Chabahar Maritime University
Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, (2016) vol. 5 issue. 1 (Previously Published under the title: Maritime English Journal)

A SWOT Analysis of e- TEFL Curriculum: A Case Study

[1] Jaleh Hassaskhah*

ID: IJEAP-1702-1000

Received: 19/01/2016 Accepted: 18/04/2016 Available online: 01/06/2016

Abstract

With the growing demand for e-learning all over the world, constant evaluation of its curriculum is incumbent upon institutions which aim to be competitive in this market. To this end, the present study employs SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, opportunities, Threats) analysis as the tool for the identification and prioritization of the gaps of the current e-TEFL (Electronic Teaching English as a Foreign Language) curriculum at one of the Iranian state universities, which is chosen to act as the case for this study. In order to collect the required data on the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats of the e-TEFL in this university, which for the ethical considerations is called the TARGET, a SWOT questionnaire was administered to 50 students and 15 instructors/ experts. The results of the analyses of the responses to the questionnaire led to ten major statements for each part of the SWOT. In addition, the scores of the external and internal factors (2.32 and 2.74 respectively) indicated that although e-TEFL has had a certain degree of achievement in this university, there are still a number of significant areas in need of improvement. In other words, the strategies employed by the TARGET so far, have only been partially effective in exploiting opportunities and defending against threats. Suggestions are made on how the current strategies may be improved to reverse the trend and help the TARGET to take advantage of the opportunities. The study implies that the information obtained through SWOT analysis is valuable for the e-TEFL curriculum designers who need to constantly seek ways to overcome weaknesses and minimize threats.

***Key words*:** E-learning; SWOT Analysis; e-TEFL

1. Introduction

First used in the 90s, the philosophy of e-learning was to employ the best technology of the day, to open educational opportunities to people who wanted to learn but were unable to attend conventional schools (Bower & Hardy, 2004). Later, Ellis (2004) argued that the definition is not revealing enough and thus posited more

[1] Corresponding Author- English Department, University of Guilan Email: hassas@guilan.ac.ir

dimensions, including content and instructional methods delivered via CD-ROM, the Internet or Intranet, as well as audio- and videotape, satellite broadcast and interactive TV. He further emphasized that some level of interactivity needs to be considered in the program to make the definition truly applicable in describing the new learning experience. Interactivity, according to Liaw (2004) referred to students' interaction with their peers, the instructor, the tools and technology, the materials, and the content, which in turn was said to raises the learner's chance of building their own knowledge, especially when learners interact with their instructor and other learners. These perspectives foreshadowed the idea that e-learning can eventually provide unique learning opportunities for individuals, and hence enhance the quality of learning.

However, not all educational institutions which offer e-learning programs are enjoying similar quality service for their students (Tarus, et. al, 2015). Therefore, in order to be competitive in the field, one of the responsibilities for any institution that hosts online courses is to provide the best possible technology and e-service for learners who use the service for any purposes. The fulfillment of this demand requires research to inform the curriculum designers who need information for any modification to such programs. Yet, despite a number of sporadic studies exploring e-learning efficiency in Iran (Darab, & Montazer, 2011; Mohammadi, 2015), research on e-TEFL is almost none in the available literature. That is, neither the researchers nor the curriculum designers have yet addressed the issues and the demands of e-TEFL as a specific discipline in its own right. Therefore, the effectiveness of e-TEFL, at least in terms of the course overall and the amount learned in the course requires immediate evaluation and perhaps revision.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that as e-TEFL, unlike other disciplines, has many components which need expertise and co-ordination, and also involves emergent and efficient interventions and causal processes which cannot be completely controlled or predicted in advance, so its study is regarded as a complicated and complex endeavor (Kurtz, & Snowden, 2003). Hence, research on e-TEFL requires a user-friendly and feasible evaluation technique if it is to inform ongoing adaptation (Flagg, 2013).

