



PEDAGOGICAL ACTIONS, TECHNOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS, AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS IN ONLINE EFL LEARNING: A QUALITATIVE STUDY

Zakky Yavani^a, Evi Nurajizah^a, Amroh Umaemah^a

^aIAIN Syekh Nurjati Cirebon

*Corresponding author: Perjuangan Street, Sunyaragi, Cirebon, West Java, Indonesia. E-mail address: zakkyavani@syekhnurjati.ac.id

article info

Article history:

Received: 16 November 2023

Accepted: 10 December 2023

Available online: 22 December 2023

Keywords:

English online learning

Pedagogical action

Performance of technologies

Students' perception

abstract

English as a foreign language (EFL) instruction in Indonesia increasingly depends on technology-mediated platforms such as Google Classroom, yet little is known about how a teacher's pedagogical action and technological performance actually operate within such platforms, and how students perceive the resulting learning experience. This study examines (1) the pedagogical actions and technological dimensions that characterize a teacher's online EFL teaching practices, and (2) students' perceptions of online EFL learning through Google Classroom and Google Meet. A descriptive qualitative design was used, involving ten eleventh-grade students of SMAN 8 Cirebon City who took part in Google Classroom-based English lessons. Data were collected through observation of the teacher's Google Classroom activity and semi-structured interviews with the students, then analyzed through data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. The findings show that the teacher enacted four of five categories of pedagogical action proposed by Laurillard (2012) as cited in Hinkelman (2018): narrative, productive, communicative, and interactive most frequently through communicative and narrative action such as video-based explanation, poem-writing assignments, and Google Meet speaking sessions, while adaptive action appeared only through a single song-recording task. These actions were carried out through six technological dimensions, namely action, grouping, timing, space, text, and tools, dominated by large-group, asynchronous, home-based learning mediated chiefly by video and audio-video text through Google Classroom and Google Meet. Regarding perception, students generally accepted the platforms and found them useful, motivating, and interesting for developing their English skills, although several responses were neutral or negative, mainly linked to limited internet access, data quotas, and reduced opportunities for face-to-face social interaction. The study concludes that pedagogical action and technological performance are closely interdependent in shaping online EFL learning, that a wider variety of pedagogical action would strengthen the quality of instruction, and that adequate internet infrastructure remains decisive for sustaining students' motivation and comprehension.

INTRODUCTION

English occupies a central position among the foreign languages formally taught in Indonesian schools, where teachers are expected to develop students' competence in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and where English remains one of the subjects assessed in the National Examination. Many students nevertheless continue to struggle with English because the methods and media used to teach it are not always attractive or engaging enough to sustain their interest (Ahmad, 2012).

This challenge has become more pressing as technology has taken on a larger role in language classrooms. The shift toward online learning, accelerated by the policy requiring Indonesian schools to conduct teaching and learning activities online during the COVID-19 pandemic, has made teachers' use of technology more consequential than before. Ahmad (2012) argues that the performance of technology in the classroom is critical to the success of this transition, and teachers are now expected to master technological performance as part of their professional competence.

People use new technologies and media to facilitate and enhance their ability to exchange meaning, to draw on accessible technical resources, and to build wide networked communities by combining digital tools, practices, and social arrangements (Lievrouw, 2011). Because of this shift, EFL teachers are challenged to discover how to develop, deliver, and evaluate their classes using new technology (Lotherington, 2011), and blended programs combining digital technology with face-to-face interaction have become increasingly common (Gruba & Hinkelman, 2012).

Learning media, in this sense, is any tool that helps a teacher communicate instructional messages in order to reach the intended learning outcomes, and the choice of media is central to how a lesson unfolds (Djamarah & Zain, 2010). Many Indonesian teachers have already incorporated online platforms into their teaching, although not all teachers have used technology as a learning resource for a variety of reasons. Online learning itself is defined by Naidu (2006) as a high level of use of information and communication technology networks in teaching and learning, carried out through a computer or mobile device connected to the internet and usable at any time and from any place. The European Commission (2001) similarly describes online learning as the use of new multimedia technology and the internet to improve the efficiency of learning by increasing accessibility to resources and distance interaction, while noting that educators still disagree about how much real benefit it brings to students. Web-based tools such as Google Classroom allow a teacher to build a virtual classroom in which students can access material, submit assignments, and receive feedback without needing to meet in a physical room (Iftakhar, 2016; Okmawati, 2020).

How a lesson is delivered through these platforms, however, cannot be separated from how it is perceived. Perception, as Kumar (2010, as cited in Hasnidar, 2020) explains, is the process by which information is acquired through the sensory receptors — the eyes, ears, nose, and skin — and transformed into what a person thinks, sees, hears, smells, or feels. In an instructional context, this process shapes whether teachers feel motivated to teach and whether students feel motivated to learn, particularly in an online format where classroom atmosphere and non-verbal cues are limited (Robbins, 2003; Barry, 1998; Chee Choy & Phaik Kin Cheah, 2009). Pedagogical action, technological performance, and perception have each attracted research attention, though largely along separate lines, as the following review shows.

