Some of the variables which have been identified as major predictive factors affecting the students' perception are age, gender, previous experience of technology, technology acceptance and individual learning styles (Keller and Cernerud, 2002). Two theories underlining this study are the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) developed by Davis (1989) and the Diffusion of Innovation Theory proposed by Rogers (1995).

The learning theory that is best applied to e-learning is the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) developed by Davis (1989). TAM has been widely applied in the area of technology use. TAM, as proposed by Davis (1989), describes that a person's behavioural intention to use e-learning is determined by *perceived usefulness* and *perceived ease of use*. Perceived usefulness is the belief that using a particular technology will improve one's performance, while perceived ease of use is the belief that using technology will be effortless (Mahdizadeh, Biemans, & Mulder, 2008). Although TAM's ultimate goal is on its actual usage, it could also be used to explain why individuals might accept or not accept a particular technology such as e-learning (Jung, Loria, Mostaghel & Saha, 2008). In addition, in this model, perceived ease of use is believed to affect perceived usefulness, and both of them affect the computer technology adoption.

Another applicable theory to e-learning is the Diffusion of Innovation Theory proposed by Rogers (1995). When investigating the infusion of technology in education, especially in higher education setting, Diffusion of Innovations Theory is one of the most

appropriate models. Rogers (1995) proposed a number of users' perceptions which might affect the adoption of innovation. The perceptions include *relative advantage*, *compatibility*, and *complexity*. He defines a relative advantage as the degree to which an innovation is perceived as better than the comparable product it overtakes, while the compatibility is as the degree of consistency with existing values, past habits, and experiences of the users of the innovation. The last perception is regarding the complexity which he defines as the degree to which an innovation is perceived as difficult to understand and use. Therefore, the study uses the two models in investigating the students' perceptions on the e-learning implementation in language learning. The perceptions being investigated are regarding the opportunities in terms of perceived usefulness and ease of use as proposed by Davis (1989) and the drawbacks regarding to complexity as proposed by Rogers (1995).

Methodology

Six students of an English department in a private university in Indonesia participated in this research. The department's curriculum showed that the department strongly encouraged the use of e-learning. This can be observed from some of the courses offered by the department, such as ICT in Language Learning, Innovative Technology, and Digital Technology in Language Learning. Other subjects also integrated the use of e-learning as additional learning outside the class. The six students, Ratri, Dani, Devi, Rina, Sasty, and Laksita were seniors at the time the data were collected and were enrolled in the courses mentioned earlier. Purposive sampling was implemented to select the participants. According to Creswell (2012), "In purposive sampling, the researcher intentionally selects individuals and sites to learn or understand the phenomenon" (p.206). Students who actively

participated in the e-learning activities were chosen. In this case, they who actively gave responses, replied to the posts, gave comments and feedbacks and also helped the other friends. Since students who were active and contributed themselves in the discussion were considered to have richer experience than the others. Thus, they can provide more information and perception about the e-learning implementation, as supported by Creswell (2012) that “the standard in choosing of participants and sites is whether they are “information rich” (p. 206). The in-depth interviews were all recorded and conducted in *Bahasa Indonesia* with which the participants felt convenient. All names were pseudonyms.

Qualitative analysis involves categorization and interpretation of data in terms of common themes in the way it serves the overall portrait of the case (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). For the present study, themes for analysis were identified from re-reading of the interviews scripts. In other word, data collected from the interview were transcribed verbatim, then categorized into the corresponding theme. In general, data were analyzed in terms of the three major themes which were the students’ perception on: first, the use of online learning toward the students’ language skills; second, the use of online learning toward the students’ language skills; and last is the drawback e-learning implementation. Additionally, several efforts were made to address validity and reliability issues in the qualitative data analysis. Possible factual errors in the interview data were checked by cross-checking. The transcribed interviews were delivered to each participant for review.

Findings and Discussion

With the emergence of the Internet and new technologies, e-learning has become one of promising solutions for the Universities which are currently in an environment of an intense change. Investigating students' perception toward e-learning technologies is important because it is one of the most effective factors for the successful e-learning implementation (Gamal & Aziz, 2011; Keller & Cernerud, 2002).

Students' perception on the opportunities of e-learning implementation in language learning

With regard to the e-learning implementation, the participants of the study claimed to have received opportunities from e-learning. The data showed that e-learning “offered flexibility”, “provided updated information”, “provided rich, unlimited resources”, “encouraged students to read”, “helped less active students become more active”, and “was fast and simpler”.