SWOT analysis (The Analyses of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats), a technique suggested by almost every book on management strategy, is one of the tools which has the potentials to make the evaluation of e-TEFL more convenient. To this end, the present study examines this hypothesis to illustrate the possibilities of SWOT for the identification and solution of some of the basic

problems regarding the e-TEFL program at the TARGET. In particular, this study used the technique to find the answers to the following research questions:

1) What are the strengths (S), the weaknesses (W), the opportunities (O) and the threats (T) of e-TEFL at the TARGET?
2) What are the suggested strategies for the TARGET in order to take advantage of the opportunities and defend against threats?

2. Review of literature

E-learning is claimed to be an approach to facilitate and improve learning through use of online technologies including: Internet and Web 2.0 tools in the learning process (Ring & Mathieux, 2002), learning technologies to enhance the learning experience for all (Khan, 1997), digital tools for curriculum delivery and assessment (Cavanaugh et.al, 2004), visual tools for learner-generated content (Orús, Barlés, Belanche, Casaló, Fraj, & Gurrea, 2016), interactive tools for creating collaborative circumstances to provoke and promote self-reflection (Anaya, Luque, & Peinado, 2016) and digital tools for ongoing professional development, interaction and collaboration (Carliner, 1999). The term has also been categorized into two types: synchronous and asynchronous (Phelan, 2015); the former being instructor-oriented and the latter self and individuals based. Besides, asynchronous online learning provides the students with access to online materials anytime, while synchronous online learning is suited for real time instruction between students and instructors.

Attracted by the above mentioned possibilities of e-learning, colleges and universities all over the world, started to employ the program and incorporate information and communication technology in education to accelerate the speed of learning, and generate autonomy in the learners. Researchers too were inspired to examine the effectiveness of the service for the earlier stated objectives. However, while the results mostly confirmed that through e- learning, learners will achieve a high volume of the state of the art information (Sarkar, 2012), the findings supporting the advantages of e-learning over conventional educational programs were not unanimous, and consequently e-learning, like any other area of research, found its proponents and opponents. The following section presents some of these research outcomes.

With few exceptions, the bulk of writings are produced by the proponents suggesting that the students who attend e- learning programs not only attain what

they do through conventional classroom instruction, but also experience further benefits such as: "broader educational opportunity for students who are unable to attend traditional schools, access to resources and instructors not locally available, and increases in student-teacher communication" (Cavanaugh et.al, 2004: p. 3). Similarly, Christensen, Anakwe, and Kessler (2001) argued that although e- learning courses may require more time or effort on the part of the student and instructor, the attitudes and satisfaction in e-learning are characterized as generally positive, and that technology use increases student perceptions of instructor originality and creativity (Christensen, et.al, 2001: p. 274). In addition, they also give credit to the economical merits of e-learning regarding the time, costs, and facilities (James, 2002).

There are also opponents who challenge the efficiency of e-learning and argue that lack of direct contact with teachers, poor computer driving skills, limited access to needed facilities, as well as insufficient knowledge to handle with the procedures potentially hinder student learning. In addition, the equipment and hardware malfunction can interrupt the learning environment and thus reduces the effectiveness of e- learning. In response to these concerns, Palloff and Pratt (2000) maintain that "technology does not teach students; effective teachers do" (p. 4).

In an attempt to explain the roots of these controversies, Sun, Tsai, Finger, Chen and Yeh (2006) claim that there are six main dimensions which determine the success of any e-learning classes: Learner dimension, Instructor dimension, Course dimension, Technology dimension, Design dimension, and Environmental dimension. Therefore, to have a better estimation of what these factors are and how they interact, the course designers, for every educational context, have to be sensitive to them and the ways in which they interact.

Research indicated that under each of the above mentioned dimension, some factors are stronger predictors for success. Arbauugh (2002) states that under learner dimension, learner attitude towards information technology (IT) is an important success determinant in e-learning; a more positive attitude toward IT might lead to a better and more effective e-learning environment. Or from another perspective as Piccoli, Ahmad, and Ives (2001) claim computer anxiety would certainly hamper learning satisfaction (Piccoli et al., 2001). However, Thompson, Meriac, and Cope (2002), as well as Wang and Newlin (2002) give the credit to self- efficacy and maintain that students with higher self-efficacy are more inclined to adopt network-based learning and earn significantly better final grades.