Research related to this study can be grouped into three clusters. The first cluster concerns students' perception of online learning in general. Hasnidar (2020) found that students of the English Education Department at Muhammadiyah University of Makassar regarded online learning as an efficient learning resource when supported by sufficient infrastructure such as a good network, and reported that online learning could inspire students and provide them with new learning opportunities. Cakrawati (2017) found that EFL students showed positive responses toward online platforms such as Edmodo and Quipper, considered them environmentally friendly because they reduced paper use for assignments, and recommended that teachers be more interactive during the online process. Syauqi, Munadi and Triyono (2020) reported more mixed results among vocational students, many of whom disagreed that online learning had been successful, and argued that careful planning and evaluation by both teachers and institutions were needed. Nasution and Ahmad (2020) likewise found that a substantial proportion of students held negative perceptions of online learning because of internet-quota requirements, limited access, and difficulty interacting with teachers, while Maskun, Rusman, Suroto and Rahmawati (2020) found that most students in their sample held a positive view of online learning in terms of appearance, content presentation, and benefit. Tanjung and Utomo (2021) found that university students held both positive and negative attitudes toward online learning: positive in terms of accessibility, flexibility, and digital-literacy gains, but negative in terms of internet bundles, network coverage, and inconsistent scheduling. None of these studies, however, examined the teacher's classroom pedagogical action and technological performance alongside student perception within the same study.

The second cluster concerns the use of technology in English language teaching more broadly. Ahmadi (2018) argued that teachers must first be convinced of the usefulness of technology before it can improve learners' thinking skills, autonomy, and confidence. Alqahtani and Mofareh (2019) and Solanki Shyamlee (2012) reached a similar conclusion, noting that technology can enhance students'

communicative skill and make English teaching more student-centered and less time-consuming, while Richards (2015) observed that teachers are continually finding new methods for using technology to improve both their own teaching and the learning opportunities available to their students. These studies establish that technology can support English learning, but none examines how a teacher's specific classroom actions, what Norton (2014) calls pedagogical action, are carried out through that technology.

The third cluster concerns pedagogical action itself. Ahmad (2012) found that engaging in pedagogical action research helped EFL student teachers in Egypt improve their teaching skills, although time constraints and limited research experience remained obstacles. Susanty, Ritonga and Tursina (2017), studying the teaching of speaking, found that teachers used a variety of materials, storybooks, songs, games, flashcards, and posters, together with strategies such as role play, discussion, interviews, and picture describing, combined with informal, summative, and formative assessment. Laurillard (2012), as cited in Hinkelman (2018), proposed that the design of learning activities cannot be determined from media capability alone; teachers must first evaluate what the learner requires. Collectively, these studies discuss pedagogical action or teaching strategy in a face-to-face context, but none situates it within online technological performance.

Taken together, these three clusters show that student perception, technology use, and pedagogical action have each been investigated productively, but always in isolation from one another. To date, no single study has combined pedagogical action, technological performance, and student perception within one online EFL classroom, leaving open the question of how these three dimensions interact in actual classroom practice.

This study addresses that gap by examining an eleventh-grade EFL class at SMAN 8 Cirebon City that carried out its lessons through Google Classroom and Google Meet. By jointly analyzing the teacher's pedagogical action, the technological dimensions through which that action was delivered, and students' perceptions of the resulting learning experience, the study offers a more integrated account of online EFL instruction than studies that examine these elements separately, and is expected to provide practical insight for teachers designing similar online lessons. The study is guided by two research questions: (1) What pedagogical actions and technological dimensions characterize the teacher's online EFL teaching practices? (2) What are students' perceptions of online EFL learning through Google Classroom and Google Meet? The remainder of this article presents the theoretical foundation underlying pedagogical action, technological performance, and perception, followed by the method, findings and discussion organized around the two research questions, and the conclusion.

Theoretical Foundation

Pedagogical action is carried out in an educational setting by academics who teach and promote students' learning; its fundamental purpose is to systematically examine the teaching-and-learning process in order to improve teaching practice while also contributing to theoretical understanding that benefits student performance (Norton, 2009, 2014). Designing such action, alongside content, is one of the practical skills teachers are expected to develop in the present era (Akay, 2017). Laurillard (2012), as cited in Hinkelman (2018), proposes five types of pedagogic action, distinguished by pedagogic performance rather than by device or media type, as summarized in Table 1: narrative action, in which students listen to an explanation, hear a lecture, or watch a video; interactive action, in which students answer quiz questions, follow links, or receive feedback; adaptive action, in which learning simulates real-world tasks such as role-play or an online game; communicative action, designed for students to convey ideas, comments, and questions; and productive action, in which students demonstrate a language-learning task through their own creative effort, often in an essay or presentation.