E-learning offers flexibility. From the interviews, flexibility became the main opportunity that e-learning offered. Flexibility referred to the ease of access to which students could access at any time and from anywhere. Ratri, Dani, Devi, Sasty, and Laksita admitted that e-learning offered flexibility in terms of time and place. In the interview they stated:

One of opportunities is flexibility where we can access e-learning from any where, at any time, and in any situation. We only need to have gadget and internet connection. E-learning is not limited to space and time. So, it is more flexible (Ratri).

The opportunity of e-learning is it is more flexible in terms of time and place, as it can be done at any time and in anywhere (Dani).

The opportunity of e-learning is that we can learn from any place not only from the classroom. As long as we have connection, we can learn (Devi).

E-learning is more flexible. We do not need to come to the class. Also, we can do it in everywhere (Sasty).

The opportunity of e-learning is flexibility. It can be done at any time and in anywhere as long as there is an internet access. It is flexible in time and place (Laksita).

The participants made some strong points regarding the flexibility in e-learning. First, e-learning was not limited to space and time. Second, by having e-learning, students could learn from any places, not only from classroom. The last, to be able to access e-learning, a reliable internet connection was imperative. That e-learning provides flexibility in learning is supported by Smart & Cappel (2006) who argued that e-learning brings the flexibility and convenience because e-learning allows students to access the lesson anytime and anywhere, and students can complete the lesson units at their own pace.

E-learning provides updated information. The second opportunity of e-learning perceived by the participants was that it provided updated material and information. Ratri, Devi, and Rina shared their experience that they could immediately get updated information or material from the teacher.

Updated information as internet always provides updated information, even in a second, it has new information (Ratri).

We become more updated. So, if the lecturer gives information or assignment, we can directly know it, as there is a notification. So, we do not need to meet the lecturers and do not need to wait until the D-day we can know what the news or the assignment is (Devi).

The opportunity of e-learning is on the updated material (Rina).

As asserted by Ally (2008), the materials in e-learning can be updated, and students can access and see the changes immediately. Teachers can also easily give students direct information based on their needs related to the course and the materials. Thus, besides getting news or materials related to the course, students can also get other updated information from the internet.

E-learning provides rich, unlimited resources. The next opportunity of e-learning the students perceived was that e-learning provided rich and unlimited resources, as Dani and Rina stated, such as references for assignment, learning materials, and examples or quizzes for language skills practices. Dani revealed that using e-learning, students became freer as it was not face to face. In e-learning, he added, they could freely explore resources, and found knowledge. E-learning provides free and easy access for students to find out the resources which are helpful for them in completing an assignment. A similar comment was made by Rina, who stated that e-learning also provided them with rich, unlimited resources.

It is a common sense to admit the fact that using e-learning in learning process provides not only teachers but also students with abundant of useful resources. E-learning encompasses technology, websites, and internet access. These features of e-learning allowed rapid access to resources, and random access to information or hyperlink.

E-learning encourages reading. Another finding on the opportunity of e-learning was that it encouraged students to read. Ratri made a strong note about such opportunity. She pointed out that e-learning could encourage students to read more as when they joined e-learning, they would find rich resources. She then added, activities in e-learning encouraged them to look for other information or sources outside the forum. Since e-learning permitted students to visit other students' pages, they could learn from reading and comparing their friends' work to make improvement on their own work. Besides, e-learning allowed teacher to provide additional suggested readings which were easily accessed by students to encourage reading and enrich students' knowledge on a particular lesson topic.

Ratri's response indicated that by joining e-learning, it could encourage her to have more reading. Since most of the instructions in e-learning were delivered in written forms, and most of the activities were commenting, replying, and responding in a discussion forum, students were required to read in order to be able to do the task instructed. First, in order to be able to finish the assignment correctly, it was necessary for students to read the written instruction carefully. Secondly, in the discussion forum, students were required to comment on a certain topic provided by the teacher. Then, students were also required to respond to the other students' comment. Thirdly, e-learning facilitates various language skills activities, one of them is reading comprehension. In the activity, teacher provided several passages related to the lesson topic, while students were required to comprehend the text and have a discussion on it.

E-learning helps less active students become more active. The finding also revealed that e-learning provided a chance for less active students to become more active. In this context, less active students refer to students who did not actively participate in the class

activity. It could also represent students who were hesitant to speak up although they know what to say as a cause of the Indonesian cultures. Ratri remarked that e-learning gave more chances for less active students who were usually not confident performing in the classroom to actively engage in online discussion forum. She explained:

Related to personality, we found some less-active students in the class. Students who have less participation, they got more chance to have improvement in e-learning rather than in class. If in the class they felt shy or not confident, their personality improved better (Ratri).