Under the instructor dimension, research indicates that instructors' timely response significantly influences learners' satisfaction. Soon, Sook, Jung, and Im (2000) point out that instructors' failing to respond to students' problems in time has a negative impact on students' learning, however, if an instructor is capable of handling e-learning activities and responding to students' needs and problems promptly, learning satisfaction will improve (Arbaugh, 2002). Instructor's attitude too has shown to be effective in the e-learning programs. Webster and Hackley (1997) indicate that instructors' attitudes toward E-Learning or IT will positively influence the outcome of e-learning since instructors are major actors in learning activities. Accordingly, Dillon and Gunawardena (1995) advise that instructors' attitudes toward e-learning should be considered in system evaluation in order to explicate online course user behaviors effectively and thoroughly. The definition for instructor attitudes toward e-learning is learners' perception of their instructors' attitude toward e-learning.

Regarding the course dimension, it is argued that due to its flexibility in time, location, and methods, course dimension facilitates learners' participation and satisfaction (Arbaugh, 2002). Moreover, by the elimination of physical barriers there will be space for more dynamic interaction which will in turn foster the establishment of constructive learning and will provide opportunities for cooperative learning (Salmon, 2000). According to constructive or cooperative learning model, interactive communications and media presentation provided by IT can help learners in developing high-level thinking models and establishing conceptual knowledge (Leidner&Jarvenpaa, 1995). The quality of virtual courses, including online interactive discussion and brainstorming, multimedia presentation, and management of learning processes, is also considered a significant factor in learner satisfaction (Piccoli et al., 2001).

Under the Technology dimension, research indicates that the quality of the technology and the Internet service significantly affect satisfaction in e-learning (Piccoli et al., 2001). Research has shown that users are more willing to adopt user friendly tools with few barriers (Amoroso & Cheney, 1991). Moreover, empirical research such as Webster and Hackley (1997) supports the fact that quality and reliability of technology, as well as network transmission speed, are shown to impact learning effects.

Besides, design dimension is affected by the technology acceptance. Davis (1989) shows that three important variables: perceived usefulness, ease of use, and

intention in adopting the technology are very reliable predictors for learning satisfaction in e-learning.

Finally, according to Thurmond, Wambach, and Connors, (2002) environmental variables such as diversity in assessment and perceived interaction with others play a great role in e-learners' satisfaction. Moore (1989) divided interaction into three different types: students with teachers, students with materials, students with students and Arbaugh (2000) suggests that the more the learners perceive interaction with others, the higher the E-learning satisfaction. Other studies, too, verify that interactive instructional design is an essential factor for learning satisfaction and success (Hong, 2002). However, interaction mechanisms in e-learning environments should be properly designed to improve frequency, quality, and promptness of interactions which can finally affect learner satisfaction.

Considering the fact that the factors mentioned above are some of determining factors that can potentially facilitate or hinder successful e-learning curriculum implementation (Markee 1997), it becomes necessary for the researchers to raise consciousness about the role of these factors in the performance of each educational context in its own right and as a unique case of interest in order to help managerial awareness; resources allocation decisions; risk management; and attention on the primary influences on strategic change (Riston, 2008). To this end, this study uses SWOT to examine the internal and external factors (SW & TO respectively) that affect the e- TEFL program at the TARGET as a case in its own right for curriculum planning and development.

The TARGET

E-learning in Iran started in 2001 in the University of Tehran with nine courses at bachelor's and master's levels. Later, University of Iran Science and Technology started online courses in 2004. It offered computer engineering, industrial engineering, chemical engineering and architectural engineering. This was later followed by other Universities such as Amir Kabir, Shiraz, Shahid Beheshti, and even some religion-based universities. The TARGET started its activity in 2011 with online courses such as: Persian Literature, TEFL, and applied mathematics at master's level and thus can be categorized as a newcomer in the Iranian e-learning market. Later, the TARGET extended its services to include other courses such as Software Engineering, Business and System Information Technology Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Telecommunication. At present 900 students are doing their master's in one of the above mentioned courses. Needless to say, like all other e-learning systems, the courses offered by the TARGET use a mixture of text and

audio as well as still and motion visuals to present lessons. The students are required to follow weekly schedule and attend online classes, unless they receive warnings and fail the course. Although the materials are accessible to all students at any time, having audio and video based classes are somehow impossible due to the low bandwidth.