Table 1. Pedagogical Actions as a Dimension of Technologies (Laurillard, 2012, as cited in Hinkelman, 2018, p. 30)

Types	Teaching Action	Learning Action	Example Technologies
Narrative	Presenting	Apprehending	Watching video
Productive	Coaching	Expressing	Publishing and production
Narrative	Presenting	Apprehending	Instruction reading
Communicative	Facilitating	Discussing	Discussion-board posting
Communicative	Facilitating	Discussing	Messaging
Communicative	Facilitating	Discussing	Messaging
Interactive	Questioning	Exploring	Pair-work dialogues
Interactive	Questioning	Exploring	Pair-work dialogues
Interactive	Questioning	Exploring	Pair-work dialogues
Adaptive	Modelling	Practicing	Video recording

Alongside pedagogical action, teachers must also attend to the performance of technology what technology actually does in the classroom (Hinkelman, 2018). Performance descriptions denote dynamic actions and relations rather than static entities. Harless (1986), as cited in Prawiladilaga (2012), defines performance technology as a process of selection, analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation aimed at the most effective program, while the International Society for Performance Improvement (ISPI, 2015), as cited in Prawiladilaga (2012), defines it as a systematic approach to improving productivity and competence using a set of methods, procedures, and strategies to solve performance-related problems. Laurillard's (2012) framework pushes this educational process of technology to the center of attention through six core dimensions: actions narrative, interactive, adaptive, communicative, and productive (how?); groupings individual, pair, and collaborative configurations (who?); timings synchronous and asynchronous, intensive and intermittent pacing (when?); spaces real classrooms, virtual online spaces, home and mobile spaces (where?); texts static and dynamic, mono-modal and multimodal displays (what content?); and tools physical devices, software applications, and networked configurations (what interfaces?). Tools in this sense can refer to either hardware or software capable of performing functions that meet an end-user's requirements (Farmer & Gruba, 2006, as cited in Hinkelman, 2018).

Perception, the third construct in this study, is defined by Robbins (2003, p. 124–130) as a process consisting of three stages acceptance, understanding, and evaluation through which physiological senses catch external stimuli that are then interpreted and judged subjectively by each individual. Chee Choy and Phaik Kin Cheah (2009), as cited in Hasnidar (2020), add that the perception of a stimulus can be shaped by past experience, intelligence, motivation, and social interaction, giving rise to indicators such as knowledge, social interaction, motivation, and experience.

METHOD

Research Design

This study used a descriptive qualitative design, appropriate for describing and interpreting the phenomenon of online EFL learning from the perspective of the people who experienced it (Creswell, 2009). Rather than testing a hypothesis, the design was chosen to portray, in as much natural detail as possible, how pedagogical action and technological performance unfolded in an actual classroom, and how students made sense of that experience (Creswell, 2008).

Participants and Setting

Data were gathered from class XI IPS 3 at SMAN 8 Cirebon City, comprising ten students who had experienced online English instruction using Google Classroom. The teacher's Google Classroom page, used to deliver the English lesson, served as the object of observation, while the same ten students, coded S.1 to S.10 to protect their identity, served as interview informants.

Instruments and Procedures

Two instruments were used. The first was non-participant, naturalistic classroom observation: the researcher did not intervene in the ongoing activity but merely observed and recorded the teacher's postings, instructions, videos, assignments, and feedback in Google Classroom over a series of sessions between 12 January and 17 February 2021, using an observation checklist derived from Laurillard's (2012) framework of pedagogical action, as cited in Hinkelman (2018), and the technological-performance dimensions described by the International Society for Performance Improvement (ISPI, 2015), as cited in Prawiladilaga (2012). The second instrument was a semi-structured, one-on-one interview (Creswell, 2009) conducted with each of the ten students individually through WhatsApp, using fourteen open-ended questions built around the perception indicators proposed by Robbins (2003), Chee Choy and Phaik Kin Cheah (2009), and Barry (1998): acceptance, understanding, evaluation, knowledge, social interaction, motivation, experience, recognition, interest, response, and how students organized their use of the platform.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed following Miles and Huberman's three interrelated steps, as cited in Sugiyono (2007): (1) data reduction, in which the raw observation notes and interview transcripts were selected and simplified into information relevant to the two research questions; (2) data display, in which the reduced data were organized into descriptive tables of pedagogical action, technological dimensions, and perception indicators; and (3) conclusion drawing, in which patterns across the observation and interview data were interpreted and compared against the theoretical framework to answer each research question.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings and discussion according to the two research questions. It first addresses RQ1 by describing and discussing the pedagogical actions and technological dimensions observed in the teacher's online EFL teaching in relation to the theoretical framework and previous studies, and then addresses RQ2 by describing and discussing students' perceptions of learning English through Google Classroom and Google Meet.

RQ1: Pedagogical Actions and Technological Dimensions in the Teacher's Online EFL Practice

Observation of the teacher's Google Classroom activity over the observation period identified four of the five categories proposed by Laurillard (2012), as cited in Hinkelman (2018): narrative, productive, communicative, and interactive action, while adaptive action appeared only once. Table 1 above summarizes each type as it was carried out by the teacher and responded to by students; the discussion below examines each type in turn together with the relevant theory and prior findings.

Narrative

Narrative action, observed three times, was the teacher's principal way of presenting new material. On 12 January the teacher posted the instruction "Open the link and learn about the video," directing students to a video containing simple animation so that the material could be grasped more quickly; on another occasion the teacher instead posted written instructions that students were required to read and follow without an accompanying video. This corresponds to Laurillard's (2012) description of narrative as a process of presenting and apprehending, in which the teacher's core action is exposition and the learner's core action is attention. Laurillard notes that narrative action in an online context can take many forms – podcasts, animations, web pages, blogs, or digital video clips – yet in this classroom it relied almost exclusively on a single video-link format. This narrower repertoire is consistent with Susanty, Ritonga and Tursina's (2017) finding that teachers commonly rely on a limited set of familiar materials even when a wider range – storybooks, songs, games, flashcards, posters – is theoretically available, and it suggests that the teacher had not yet fully diversified the

narrative forms recommended in the framework, even though the type itself was used consistently and was, according to students' later responses, one of the more accessible aspects of the course.