This finding is in line with Soliman (2014) who argues that e-learning allows students who are introverts to take a chance in interacting virtually through forums and chats which lead to enhance communicative competency. In addition, the participants in Tanveer's (2011) study also confirmed that e-learning allows them to be autonomous, offers various activities, promotes intrinsic motivation to learn, and facilitates introvert students to interact better. Those opportunities were attained since e-learning permits different type of communication which enables students to interact with their peers without meeting face to face and without feeling worry of being bullied if they make mistake.

E-learning is fast and simpler. The last finding on the opportunity of e-learning perceived by the participants was that it was fast and simpler. Ratri maintained that e-learning was fast since students can directly find out updated course information provided by either their teacher or their classmates. Besides, it also provided push-up notification for any activity in the online class, such as notification on who currently commented or replied a post or what information was currently posted. The same point was expressed by Sasty who informed that e-learning did not take time, as for her, if she met face to face, she needed to

spend some times on the trip. Therefore, she concluded that e-learning was simpler. Simple meant that it was easy to use and was applicable to any context. This finding inferred that e-learning benefitted them as it provided essential course information faster. Besides, the features of e-learning allowed a simple way of delivery.

Students' perception on the drawback of e-learning implementation in language learning

As with any approach to learning, there are also limitations to consider. Possible drawbacks involved in innovation particularly used in language learning should not be underestimated. Thus, the other purpose of this study regarding the use of e-learning was investigating the drawbacks or complexity that e-learning had created perceived by students. During the interviews, the participants shared their stories with regard to the drawbacks of e-learning implementation. They expressed that e-learning, in terms of social interaction, “decreased direct interactions” and “decreased oral communication”. In addition, “it was costly”. Other drawback they remarked is in terms of technical problems, such as e-learning required “adequate technological skills” and “good internet access or connection”. Last but not least, e-learning “did not allow actual or direct teachers' feedback” and “increased possibility of plagiarism and cheating”.

E-learning decreases social interaction. Ratri, Dani, Devi, and Sasty remarked that e-learning decreased social interaction. They argued that compared to the classroom activity, the interaction atmosphere in e-learning was limited as the activities were conducted virtually. Ratri explained that the drawback of e-learning was that it did not allow face-to-face interaction atmosphere among students and teachers. She explained further that on one

side, e-learning was good, but on the other side, teachers cannot disregard face to face learning. The same point was experienced by Dani who maintained, “e-learning decreased interaction among students”. He also explained “as the interaction was limited, then it seemed passive”. He considered that e-learning generated a passive interaction as its interaction was limited to a written language. In addition to Ratri and Dani, Devi explicitly stated, “also, in my opinion, e-learning reduces the frequency of meeting up with friends and with the teacher, so, it reduces the social interaction”. The last participant who agreed that e-learning decreased face-to-face interaction was Sasty. She found out that e-learning hindered her from direct social interaction. She then argued that since it was a virtual learning, she could not interact face-to-face so that she could not see facial expression. The facial expression belongs to body language which is significance in communication. It helps students understand utterances better.

The finding infers that e-learning, to some extent, provided limited access for students and their teachers to interact as it is done virtually. This finding is in support with Young’s (1997) study, which revealed that one of the most prominent weaknesses of e-learning implementation is the absence of direct interaction, not only between students and teachers, but also among colleague students. From the findings, even though students and teacher could experience face-to-face communication virtually by the support of video call applications such as Yahoo Messenger, Skype, Google Hangout, and Tanggo, the atmosphere was different, and was still limited by the delayed response and unclear voice depending on the connection.

E-learning decreases oral communication. The second drawback of e-learning perceived by the participants was that it decreased oral communication. Ratri noted that e-

learning decreased oral communication by stating that although she could interact with her classmates and her teacher during the e-learning activity, it was not a direct communication. She added, “students and teacher were lacked of oral communication”. For her, students should also have had interpersonal interaction which allowed them to know how to communicate in front people directly so that they communicate neither only in social media, nor behind the scene. Rina and Laksita had the same opinion about e-learning which decreases oral communication. Rina stated, “in my opinion, e-learning decreased oral communication,” while Laksita pointed out that “the drawback of e-learning was that it decreased direct face-to-face communication with friends”.