As for the e-TEFL, the official website of the TARGET claims that the five semester long MA degree program provides learners with the support to enhance competencies embedded into the core principles and practices of teaching and learning. It also claim that a variety of information technologies will be used to deliver course materials and instruction to students, including the use of multi-media online activities, print materials, web, e-mail, Internet, CD-ROM, computer software, audio/video conferencing, audio/video tapes and TV or radio. In addition, the courses are said to be supported by interactive 'learning objects', podcasts and video clips from lectures and seminars given by teaching and research staff at the University. In addition, the applicants are told that there will also be extensive use of discussion forums and synchronous communication with other students on each course, as well as the teacher. However, the e-TEFL offered at the TARGET uses the same curriculum as do the conventional classes. More specifically, a number of important lessons on current theory and practice in applied linguistics, language teaching, English language curriculum, pedagogy and assessment are offered to the students throughout the academic period. It should also be mentioned that enrollment into this program, though on the basis of a nationwide entrance exam, is not very competitive and almost all who register will pass, and are immediately provided with few mandatory orientation classes prior to the course to get to know the program and its procedures. Later, on successful completion of the courses, students will be eligible for the MA Certificate in English Language Teaching, with which they can directly enter the market.

2.1 The vision and mission

According to its official website, the general vision for the TARGET in providing e-learning is ‘to use ICT to improve teaching and learning, to raise student achievement, and be a national and even international leader in education’ and its general mission statement is ‘identifying powerful ways to use e-learning tools that connect back to the vision to make a difference in student learning outcomes.’ However, there is little evidence to verify whether or not the promises are fulfilled in practice. Therefore, to safeguard the system, an examination of its external factors

(TO) and internal factors (SW) with reference to its vision of the future is necessary for any sort of decision making at the TARGET. SWOT analysis is said to be able to give an overall picture of the present situation which would help initiating competent programs or replacing redundant, irrelevant programs with innovative and relevant ones.

3. Method

3.1 Participants

A purposive sample of fifty graduate e-TEFL students and 15 instructors/ experts from the TARGET participated in this study. The students who were in different stages of the program—newly entered, about to finish and just graduated--were identified by purposive selection. The graduate e-TEFL students (n = 50) and the instructors/ experts (n = 15) were recruited through a data bank of participants to the e-learning program at the TARGET. These participants were recruited because of their experience with the e-TEFL.

3.2 Instrumentation

A conventional open –ended SWOT questionnaire was administered to address e-TEFL issues at the TARGET and explore the potential factors which are likely to affect its current status, as well its curriculum implementation. However, the tool was used only in the preliminary stage to provide the basic framework for strategic analysis, and once the framework was established, the lists of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats generated by the tool (See the appendix) were analysed to suggest strategies that fit the particular anticipated situation, the capabilities and objectives at the TARGET .

3.3 Procedures

In order to identify and summarize the current state of the e-TEFL at the TARGET and help to devise a plan for the future which would employ the existing strengths, redress existing weaknesses, exploit opportunities and defend against threats, a SWOT analysis matrix was required. As the prerequisite to well-functioning of a SWOT analysis is that all relevant people in the process should be involved (Hill & Westbrook1997), the study required to gather data from the involved parties in the program: the instructors/ experts and the students. Accordingly, based on the objective of the study which intended to examine how e-TEFL curriculum affects the average students and instructors/ experts at the TARGET, the average members of the instructors/ experts and student population were selected based on the typical case sampling technique, which is purposive and

non-random. This kind of sampling allowed the researcher to develop a profile about what is normal or average for the e-TEFL curriculum at the TARGET.