Productive

Productive action was observed only once, when on 26 January the teacher posted the assignment: "Make a poem about fall in love at the first sight, about yourself. Don't take the poem from the internet." The teacher's role here shifted from presenting to coaching, and the students' role from apprehending to expressing exactly the pairing Laurillard (2012) assigns to this category. Because writing is, as Tarigan (2008, p. 8) observes, a productive and expressive activity that depends on a continually developing mindset, the assignment also functioned as a safeguard against plagiarism, requiring students to produce original work rather than copy existing text. That productive action occurred only once across the observation period, however, indicates that opportunities for students to demonstrate creative, expressive output as opposed to receiving or discussing material remained limited. Norton (2014) frames pedagogical action research as a means of improving both teaching practice and student learning simultaneously; a heavier reliance on narrative and communicative action at the expense of productive action suggests room for the teacher to expand this dimension of practice, particularly for a skill such as writing that depends on repeated, guided production.

Communicative

Communicative action was the most frequent type observed, occurring four times, and was used mainly to assess students' speaking skill. On 27 January the teacher posted: "MULAI PEMBELAJARAN JAM: 09.00–10.30 via gmeet," sharing a Google Meet link through Google Classroom so that students could join a live session; students could also send messages to interact with the teacher or classmates outside the live session. This matches Laurillard's (2012) description of communicative action as facilitating discussion, with the teacher's role as facilitator and the students' role as discussants. Fotos (2004) similarly argues that technologies such as online discussion groups, small-group conversation, and video links are efficient ways of bringing oral communication into an online course, particularly at the early stages of a task. The prominence of communicative action in this classroom is consistent with the emphasis, found across several previous studies of online learning (Cakrawati, 2017; Rifiyanti, 2020), on using video-conferencing tools to preserve some form of live interaction despite physical distance; it also mirrors Baron's (2020) finding that students commonly rely on video-conferencing platforms such as Zoom or Google Meet to practice speaking with classmates and the teacher when face-to-face instruction is unavailable.

Adaptive

Adaptive action appeared once, when the teacher shared a song-based video related to the lesson topic and asked students to re-record themselves performing it as a way of practicing speaking skills and vocabulary; the teacher then assigned a grade once each recording was submitted through Google Classroom. This is consistent with Laurillard's (2012) description of adaptive action as modeling by the teacher and practicing by the learner, and with Haston's (2007) observation that teacher modeling for student imitation whether delivered live or through a recording is a useful device for introducing new performance concepts, provided it is not overused to the point of becoming, in Haston's words, "a crutch that actually prevents students from learning." Because this type of action can also resemble the cooperative, exploratory role-play activities described by Westecott (2003) and Thorne and Reinhardt (2008), its single occurrence in this classroom suggests that the teacher used adaptive technology cautiously rather than as a routine strategy, relying on it for a specific vocabulary- and pronunciation-focused task rather than as a general instructional mode.

Interactive

Interactive action was observed three times and was realized mainly through pair-work dialogues. On 2 February the teacher posted the instruction for "Unit 6 (Who is speaking?): Please join with Google Meet ... attention to the schedule," directing students toward a paired-dialogue exercise. Questioning is, according to Laurillard (2012), the teacher's core action here, and inquiry the learner's, and Levy and Nicholas (2009) describe pair work as an activity that lets two students engage in a communication task together, improving both participation and language use across speaking, writing, and reading (Harmer, 2001, as cited in Anggiana, 2011). Harmer (2001) lists clear advantages of this format – it increases each student's speaking time, encourages learner autonomy, and creates a calmer, more cooperative classroom – but also notes real risks: pairs may drift off-task, some students prefer working with the teacher rather than a similarly limited peer, and partner assignment can be contentious. In an online setting these risks are compounded by unstable connections and by the difficulty of monitoring multiple pairs simultaneously, which likely explains why this type, though used repeatedly, was still confined to a single recurring format (pair-work dialogue) rather than being extended to quizzes, hyperlinked exploration, or other interactive formats that the framework also allows.

Taken together, the teacher used four of Laurillard's (2012) five categories with some regularity: narrative, communicative, and interactive most often, productive and adaptive only once each – a pattern that echoes Ahmad's (2012) argument that many EFL teachers benefit from structured, ongoing pedagogical action research precisely because their initial repertoire of classroom action tends to be narrower than the full range the framework makes available. The dominance of communicative and narrative action, in particular, suggests a teaching style oriented toward explaining content and assessing oral performance, with comparatively less attention to written production and adaptive, self-paced practice – an imbalance worth addressing given that productive and adaptive action are, according to the framework, equally important for developing all four language skills rather than speaking alone.