It was obvious that students were not able to have direct oral communication as the communication the e-learning provided was in the form of written language. That e-learning decreased students’ opportunities to communicate orally was considered unfortunate by the participants as it minimized their chance to learn how to communicate in real situation. This finding is supported by Zhao & McDougall (2008) who state that e-learning cannot enhance students’ oral English communication proficiency because it is lack of personal contact.

E-learning is costly. The study also revealed that e-learning was considered costly by one participant. Ratri made a strong point that she had to spend extra money to experience e-learning. She stated, “it is costly. E-learning required much money for the personal internet access.” E-learning enabled students to work at their own pace and space. Thus, each student had to provide themselves with internet connection which allowed them to involve in the e-learning activity. However, this internet connection was considered costly. The faster the internet connection they wished to have, the more the cost they had to spend.

E-learning requires technological skill. The next drawback perceived by the participants regarding the implementation of e-learning was that this technique required a decent technological skill. Devi shared her experience in joining e-learning. She expressed, “in the beginning of e-learning, I feel lack of technological skills.” Her lack of technological skills made her ask her teacher or her classmates to help her deal with the technological issues, such as how to operate a software or application and how to do an online task or assignment in a particular site.

This research finding suggested that teachers need to provide students with sufficient knowledge and skills about the software or application used for e-learning. In order to assure the successful e-learning implementation, teachers should introduce the application to the students in the beginning of the implementation, demonstrate them how to operate it, and provide guidelines about what the students need to accomplish, so that the students become familiar and are not confused. Besides, e-learning serves as a tool or media to help students in learning English, teachers still play significant roles in the learning activity; therefore, they should provide continuous direction and supervision to their students.

E-learning requires internet access or connection. Internet connection becomes one of the crucial elements in e-learning. It serves as the channel to connect the computer into one of e-learning tools or websites. However, internet connection turns into a technical problem perceived by the participants. During the interview, Ratri, Devi, Sasty, and Laksita expressed their disappointment regarding the slow internet connection. They stated that it was a big problem when they were joining e-learning, as seen in the following response:

Limited access became a problem, especially when we were having fun activities in e-learning, then suddenly the connection was troubled. No signal meant it could be the end. In conclusion, the drawback was more on the technical problems (Ratri).

[The drawbacks of e-learning was] lack of signal (Devi).

If it is e-learning, it means we need connection. Whereas, we were still lack of internet connection (Sasty).

The drawback was that we should have good internet connection. For example, if we were going to a remote area, then it could be a problem when we were doing online assignment (Laksita).

The participants' experiences indicated that despite the apparent advantages of e-learning, it presented certain technical problems with regard to utilising it in educational learning environments. Volery's (2000) study identified that while being involved in e-learning was considered rewarding, most of his respondents did not fully participate in the e-learning due to technical problems, which led to frustrations in trying to connect and utilise the network systems. Moreover, Ku and Lohr (2003) assert that technological problems commonly faced by students in e-learning include frequent disruption to the internet connection, slow loading, and incompatibility of software and hardware. Hence, these technical problems, especially the slow internet connection, were a drawback that hamper the implementation of e-learning.

E-learning does not allow actual or direct teachers' feedback. Another drawback of e-learning the participants perceived was on the lack of actual teachers' feedback. Dani pointed out that he did not get detail feedback when it was delivered through e-learning. Further, he explained that it was easier and clearer to have feedback from face-to-face

learning rather than through e-learning. He responded, “In e-learning, we did not get detail feedback from our lecturer as the feedback was only a written feedback, while I preferred detail feedback as in face-to-face class”.

That e-learning changed the way how learning was conducted, so did it change how feedback was delivered. Compared to face-to-face learning, the feedback provided by teachers was indeed limited to a written form. Additionally, in some applications or sites, the feedback was limited to a certain number of characters. This limited written feedback might create confusion for some students. Students might need to clarify to their teacher what the feedback or revision meant in order not to create misunderstanding. For some students who were not comfortable with virtual feedback, they might find it difficult.