3.4 Data Analysis

As stated earlier, the SWOT analysis framework is used as the analytical tool to categorize significant factors, both internal and external to the organizational practices. To provide a clear assessment of the situation, the data gathered through the SWOT matrix underwent a SWOT analysis. In the first phase of the research, external factors (opportunities and threats) and internal factors (strengths and weaknesses) that affected e-TEFL were identified and weights were assigned to each factor. The value of each weight should be between 0 and 1 (or alternatively between 10 and 100 if the 10 to 100 scale is used). Zero means the factor is not important. One or hundred means that the factor is the most influential and critical one. The sum total value of all weights should equal 1 or 100. Next, the responses were given rates in the External Factor Evaluation (EFE) and the Internal Factor Evaluation (IFE) matrices. The ratings in IFE Matrix refer to how strong or weak each factor is in the program and how effectively the current strategy being employed, responds to the opportunities and threats. Rating should be between 1 and 4. Rating captures whether the factor represents a major threat (rating = 1), a minor threat (rating = 2), a minor opportunity (rating = 3), or a major opportunity (rating = 4). The same rating scale 1 to 4 is used, for strengths (Major strength= 4, minor strength= 3) and weaknesses rating (Major weakness= 1, Minor weakness= 2). Afterwards, each factor weight is multiplied by its rating to give the weighted score for each factor. Finally, the sum total of all weighted score will be calculated for each factor and for the program. It should be noted that weights and ratings are assigned subjectively. Therefore, it is a more difficult process than identifying the key factors. We assign weights based on experts' opinions about the success factors and then use their opinion or analysis to assign the appropriate weights. The same process is with ratings.

4. Findings & Results

The results indicated that the score of external and internal factor for the e-TEFL at the TARGET were 2.32 (Table 1) and 2.74 (Table 2) respectively. Considering that the total score of 2.5 is an average score, the low total score in external evaluation indicates that strategies are not well designed to meet the opportunities and defend against threats, but the above average score of 2.74 in internal evaluation indicates that university's strategies are moderately effective in

exploiting opportunities or defending against threats. Therefore, based on the findings derived from IFE or EFE matrices, the TARGET should improve its strategies and focus more on the opportunities.

Table 1. EFE Matrix

Key External Factors	**Weight**	**Rating**	**Weighted Score**
Opportunities			
Time management	0.02	3	0.06
Social Networking beyond borders	0.17	3	0.51
Alternative learning supports such as mobile devices	0.05	3	0.15
History tracking	0.12	4	0.48
Flexible schedule	0.03	4	0.12
Adaptiveness	0.14	3	0.42
Threats			
Technical Infrastructure	0.06	1	0.06
digital divide – some are tech savvy and others either illiterate or poorly literate	0.04	1	0.04
health issues – long term effects have not been thoroughly examined yet	0.02	2	0.08
Overwhelming amount of data can interfere with students' ability to regulate their learning	0.08	1	0.08
Pace of technological changes and difficulty in keeping up with the pace	0.12	1	0.12
Lack of e- specific curriculum	0.10	1	0.10
Cultural infrastructure--resistance to change in teaching/ learning beliefs	0.05	2	0.10
Total	**1.00**	**-**	2.32

Table 2. IFE Matrix

Key Internal Factors	Weight	Rating	Weighted Score
Strengths			
accessibility for everyone from anywhere, any time	0.10	3	0.40
cost effective	0.08	4	0.24
self-paced learning	0.07	3	0.28
technological involvement	0.02	3	0.06
mobility of teaching materials	0.06	3	0.18
reachability to all learners with different learning styles/ students with disabilities	0.11	4	0.44
Friendly environment	0.08	4	0.32
Weaknesses			
Untrained or poorly trained teachers	0.10	1	0.10
poorly designed materials	0.13	1	0.26
Low quality of the system	0.07	2	0.14
Low speed internet	0.09	1	0.18
Inefficient teaching apps.	0.04	1	0.04
lack of human interaction	0.05	1	0.10
Total			2.74

However, IFE or EFE matrices alone have little value on their own. Both analyses should be done and their results should be combined to discuss new strategies or for further analysis. To formulate strategic plans, SWOT matrix (Table 3), including four strategies groups, suggests how the strengths can be used to take advantage of opportunities; how the weaknesses can be reduced by taking advantage

of opportunities; how the strengths can be used to reduce the impact of threats; and finally how the weaknesses can be addressed to make these threats a reality.