Counting the eleven observed instances across the observation period makes this imbalance more concrete: communicative action accounted for four instances (36%), narrative and interactive action for three instances each (27% each), and productive and adaptive action for one instance each (9% each). This distribution shows that more than sixty percent of the teacher's pedagogical action was devoted to communicative and narrative types, while the two categories most closely associated with independent, self-paced skill-building – productive and adaptive – together made up less than a fifth of observed practice. Because Norton (2014) frames the purpose of pedagogical action research as the joint improvement of teaching practice and student learning, this frequency pattern is best read not as a deficiency unique to this teacher but as an empirical illustration of the gap Ahmad (2012) identified between the full range of pedagogical action available in principle and the narrower set that teachers, particularly under the added pressure of an emergency shift to online delivery, tend to draw on in practice.

Across all five categories, the teacher's actions were carried out through six technological dimensions – action, grouping, timing, spaces, text, and tools – summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Technological Dimensions of the Observed Online Lessons (adapted from Laurillard, 2012)

Action	Grouping	Timing	Spaces	Text	Tools
Narrative	Individual	Asynchronous	Home & mobile	Video	Software application
Productive	Individual	Asynchronous	Home & mobile	Printed	Software application
Narrative	Individual	Asynchronous	Home & mobile	Printed	Software application
Communicative	Large group	Asynchronous	Home & mobile	Audio & video	Software applications
Communicative	Large group	Asynchronous	Home & mobile	Audio & video	Software applications
Communicative	Large group	Asynchronous	Home & mobile	Audio & video	Software applications
Interactive	Large group	Asynchronous	Home & mobile	Audio & video	Software applications
Interactive	Large group	Asynchronous	Home & mobile	Audio & video	Software applications
Interactive	Large group	Asynchronous	Home & mobile	Audio & video	Software applications
Adaptive	Individual	Asynchronous	Home & mobile	Audio & video	Software applications

Action and Grouping

Consistent with the pedagogical-action findings above, the teacher's actions were dominated by communicative action, used mainly to test students' comprehension and speaking ability, followed by narrative and interactive action. In terms of grouping, the teacher combined individual work used mainly for narrative, productive, and adaptive tasks that students completed at their own pace, such as watching a video or recording a song with large-group activity, used for communicative and interactive tasks that involved the whole class through Google Meet. Pilgreen (2000) found, in a study of sustained silent reading, that the involvement of others helped students stay focused; the same principle appears to hold in reverse here, since students living farther from school, and therefore more reliant on individual study, reported feeling that material explained without a live group session was harder to follow a concern discussed further under students' perception below.

Timing and Spaces

All observed sessions took place asynchronously; the teacher adjusted the timing of material delivery to students' circumstances rather than requiring everyone to be online at the same moment, except for the scheduled Google Meet sessions used for communicative and interactive action. This distinction between synchronous and asynchronous timing, drawn from Hinkelman (2018), reflects a deliberate accommodation of students' varying access to devices and connectivity. Because students and the teacher could not be in one physical room together, Google Classroom effectively became the classroom space itself, with students studying from home using their own smartphones consistent with Naidu's (2006) definition of online learning as instruction mediated by networked information and communication technology, usable at any time and from any place.

Text and Tools

Material was presented mainly through video and audio-video text, and to a lesser extent through printed text, consistent with Laurillard's (2012) distinction between static, mono-modal displays (printed instructions) and dynamic, multimodal displays (video, audio-video). Google Classroom and Google Meet were the two principal tools supporting these lessons. Table 3 summarizes the broader category of physical devices and software applications within which these tools sit, following Hinkelman's (2018) tool taxonomy.

Table 3. Physical Devices and Software Applications (adapted from Hinkelman, 2018)

	Physical devices	Software applications
Classroom	Whiteboards, screens/displays, projectors, CD/DVD players, document cameras, printers/scanners, wired computers	Internet browsers, operating systems, security programs, office applications, class website
Network	Servers, wireless hubs, backup systems, cloud services, databases, repositories	Local area networks, e-mail and messaging, learning management systems (enrolment, gradebook, files), quiz/assignment/forum plugins
Mobile	Notebook computers, tablets, smartphones, cameras and video cameras	Internet-browser apps, mail and messaging, social networking, photo/video editing, dictionaries, translators

Both Google Classroom and Google Meet fall under networked, mobile-accessible software applications in this taxonomy. Google Classroom, a blended-learning platform first introduced in 2014 (Luckerson, 2015, as cited in Saputri, 2020), lets a teacher freely develop and share assignments with students (Nagele, 2017, as cited in Saputri, 2020), while Google Meet, one of Google's video-communication tools, supports the live, face-to-face interaction that Google Classroom alone cannot provide. Their complementary strengths Google Classroom's ease of access through a browser, and Google Meet's capacity for direct video interaction closely match the division of labor observed in the data: Google Classroom carried narrative, productive, and adaptive action, while Google Meet carried most communicative and interactive action.

RQ2: Students' Perceptions of Online EFL Learning through Google Classroom and Google Meet

Interview data from the ten student informants were organized around the three complementary sets of perception indicators described in the theoretical foundation above: Robbins' (2003) acceptance, understanding, and evaluation; Chee Choy and Phaik Kin Cheah's (2009) knowledge, social interaction, motivation, and experience; and Barry's (1998) recognize, organize, interest, and response.