E-learning increases possibility of plagiarism and cheating. Lastly, this study indicated that plagiarism and cheating were notions emerged during the interviews regarding the drawbacks of e-learning implementation. Rina and Sasty believed that in e-learning, students were able to access resources freely by surfing some sites, then they easily copied and pasted their surfing results into e-learning forum or online assessment without paraphrasing or citing the original work. Rina remarked, “e-learning makes students cheat easily because when answering a question, students can easily open other sites, find the answer or similar materials, and copy paste the answer into the discussion forum”. In addition to Rina, Sasty explicitly stated, “actually, there was an issue in e-learning that students could easily copy paste work. So, it was related to plagiarism.” She then added, “Maybe, some students, who were lazy to think, just copied and pasted the answer from their friends or looked for materials from internet, then posted the answer based on their browsing results.”

The finding revealed that e-learning increased the possibility of plagiarism and cheating. It is also argued by Arkorful and Abaidoo (2014) that since e-learning is delivered through the use of “proxy”, it causes loss of control or regulation in the context of bad activities like cheating. This study suggested that in order to minimize the chance of plagiarism and cheating, teachers should make a clear regulation toward this issue in the beginning of the e-learning implementation. Furthermore, the teacher should check the students’ work in order to avoid such issue in e-learning. Teachers and students are also advised to make an agreement upon a punishment for students who are doing plagiarism.

Conclusions and Implications

Evidence from this research showed that participants had diverse perceptions towards e-learning ranging from highly positive to reluctance of relying heavily on its use. Generally, students’ perceived that e-learning offered flexibility, provided updated information, provided rich and unlimited resources, encouraged reading, and helped less active students become more active, and was fast and simpler. However, in spite of the benefits to students when e-learning is incorporated into teaching and learning, there are some drawbacks which needed immediate attention. The drawbacks like decreasing social interaction and oral communication, costly, lack of technological skills, lack of digital resources, slow internet access or connection, lack of actual or direct teachers’ feedback, and increasing possibility of plagiarism and cheating, acted as barriers to cause the full potential of e-learning to remain untapped. These results are in line with the findings of similar studies conducted at major institutions and illustrate the importance of e-learning.

With regard to the implementation of e-learning, this study suggests some strong notes for the e-learning users, including teachers and university administrators. Firstly, some students might not be familiar with the use of e-learning since they come from various social background and technology literacy levels. Therefore, teachers are responsible to give demonstration or guideline to students dealing with how to operate this e-learning. Secondly, using various types of learning, e.g. using e-learning and face-to-face, is strongly recommended. By doing so, students can enhance both oral communication in face-to-face learning and nonverbal communication. Thirdly, teachers should discuss the materials which they discussed in class at e-learning session more intensively to get better understanding. Then, teacher could also provide clarification or correction if there were any misconception towards the material. Besides, teachers are suggested to design their e-learning with various materials, activities, and sites to minimize monotonous activities and to provide meaningful learning experience. Regarding the second and the third findings, teachers may vary or combine the five different types of e-learning as proposed by Horton and Horton (2003), so that the students' needs can be facilitated. Lastly, teachers need to check and provide constructive feedback on students' works in order to avoid cheating and plagiarism.

In order to enhance the efficacy of e-learning environment, teachers and students must be provided with ample supports by university administrators. This study also emphasized that the university administrators should pay more profound interests and efforts in supporting the e-learning implementation for learning. As asserted by Dudeney and Hockly (2007), there is a need for university administrators to increase their understanding and knowledge on the successful adoption and diffusion of e-learning. One of the ways to do so, perceived by the participants, is by providing facilities and equipment supporting the

implementation of e-learning, especially on more updated computer software and fast internet connection.

Although most participants had asserted that e-learning enhanced teaching and learning, they also attributed some complexities towards its implementation. Better understanding of the context of e-learning readiness and perception should enable university administrators to address their students' needs more fully. Finally, although e-learning has a lot of potentials and advantages, until the e-learning challenges have been taken into consideration, its fully potentials and advantages cannot be completely acquired by students.

Reference

- Ally, M. (2008). Foundations of educational theory for online learning. In T. Anderson, *The theory and practice of online learning* (2nd Ed). Canada: AU Press, Athabasca University.
- Alonso, F., López, G., Manrique, D., & Viñes, J. M. (2005). An instructional model for web-based e-learning education with a blended learning process approach. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 36(2), 217-235.
- Arkorful, V., & Abaidoo, N. (2014). The role of e-Learning, the advantages and disadvantages of its adoption in higher education. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(12), 397 – 410.
- Burdette, P. J., Greer, D. L., & Woods, K. L. (2013). K-12 online learning and students with disabilities: Perspective from state special education directors. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 17(3). 65 – 72.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education*. 7th ed. London: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. 2012. *Educational research: Planning, conducting, evaluating, quantitative and qualitative research*. 4th ed. Boston: Pearson.
- Dargham, J., Saeed, D., Mcheik, H. (2012). E-Learning at school level: Challenges and benefits. *The 13th International Arab Conference on Information Technology*. ACIT2012 Dec. 10-13, ISSN: 1812-0857, 2012.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–339.