Table 3. SWOT Matrix

	STRENGTHS **mobility of teaching materials** **accessibility for everyone from anywhere, any time** **reachability to all learners with different learning styles/ students with disabilities** **technological involvement** **student autonomy** **self-paced learning** **Self- regulated learning** **environmentally friendly** **cost effective** **up to date**	**WEAKNESSES** **Untrained or poorly trained teachers** **Low speed internet** **Low quality of the system** **incompetent students** **poorly designed Materials** **untrained personnel** **concentration problems** **lack of human interaction** **deep learning does not take place** **Inefficient teaching apps.**
OPPORTUNITIES 1. **Social Networking beyond borders** 2. **Using the possibilities of Computers** 3. **History tracking** 4. **Adaptiveness** 5. **Supported ongoing learning** 6. **assessment possibilities** 7. **Alternative learning supports such as mobile devices**	Opportunity-Strength (OS) Strategies Use the strengths to take advantage of opportunities 1. Link classes with national/ international universities (S1, S2, S3, O1, O2) 2. Get help from the mobile versions of the LMS as well (S4,S5,S8,S10,O2,O5, O7) 3. Design flexible computer assisted materials (S3, S5, S7,O4,O9)	Opportunity-Weakness (OW) Strategies Overcome weaknesses by taking advantage of opportunities 1. Plan national/ international Webinars for teachers, students and the personnel(W1,W4, W6, W8,O1,O2,O5,O7) 2. Use the possibilities of computer to provide more interesting and more efficient instruction (W 7, W5,W9,W10 ,O2,O3,O4,O9,O10) 3. Have workshops on

8. **Easy Data Management** 9. **Flexible schedule** 10. **Time management** .	4. Take advantage of constructive immediate computer assisted assessment to help learners with more efficient learning(S7,S9,O3,O4, O8,O10)	boosting system quality (W2,W3,O5,O6,O10)
THREATS 1. **Academic and social status of the e-learning graduates** 2. **Technical Infrastructure** 3. **Cultural infrastructure--resistance to change in teaching/ learning beliefs** 4. **Pace of technological changes and difficulty in keeping up with the pace** 5. **Lack of e-specific curriculum** 6. **digital divide – some are tech savvy and others either illiterate or poorly literate** 7. **health issues – long term effects have not been thoroughly examined yet** 8. **Overwhelming**	Threat-Strength (TS) Strategies Use strengths to avoid threats 1. Provide learners with easy to access tutorials and help.(S1,T2,T3,T6,T7) 2. Encourage networking with peers, experts, and institutions.(S2,S4,S8, T1,T4,T9,T10) 3. Provide a flexible computer assisted curriculum (S3,S5, S7,T5,T10)	Threat-Weakness (TW) Strategies Minimize weaknesses and avoid threats 1. Revise the requirements for entering the program. (W3,W4,W9, T1, T6) 2. Incorporate virtual teacher development into teacher education curriculum (W1,W3, W7, T5,T6, T8) 3. Update virtual learning system. (W3,W8,W10,T4,T7,T8, T9,T10) 4. Evaluate the program, and its outcome on an interval basis (W3,W5,W10,T1, T2, T3,T4)

amount of data can interfere with students' ability to regulate their learning **9. Lack of human contact** **10. Boredom & Lack of focus**		

5. Conclusion & Discussion

The results have indicated that various aspects of the performance at the TARGET have competitive significance for the success or failure of this institution (Table 3). In particular, the TARGET can benefit from some strengths (such as: accessibility for everyone, cost effectiveness , self-paced learning , technological involvement , mobility of teaching materials, reachability to all learners with different learning styles/ students with disabilities, friendly environment) and take advantage of some opportunities (such as: time management , social networking beyond borders , alternative learning supports such as mobile devices , history tracking , flexible schedule , adaptiveness) in order to minimize its weaknesses (such as untrained or poorly trained teachers, poorly designed materials, low quality of the system, low speed internet, inefficient teaching apps, lack of human interaction) and avoid threats (such as: technical infrastructure, digital divide, health issues, overwhelming amount of data, inability to regulate learning, difficulty in keeping up with the pace of technological changes, lack of e- specific curriculum, cultural infrastructure--resistance to change in teaching/ learning beliefs). Accordingly, based on the external and internal factors, identified through the SWOT framework, strategies were suggested on how to use the strengths to take advantage of opportunities, how to overcome weaknesses by taking advantage of opportunities , how to use strengths to avoid threats, and finally how to minimize weaknesses and avoid threats (see Table 3).