Indicators Based on Robbins (2003): Acceptance, Understanding, and Evaluation

Asked whether they accepted the material well when the teacher delivered it, responses were divided. One student welcomed the teacher's use of varied media:

"Of course. Sometimes the teacher provides material in a way that makes students interested, for example by sharing YouTube links and PowerPoint slides accompanied by an explanation." (S.1)

Others were less positive, citing the difficulty of the language itself and a perceived lack of explanation:

"I don't think so, because English looks a bit difficult, and the teacher only gives assignments." (S.2)

According to Robbins (2003, p. 124–130), acceptance operates at the physiological stage of perception, where the senses catch an external stimulus before it is interpreted; Hasnidar (2020) similarly frames this as the role of the five senses in receiving knowledge transmitted from one person to another. The mixed responses here suggest that acceptance depended heavily on how much explanation accompanied a given piece of material rather than on the platform itself. On the understanding indicator, students showed a shared, largely accurate grasp of what online learning means:

"My understanding of online learning [is] virtual learning using the internet. Learning that does not have to go to school, so it can be done at home... The internet [connects] a classroom but a different place." (S.2)

"[A] learning process that uses electronic devices and the internet to support understanding." (S.3)

These responses closely echo Ally's (2008, p. 7) definition, as cited in Hasnidar (2020), of online learning as the use of the internet to access learning content while remaining connected to teachers and peers, and Dabbagh and Bannan-Ritland's (2005, p. 15) description, also cited in Hasnidar (2020), of distance education as an interactive approach supported by collaborative pedagogical resources that build knowledge through social interaction. The alignment between students' own definitions and the formal theory indicates that, whatever difficulties they experienced in practice, students understood the underlying concept of online learning clearly. On the evaluation indicator, students were asked whether Google Classroom made it easier to store important documents and assignments:

"Yes, of course, because GCR can access Google Drive we just copy and paste the link in GCR." (S.2)

"GCR can access Google Drive, so it will reduce cellphone memory usage." (S.5)

This subjective, generally favorable evaluation is consistent with Robbins' (2003) claim that evaluation is shaped by each individual's own experience of the stimulus in this case, the practical convenience of cloud-based storage.

Indicators Based on Chee Choy and Phaik Kin Cheah (2009): Knowledge, Social Interaction, Motivation, and Experience

Asked whether online learning made the material easy to understand, students again gave mixed but informative answers:

"If the problem [is] understanding the material, it depends on how [the teacher explains] it. Sometimes the teacher explains the material through YouTube with various pictures." (S.1)

"Not all students can understand the material as soon as [it is given]... [because] the students' perceptive power is different [and] the explanation... [is] less detailed." (S.2, S.3)

Chee Choy and Phaik Kin Cheah (2009), as cited in Hasnidar (2020), note that the perception of a stimulus can be affected by past experience, intelligence, motivation, and social interaction a claim borne out here, since students attributed their comprehension difficulties less to the platform than to

differences in individual ability and the level of detail in the teacher's explanation. This is consistent with Effendi's (2005), as cited in Hasnidar (2020), observation that online learning, despite saving time and cost, requires significant upfront planning by learners because unresolved barriers such as a poor network or an unfamiliar application can otherwise go unaddressed. On social interaction, most students felt online learning fell short of face-to-face contact:

"For online learning, [there are] fewer... interactions, due to limitations in the study. For example, students are too focused on the assignments given by the teacher." (S.1)

"I think less [interaction], depend[ing] on... face to face... in class, because you can interact directly with friends and teachers... it's better if you just [meet] face to face." (S.4)

This finding parallels Nasution and Ahmad's (2020) observation that difficulty interacting with teachers and classmates was among the main sources of negative perception toward online learning, and Tanjung and Utomo's (2021) finding that reduced student–teacher interaction was one of the clearest disadvantages university students associated with the shift away from face-to-face instruction. On motivation, however, responses turned notably more positive:

"Yes, since the pandemic took place, my school has used Google Classroom as a medium for learning, and this is also easy to access." (S.1)

"[It is] able to motivate students to participate in the learning process, because of the current pandemic... students are more enthusiastic to participate in online learning. However, [students face] limitations [with] internet and quota." (S.2)

This mirrors Hasnidar's (2020) conclusion that online learning can inspire students to engage more with their studies when adequate infrastructure is available, and it foreshadows the internet-dependence theme that recurs throughout the remaining indicators. On experience, students described concrete, largely favorable trade-offs:

"The advantages of GCR [are that it] can share materials, assignments, etc. The lack of GCR [is] because... students must have internet and quota." (S.1)

"The use of GCR can save time when accessing material or [collecting] tasks... but for the cost itself, GCR [still requires] quota." (S.2)

These responses indicate that students had developed a new, largely positive point of comparison for evaluating learning media, consistent with Chee Choy and Phaik Kin Cheah's (2009) claim, cited in Hasnidar (2020), that past experience shapes how a new stimulus is perceived.