- Dudeny, G., & Hockly, N. (2007). *How to teach English with technology*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Gamal, S.E., & Aziz, R.A.E. (2011). The perception of students regarding e-Learning implementation in Egyptian Universities. *eL & mL 2011: The Third International Conference on Mobile, Hybrid, and On-line Learning*.
- Ganderton, R. (1999). Interactivity in L2 web-based reading. In R. Debski & M. Levy (Eds.), *WorldCALL: Global Perspectives on Computer-Assisted Language Learning* (p. 49–66). Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Gulbahar, Y. (2009). *E-Learning*. Turkey: Pegem Academy Publishing.
- Horton, W. and Horton, K. (2003). *E-Learning tools and technologies*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Publishing, Inc.
- Hu, Q., & Johnston, E. (2011). Using a wiki-based course design to create a student-centered learning environment: Strategies and lessons. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 18(3), 493 – 512. *Journal of Educational Media*, 27(1-2), 55-65.
- Jung, M., Loria, K., Mostaghel, R & Saha, P. (2008). E-learning: Investigating University Students' Acceptance of Technology. *European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning* [online]
http://www.euodl.org/materials/contrib/2008/Jung_Loria_Mostaghel_Saha.htm
- Keller, C., & Cernerud, L. (2002). Students' perception of e-learning in university education.
- Ku, H. Y., & Lohr, L. L. (2003). A case study of Chinese student's attitudes toward their first online learning experience. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, 51(3). 95 – 102.

- Lam, P., Lee, J., Chan, M., & McNaught, C. (2011). Students' use of e-Learning strategies and their perceptions of e-Learning usefulness. In S-M. Barton, J. Hedberg, & K. Suzuki (Eds.), *Proceedings of Global Learn Asia Pacific 2011* (pp. 1379–1388), Melbourne Australia, 28 March – 1 April. Chesapeake VA: Association for the Advancement of Computers in Education.
- Lee, T., & Lee, J. (2006). Quality assurance of web based e-learning for statistical education. *COMPSTAT: Proceedings in Computational Statistics: 17th Symposium*, Rome.
- Levy, M. (2010). Developing the language skills: Aligning the technological tool to the pedagogical purpose. In C. Ward (Ed.), *The Impact of Technology on Language Learning and Teaching: What, How and Why*. Anthology Series 51 (p. 16-27). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Levy, M., & Kennedy, C. (2005). Learning Italian via mobile SMS. In Agnes Kukulska-Hulme and John Traxler (Eds.), *Mobile learning: A handbook for Educators and Trainers*. London: Routledge.
- Liao, H., & Lu, H. (2008). *Richness versus parsimony antecedents of technology adoption model for E-learning websites*. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-85033-5_2.
- Mahdizadeh, H., Biemans, H., & Mulder, M. (2008). Determining factors of the use of e-learning environments by university teachers. *Computers & Education*, 51, 142-154.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2005). *E-learning in tertiary education: Where do we stand?* OECD.
- Pituch, K.A., & Lee, Y. (2004). The influence of system characteristics on e-learning use. *Computers and Education*, 47(2006). 222 – 244.

- Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Smart, K. L., & Cappel, J. J. (2006). Students' perceptions of online learning: A comparative study. (C. Cope, Ed.) *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 5, 201-219
- Soliman, N. A. (2014). Using e-learning to develop EFL students' language skills and activate their independent learning. *Creative Education*, 5, 752-757. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ce.2014.510088>
- Tagoe, M. (2012). Students' perceptions on incorporating e-Learning into teaching and learning at the university of Ghana. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDICT)*, 8(1), 91 – 103.
- Tanveer, M. (2011). Integrating e-Learning in classroom-based language teaching: Perceptions, challenges and strategies. *ICT for Language Learning: 4th Edition*. Retrieved from http://conference.pixel-online.net/ICT4LL2011/common/download/Paper_pdf/IEC141-252-FP-Tanveer-ICT4LL2011.pdf.
- Volery, T. (2000). Critical success factors in online education. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 14(5), 216 – 223.
- Young, J. R. (1997). Rethinking the role of the Professor in an age of high-tech tools. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 44(6), 26 – 28.