THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

Micro-Module Courseware Development Grant

Scheme 3: eLearning Pedagogy Research

Interim Report (2017-18)

Report due 31 May 2018. Please return by email to mmcd@cuhk.edu.hk

PART I

Project title: A Comprehensive Analysis of Different Types of UGFN1000 Micro-modules:
From Users' and Developers' Perspectives
Principal supervisor: Cheung Hang Cheong Derek and Ng Ka Leung Andy
Department / Unit: General Education Foundation Programme, Office of University General
Education
Project duration: From December 2017 to October 2018
Date report submitted: 25/5/2018

1. Project objectives

The project is so far on track to meet the set objectives.

2. Progress on process, outcomes or deliverables

What have been accomplished so far?

1) Mode of micro-modules implementation

In previous course setting, 2 sets of micro-modules were implemented as supplementary materials in several classes of UGFN1000 and its usage is in voluntary manner. In 2017-18T1, we have made the micro-modules into a compulsory course item. Online discussion forum, which accounts for 6% of the assessment, is an existing platform for students to have further discussion on the core questions. Students were required to watch the micro-modules before participating in the online discussion.

2) Online survey

In 2017-18T1, an online survey was introduced to the users of micro-modules to let them express their views on the effects of micro-modules on their e-Learning readiness. The data was collected and will be analyzed.

3) Focus group interview and survey

In 2017-18T1, we invited the users of micro-modules to focus group interviews. The focus group consisted of two parts. In first part, participants were asked to go through the

micro-modules developed for particular text in UGFN1000 and respond to a survey regarding the effectiveness of the videos for their learning. Then, they were asked to comment on and compare various types of micro-modules, in term of the presentation formats and the video contents. In second part, participants were asked to describe their usage of different e-platform in their learning, their preferences to traditional lecture and online lecture, and hence their e-Learning readiness. The conversations have been transcribed and analyzed preliminarily.

Have any obstacles been encountered and what are the remaining tasks to be finished?

No.

The remaining tasks to be finished include:

- Focus group transcripts and online survey, in response to students' e-Learning readiness, will be analyzed to evaluate students' preference and availability towards online learning.
- (2) Individual interview to producers will be conducted to examine the involved cost, procedures and barriers in producing the videos of different types.
- (3) The content of individual interviews will be analyzed. Comparison of cost-effectiveness, and barriers and challenges in micro-modules production of various types of videos will be drawn.

Is the project still on time for completion (which includes preparation of the final report) on or before the grant expiry date?

All concerned data is expected to arrive in late July, 2018. The data analysis is expected to finish in late September, 2018.

Provide a listing of project outputs to date.

As listed above. Detailed data is attached as appendix.

3. Evaluation Plan

Have you altered your evaluation plans? The evaluation will be conducted as planned.

Does your evaluation indicate that you have achieved your objectives?

The current evaluation method so far matched with our study objectives.

4. Dissemination Activities (reports, websites, video links, products, etc.)

Provide a listing of dissemination activities to date.

The findings to date have been presented in:

9th International Conference on Language, Education, Humanities and Innovation 2018, titled "Effectiveness and Preference of Different Types of E-Learning Courseware: A Students' Perspective Study"

Appendix

<u>Micro-modules</u> <u>Micro-Module Courseware Development Grant</u> <u>Scheme 3: eLearning Pedagogy Research</u> <u>Report data</u>

(a) <u>To evaluate the effectiveness of different types of videos in facilitating students'</u> <u>attainment of ILOs</u>

(i) Survey

In order to ensure that students could give a fair comparison of the different types of videos, we gathered 4 groups of students, in total 16 participants, to watch the 4 types of videos. Those videos were edited from the existing online micro-modules for text 8 (In Search of Memory: The Emergence of a New Science of Mind, Eric R. Kandel) in UGFN. With consideration to the completeness of the presentation, they were cut into short videos within 10 minutes. The participants were asked to fill in a survey after watching each video, regarding to its effectiveness in assisting their study from their perception.

Means were calculated as below:

	facilitates your reflection on the related issues	enhances your understanding of the related issues	enhances your understanding of the text	stimulates your interests to the related issues
Voiceover PowerPoint	4.00	4.81	4.31	4.63
Recorded Lecture	3.56	4.63	4.13	4.75
Powtoon Video	4.75	5.19	4.69	5.38
Student discussion	3.00	3.13	2.44	2.44

After watching 4 videos, they were also asked to give their preferences to the 4 videos according to its effectiveness in aiding them for course assessment. The preferences were converted accordingly (1^{st} preference = 4, 2^{nd} preference = 3, 3^{rd} preference = 2, 4^{th} preference = 1) and summary is shown as below:

	Reduce		Enrich the			
	my	Enhance my	materials in	Enhance my	Allow me to have	Overall
	motivation	performance	writing reflective	understanding	more in-depth	facilitate my
	to read	in tutorial	journal/term	on the text	reflection on the	learning in
	the texts	discussion	paper	content	related topics	UGFN
Voiceover	1.04	2.62	2.00	2.01	2.01	2.01
PowerPoint	1.94	2.63	3.00	2.81	2.81	2.81
Recorded	2.42	2.24	2.44	2.44	1.00	2.40
Lecture	3.13	2.31	2.44	2.44	1.88	2.19

Powtoon	1.62	2.20	2.42	2.25	2.50	2.00
Video	1.63	3.38	3.13	3.25	3.56	3.69
Student	3.31	1.69	1.44	1.50	1.75	1.31
discussion	5.51	1.09	1.44	1.50	1.75	1.31

(ii) Focus group interview

The 16 participants aforementioned were asked to give comments and elaborate their preferences to the 4 videos in focus group setting.

Voiceover 1	PowerPoint		
Advantages	Disadvantage		
- For some students, they could focus on the content in the Voiceover PowerPoint, without lecturer's image	- For some students, they could hardly concentrate without the presence of the presenter		
 Richer in information compared to Powtoon Video and Student Discussion Information presented could be used in written assignment 	 Overwhelmed with information and distorted extended thinking Some prefer reading the PowerPoint instead of listening to the lecturer, given that the content were similar 		
Recorded Lecture w	vith lecturer's image		
Advantages	Disadvantage		
 For some students, lecturer's image could provide a sense of real-time lecture, and thus they were more concentrated Instruction and presentation are more complete with lecturer's image and hence cues, and thus more interactive Richer in information compared to Powtoon Video and Student Discussion Information presented could be used in written assignment 	 For some students, lecturer's image distracted them from listening the content and reading the PowerPoint Overwhelmed with information and distorted extended thinking Some prefer reading the PowerPoint instead of listening to the lecturer, given that the content were similar 		
Powtoo	n Video		
Advantages	Disadvantage		
 Well organized and structured Easy to follow and concentrate A clear outline to course issues Facts and examples were presented in a vivid way Overall, students preferred Powtoon Video the most. 	 Information are less detail and concrete compared to Voiceover PowerPoint and Recorded Lecture Less likely to be used in written assignment 		
Student D	Discussion		

-	Opportunity to listen to other perspectives	 Not well structured, like a norm tutorial discussion setting
-	Less factual compared to the other videos, prompting new thoughts	 Less authoritative Less likely to be used in writte assignment