Indicators Based on Barry (1998): Recognize, Organize, Interest, and Response

On recognition whether students were familiar with how to use Google Classroom responses were confident and consistent:

"I basically... understand how to learn using GCR online... The teacher will share information with the students, and students can comprehend and respond to the questions the teacher has posed." (S.1)

On how they organized their use of the platform, students converged on two main functions submitting assignments on schedule and communicating through the comments feature:

"Usually I use Google Classroom to send assignments that have been given by the teacher. The [deadline] for collecting has been determined by the teacher beforehand." (S.1)

"As a supporting tool to keep the learning process carried out. In addition, in Google Classroom there is a feature to communicate or exchange ideas between students and teachers... by writing in the comments column." (S.2)

On interest whether Google Classroom was an engaging medium for online learning most students responded positively, citing accessibility as the main reason:

"GCR is an interesting medium in my opinion because it is easy to access through Google, and because I am already familiar with learning [on] GCR." (S.1)

"Yes, for the time being, since it is used by a large number of schools... it is conveniently accessible and does not require downloading." (S.2)

Finally, on response whether students liked learning through Google Classroom most answers were favorable, though not universally so:

"For the new [features], I don't like it, because it [is] like errors on some systems." (S.1)

"I like using GCR as a medium for online learning during the current pandemic because it is easily accessible via Google, and [it] help[s] to understand the material and collect assignments." (S.2, S.3)

Barry (1998, p. 48), as cited in Hasnidar (2020), defines perception as the series of processes by which a person perceives, organizes, responds to, and makes sense of stimuli in the environment; the pattern across these four indicators – confident recognition, purposeful organization, moderate-to-high interest, and mostly positive but occasionally frustrated response – suggests that students had, by the time of the interview, fully incorporated Google Classroom into their routine, even where they continued to note its technical limitations. This finding is broadly consistent with Cakrawati's (2017) and Maskun, Rusman, Suroto and Rahmawati's (2020) conclusions that a majority of students hold a positive view of online-learning platforms once they have become accustomed to using them, while the recurring mentions of system errors, internet quotas, and connection quality echo the infrastructural concerns raised by Syauqi, Munadi and Triyono (2020), Nasution and Ahmad (2020), and Tanjung and Utomo (2021).

Taken together, the findings for RQ1 and RQ2 suggest that pedagogical action, technological performance, and student perception are not separate phenomena but shape one another directly. Communicative and narrative actions, delivered through accessible video and messaging tools, correspond with the aspects of learning students accepted, recognized, and responded to most positively, while the more neutral, negative, or divided responses – on understanding, social interaction, and evaluation – tended to cluster around students who faced constraints in internet access, data quota, or the level of detail in the teacher's explanation. This is consistent with Ahmadi's (2018) argument that technology can only translate into positive learning outcomes once both the teacher's use of it and the learner's access to it are adequate; in this classroom, the technology and the teacher's actions were broadly sound, but their benefit for individual students still depended on factors outside the classroom itself.

Limitations

Two limitations should be noted when interpreting these findings. First, because the study relied on non-participant observation of a single teacher's Google Classroom page over roughly one month, the range of pedagogical action documented reflects that particular unit of material rather than the teacher's full repertoire across a semester; a longer observation period might well have captured additional instances of productive or adaptive action of the kind theorized by Laurillard (2012) but only lightly represented here. Second, because the ten student informants were drawn from a single class at one school, their perception data – however detailed – cannot be generalized to EFL students at other schools or grade levels with different infrastructure, and the internet- and quota-related constraints they described should be read as characteristic of their specific context during the pandemic rather than as a universal feature of Google Classroom-based learning. Both limitations point toward the same direction for future research: a longer observation window and a broader, multi-school sample would allow the pedagogical-action and technological-performance framework used here to be tested with greater confidence.

CONCLUSION

This study set out to answer two research questions concerning an eleventh-grade EFL class at SMAN 8 Cirebon City. In response to RQ1, the teacher's online EFL practice was characterized by four of Laurillard's (2012) five categories of pedagogical action – narrative, productive, communicative, and interactive – most frequently realized through communicative action for assessing speaking and narrative action for presenting material, while adaptive action appeared only once, through a song-recording task, indicating room to diversify the teacher's pedagogical repertoire. These actions were carried out through six technological dimensions: action (dominated by communicative and narrative action), grouping (individual for self-paced tasks, large

group for live sessions), timing (mainly asynchronous, with scheduled synchronous Google Meet sessions for communicative and interactive action), spaces (home and mobile), text (mainly video and audio-video, with printed instruction used occasionally), and tools (Google Classroom for asynchronous tasks, Google Meet for live interaction).

In response to RQ2, students generally perceived online learning through these platforms positively, particularly regarding recognition, organization, motivation, interest, and the practical convenience of cloud-based storage. Acceptance, understanding, and evaluation of English content specifically were more divided, and social interaction was consistently reported as weaker than in face-to-face instruction. Across nearly every indicator, students' responses converged on one recurring condition: the quality of their perception depended on the adequacy of their internet connection and data quota, and on how much detail the teacher provided when explaining material. Findings that echo Hasnidar's (2020), Nasution and Ahmad's (2020), and Tanjung and Utomo's (2021) conclusions that infrastructure, more than the platform itself, determines whether online EFL learning is experienced as effective.