Needless to say, the TARGET's performance in these areas, as represented by the selected parameters at the time of analysis, is relative and can change in time, as can its competitors' performance vary between periods. However, SWOTs usually reflect a person's existing position and viewpoint, which can be misused to justify a

previously decided course of action rather than used as a means to open up new possibilities. Therefore, probably the strongest message from the SWOT analysis is that, whatever course of action is decided, decision making should contain each of the following elements: building on Strengths, minimizing Weaknesses, seizing Opportunities, and counteracting Threats. Consequently, periodic depiction of the impact of these changes on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats at this institution, like any others, is essential in the strategic management process.

In conclusion, as e-learning is the future and naturally requires different methods and methodologies of teaching and learning which change periodically with the change in technology, its performance requires frequent updated analysis. Periodic SWOT analysis, followed by needs analysis and team work with major departments for curriculum is a convenient and cost effective tool for the evaluation of the e-TEFL and can encourage staff to perform better, not only at the TARGET, but at any other institutions, and in any other disciplines.

References

Anaya, A. R., Luque, M., & Peinado, M. (2016). A visual recommender tool in a collaborative learning experience. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 45, 248-259.

Arbaugh, J. B. (2000). Virtual classroom characteristics and student satisfaction with internet-based MBA courses. Journal of Management Education, 24(1), 32–54.

Arbaugh, J. B. (2002). Managing the on-line classroom: a study of technological and behavioral characteristics of web-based MBA courses. Journal of High Technology Management Research, 13, 203–223.

Bower, B. L., & Hardy, K. P. (2004). From correspondence to cyberspace: Changes and challenges in distance education. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2004(128), 5-12.

Carliner, S. (1999). *Overview of Online Learning*. Human Resource Development Press, Amherst,
MA.

Cavanaugh, C., Gillan, K. J., Kromrey, J., Hess, M., & Blomeyer, R. (2004). The effects of distance education on K-12 student outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Learning Point Associates/North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL).*

Christensen, E. W., Anakwe, U. P., & Kessler, E. H. (2001). Receptivity to Distance Learnings: The Effect of Technology, Reputation, Constraints, and Learning Preferences. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 33(3), 263-279.

Darab, B., & Montazer, Gh. A. (2011). An eclectic model for assessing e-learning readiness in the Iranian universities. *Computers & Education*, 56, 900–910.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340.

Dillon, C. L., & Gunawardena, C. N. (1995). A framework for the evaluation of telecommunications-based distance education. In D. Stewart (Ed.). 17th world congress of the international council for distance education (Vol. 2, pp. 348–351). Milton Keynes, UK: Open University.

Ellis, R. (2004). Down with boring e-learning! Interview with e-learning guru Dr. Michael W. Allen. Learning circuits. Retrieved from. http://www.astd.org/LC/2004/0704_allen.htm

Flagg, B. N. (2013). *Formative evaluation for educational technologies*. Routledge.

Hill, T., & Westbrook, R. (1997). SWOT analysis: It's time for a product recall. *Long range planning*, 30(1), 46-52.

Hong, K. S. (2002). Relationships between students' and instructional variables with satisfaction and learning from a Web-based course. Internet and Higher Education, 5, 267–281.

James, G. (2002). Advantages and disadvantages of online learning. Retrieved 5/18/2014 http://www.comminit.com/ict-4development/node/210058.

Khan, B. H. (Ed.). (1997). *Web-based instruction*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Kurtz, C. F., & Snowden, D. J. (2003). The new dynamics of strategy: Sense-making in a complex and complicated world. *IBM systems journal*, 42(3), 462-483.