Overall, online EFL learning through Google Classroom and Google Meet can motivate students and expose them to new learning experiences, but its success is conditional on both a wider variety of pedagogical action and sufficient technological infrastructure. Teachers designing online EFL lessons are therefore encouraged to combine communicative and narrative action with more frequent productive and adaptive action, to provide more detailed explanation alongside video material, and to remain attentive to disparities in students' access to technology when planning how a lesson will be delivered. Students, in turn, are encouraged to take a more active and exploratory role in supporting the online learning process, while future research should investigate pedagogical action and technological performance across a wider range of platforms and grade levels to strengthen the theoretical grounding of these constructs in the EFL context.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, Z. S. (2012). Pedagogical action research projects to improve the teaching skills of Egyptian EFL student teachers. *Proceedings of ICERI Conference*.
- Ahmadi, M. R. (2018). The use of technology in English language learning: A literature review. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 3(2), 115–125.
- Akay, E. (2017). Designing content and pedagogy: A framework for effective teaching in higher education. *Journal of Educational Practice*.
- Ally, M. (2008). Foundations of educational theory of online learning. In T. Anderson (Ed.), *The theory and practice of online learning* (2nd ed., pp. 15–44). Athabasca University Press.
- Alqahtani, M., & Mofareh, A. (2019). The use of technology in English language teaching. *Frontiers in Education Technology*, 2(3).
- Baron, R. (2020). Students' perception on online application in speaking skill e-learning. *VELES: Voices of English Language Education Society*, 4(2), 213–221.
- Barry. (1998). A study of students' perception in English classes. Vol. 33, No. 2.
- Cakrawati, L. M. (2017). Students' perceptions on the use of online learning platforms in EFL classroom. *English Language Teaching and Technology Journal*, 1(1), 22–30.
- Chee Choy, S., & Phaik Kin Cheah, P. (2009). Teacher perceptions of critical thinking among students and its influence on higher education. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(2), 198–206.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dabbagh, N., & Bannan-Ritland, B. (2005). *Online learning: Concept, strategies, and application*. Pearson Education.
- Djamarah, S. B., & Zain, A. (2010). *Strategi belajar mengajar* (4th ed.). Rineka Cipta.

- European Commission. (2001). The e-learning action plan: Designing tomorrow's education. <http://www.elearningeuropa.info>.
- Fotos, S. (2004). Writing as talking: E-mail exchange for promoting proficiency and motivation in the foreign language classroom. In S. Fotos & C. Browne (Eds.), *New perspectives on CALL for second language classrooms*.
- Gruba, P., & Hinkelman, D. (2012). *Blending technologies in second language classrooms*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed.). Pearson Education.
- Hasnidar. (2020). Students' perception of using online learning materials (a descriptive qualitative research in Muhammadiyah University of Makassar). Undergraduate thesis, Muhammadiyah University of Makassar.
- Haston, W. (2007). Teacher modeling as an effective teaching strategy. *Music Educators Journal*, 93(4), 26–30.
- Hinkelman, D. (2018). *Blending technologies in second language classrooms* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Iftakhar, S. (2016). Google Classroom: What works and how? *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 3(Feb.).
- Laurillard, D. (2012). *Teaching as a design science: Building pedagogical patterns for learning and technology*. Routledge.
- Levy, M., & Nicholas, M. (2009). *Pair work and group work*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lievrouw, L. A. (2011). *Alternative and activist new media*. Polity.
- Lotherington, H. (2011). Teaching multimodal and digital literacy in L2 settings: New literacies, new basics, new pedagogies. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 226–246.
- Maskun, Rusman, Suroto, & Rahmawati. (2020). Student perceptions of online learning. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 5(2).
- Naidu, S. (2006). *E-learning: A guidebook of principles, procedures and practices* (2nd rev. ed.). Commonwealth Educational Media Center for Asia (CEMCA).
- Nasution, & Ahmad. (2020). Student perceptions of online learning during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Jurnal Pendidikan*.
- Norton, L. (2009). *Action research in teaching and learning: A practical guide to conducting pedagogical research in universities*. Routledge.
- Norton, L. (2014). The case for pedagogical action research in psychology learning and teaching. *Psychology Teaching Review*, 20(2).
- Okmawati, M. (2020). The use of Google Classroom during pandemic. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9(2). <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jelt>.
- Pilgreen, J. (2000). *The SSR handbook: How to organize and manage a sustained silent reading program*. Boynton/Cook.
- Prawiladilaga, D. S. (2012). *Wawasan teknologi pendidikan*. Kencana.
- Richards, J. C. (2015). Technology in language teaching today. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(2), 16-29.
- Rifiyanti, H. (2020). Learners' perceptions of online English learning during Covid-19 pandemic. *Scope: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(1).
- Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Organizational behaviour* (10th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Solanki Shyamlee, D. (2012). Use of technology in English language teaching and learning: An analysis. *International Conference on Language, Medias and Culture, IPEDR*, 33.
- Sugiyono. (2007). *Metode penelitian pendidikan pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

- Susanty, Ritonga, & Tursina. (2017). Teaching and learning process of speaking. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*.
- Syauqi, K., Munadi, S., & Triyono, M. B. (2020). Students' perceptions toward vocational education on online learning during the Covid-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 9(4), 881–886.
- Tanjung, F. Z., & Utomo, A. (2021). Investigating EFL students' perception on online learning amidst Covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 6(1).
- Tarigan, H. G. (2008). *Menulis sebagai suatu keterampilan berbahasa*. Angkasa.
- Thorne, S., & Reinhardt, J. (2008). Bridging activities: New media literacies and advanced foreign language proficiency. *CALICO Journal*, 25(3), 558–572.
- Westecott, E. (2003). Playing with paper: The role of paper prototypes in the development of interactive narratives. *Digital Creativity*, 14(1), 43–52.