Leidner, D. L., & Jarvenpaa, S. L. (1995). The rise of information technology to enhance management school education: a theoretical view. MIS Quarterly, 19, 265–291.

Liaw, S. S. (2004). Considerations for developing constructivist Web-based learning. International Journal of Instructional Media, 31(3), 309–321.

Markee, N. (1997). *Managing curricular innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mohammadi, H. (2015). Investigating users' perspectives on e-learning: An integration of TAM and IS success model. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 45, 359-374.

Moore, M. G. (1990). Background and overview of contemporary American distance education. Contemporary issues in American distance education (pp. xii−xxvi). New York: Pergamon Press.

Orús, C., Barlés, M. J., Belanche, D., Casaló, L., Fraj, E., & Gurrea, R. (2016). The use of YouTube as a tool for learner-generated content: Effects on students' learning outcomes and satisfaction. *Computers & Education.* 95:254–269

Palloff, R. M., & Pratt, K. (2000, October). *Making the transition: Helping teachers to teach online*. Paper presented at the EDUCAUSE 2000 Conference, Nashville, Tennessee. Retrieved April 20, 2015, from http://www.educause.edu/conference/e2000/proceedings.html

Phelan, J. E. (2015). The Use of E-Learning in Social Work Education. *Social Work*, 1-8.

Piccoli, G., Ahmad, R., & Ives, B. (2001). Web-based virtual learning environments: a research framework and a preliminary assessment of effectiveness in basic IT skill training. MIS Quarterly, 25(4), 401–426.

Ring, G., & Mathieux, G. (2002, February). *The key components of quality learning*. Paper presented at the ASTD Techknowledge 2002 Conference, Las Vegas.

Riston N. (2008). *Strategic Management*. Neil Riston and Ventus Publishing.

Salmon, G. (2000). Computer mediated conferencing for management learning at the Open University. Management Learning, 31, 491–502.

Sarkar, S. (2012). The role of information and communication technology (ICT) in higher education for the 21st century. The science probe, 1(1), 30-41.

Soon, K. H., Sook, K. I., Jung, C. W., & Im, K. M. (2000). The effects of Internet-based distance learning in nursing. Computers in Nursing, 18(1), 19–25.

Sun, P. C., Tsai, R. J., Finger, G., Chen, Y. Y., & Yeh, D. (2008). What drives a successful e-Learning? An empirical investigation of the critical factors influencing learner satisfaction. Computers & education, 50(4), 1183-1202.

Tarus, J. K., Gichoya, D., & Muumbo, A. (2015). Challenges of implementing e-learning in Kenya: A case of Kenyan public universities. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 16(1).

Thompson, L. F., Meriac, J. P., & Cope, J. G. (2002). Motivating online performance: the influences of goal setting and Internet selfefficacy. Social Science Computer Review, 20(2), 149–160.

Thurmond, V., Wambach, K., Connors, H. R., & Frey, B. B. (2002). Evaluation of student satisfaction: Determining the impact of a web-based environment by controlling for student characteristics. The American Journal of Distance Education, 16(1), 169-190.

Wang, A. Y., & Newlin, M. H. (2002). Predictors of web-student performance: the role of self-efficacy and reasons for taking an on-line class. Computers in Human Behavior, 18, 151–163.

Webster, J., & Hackley, P. (1997). Teaching effectiveness in technology-mediated distance learning. Academy of Management Journal, 40(6), 1282–1309.

Appendix

SWOT analysis questionnaire

SWOT Analysis for e-TEFL at the TARGET Date: _____		
Dear respondent, Please list at least 5 statements about the SWOT of the e-TEFL at the TARGET.		
	Positive	Negative
Internal	Strengths 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Weaknesses 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
External	Opportunities 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Threats 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Note:

S=– are positive attributes internal to the organisation or situation that are within your control.

W=are also internal factors within your control that may impede your ability to meet your objectives.

O=are external factors that the organisation or project should (or could) develop.

T=are external factors beyond your control that could place the project or organisation at risk.