Journal of Teaching of English
Volume 8 No. 4
e-ISSN: 2548-6810

The Acceptance of Google Meet as a Platform for Online TOEFL Course

Waode Anis Fitriah Salsabilah[1], Asrun Lio[2], Alberth[3]
anissalsabilah2@gmail.com
[1,2,3]Halu Oleo University, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to find out the students' acceptance of Google Meet in the online TOEFL course and the constraints students faced during the TOEFL course through Google Meet. This study used a qualitative and quantitative design with a descriptive type to analyze all data reported by students. This study used in-depth interviews, questionnaires, and triangulation to collect data in this study. In this case, there was an interview guideline and an adapted TAM questionnaire from Venkatesh & Bala (2008) consisting of 48 items. This study also used triangulation to recheck the information from the two previous data collection techniques to match the needs of this study. In collecting the data, 15 respondents were selected purposively. This study showed that students accept using Google Meet in the TOEFL course. Their acceptance was in the good category of 3,60. Their acceptance limited to Google Meet, which could be a bridge for course implementation and only suitable for certain TOEFL course materials such as structure and reading. Furthermore, related to the constraints, the two most commonly reported constraints were the problem of a poor internet network and the use of Google Meet was ineffective for delivering listening material. Based on it all, this study concluded that Google Meet was acceptable as a platform for the online TOEFL course even though it was undeniable that the reality was that Google Meet cannot always meet the needs of online learning, especially in the TOEFL course. So, this can be a future consideration for the course organizers.

Keywords:
Google Meet, TOEFL Course Platform, Technology Acceptance Model (TAM).

1. Introduction

Test of English as a Foreign Language, commonly known as TOEFL. It is an English test designed in such a way as to assess one's mastery as well as proficiency in English (Syamsuddin and Alimin, 2014; Ismail and Othman, 2020). This test generally includes assessing English listening skills, understanding the English structure well and correctly, and reading English. The test is necessary for all people, both students, and the general public. Moreover, this is confirmed by a study that noted that 98% of most students and the general public need a TOEFL Preparation Course because remembering TOEFL is important (Kayyis, Pratiwi, Tristiana, and Wulandadri, 2021). As in the world of work, it cannot be denied that there are also jobs that include TOEFL as one of the specifications of a worker. In addition, students need the TOEFL test because it is one of the requirements that students must meet to take the exam to complete their studies at once to achieve a bachelor's degree. That is why the researcher found many TOEFL Preparation Courses everywhere.

One of the TOEFL courses that attracted the researchers' attention was the TOEFL course organized by the Language Center (*UPT Bahasa*). Of the many TOEFL course places, the researcher chose the TOEFL course organized by Language Center for this study. It was because the location of the TOEFL course is within the environment of Halu Oleo University, so of course, it provided convenience for the researcher to conduct this study. Then, the researcher chose the TOEFL course organized by Language Center for this study. It was because there was a change in the course implementation system at Language Center from offline to online caused by Covid. It is based on the circular issued by the government on 18 March 2020, where all indoor and outdoor activities in all sectors, including education, are temporarily postponed to reduce the spread of Covid. So on that basis, all teaching and learning activities in the university environment, including TOEFL course activities conducted by Language Center, have been conducted online from 20 March 2020, according to the circular issued by Halu Oleo University. So at first, TOEFL course activities are done offline or face to face even for the registration process is still done manually by paper-based, it has to change to an online learning system.

In addition, another reason that encouraged the researcher to choose the TOEFL course by the Language Center was there was the use of online applications in the TOEFL course because of the application of online learning. In this case, Google Meet is one of the online applications used in Language Center to facilitate the TOEFL course process. One of the reasons the Language Center chose Google Meet as an online TOEFL course platform is that, in addition to what was stated by Mulyatiningsih, Palupi, Ekawatiningsih, and Firdausa (2021) that Google Meet is synchronous, it also has features that support the online learning process. Some of them, such as the share screen feature, can provide convenience for lecturers in sharing materials while explaining them. Then, Google Meet has a camera and microphone feature that can support the teaching of the TOEFL course online in real time. In other words, communication between students and lecturers in the online TOEFL course can be carried out directly and face to face simultaneously, like offline learning.

Nevertheless, besides, Google Meet has features that greatly help the learning process on the online TOEFL course, like face to face learning. The use of Google Meet is also not separated from constraints. It is because the form of Google Meet is a synchronous learning platform, where all the processes in Google Meet occur entirely in sync. It is conveyed directly from the computer or laptop to the audience anywhere and anytime with an internet connection. So it is possible that constraints such as faint teachers' voices, blurred display of teaching materials, and sounds with teaching materials displayed not at the same time can occur because the availability of the internet network in each student's place is inadequate (Handayani, 2020). So, indirectly, the researcher also considered it necessary to conduct a study on the TOEFL course by the Language Center.

Then because it may be that implementing the TOEFL course with Google Meet is not separated from constraints, as the researcher mentioned earlier. So, there may be a positive or even negative acceptance from students due to the use of Google Meet for various reasons. On this basis, one of the reasons that supported the

researcher to conduct a study on the TOEFL course by the Language Center was because the researcher assumed that it was necessary to know the users' acceptance of Google Meet as an online TOEFL course platform. As Mun and Hwang (2003) also said that knowing user acceptance of an online learning platform is essential because we can determine whether the application is accepted for use as a learning platform in such situations or unaccepted. Moreover, there is also a theory that supports doing so. The theory is the Technology Acceptance Model, commonly called TAM, which is a theory specifically used to describe the user's approval or rejection of the technology or, in this case, an online learning platform, with a particular dimension to see how the platform can be accepted in its application (Jundullah, Umar, and Yudhana, 2019). So on that basis, the researcher assumed that it was necessary to know whether Google Meet is acceptable or not in the TOEFL course.

Another reason that made the researcher more convinced to take the TOEFL course conducted by Language Center as study material for this study was that the researcher found that many researchers have previously conducted similar studies. However, it was not specific about user acceptance of Google Meet as an online TOEFL course platform. The two previous studies included a study conducted by Purwanto and Tannady (2020) that found that students who use Google Meet felt that Google Meet was easy to use, so the benefits were felt directly by users, which created a positive attitude and intention in accepting Google Meet. Then, another study was conducted by Bintara and Kocimaheni (2020) that showed that Google Meet met the requirements to become an online learning platform because Google Meet can meet the needs of online learning. Therefore, the researcher believed that knowing the acceptance of Google Meet as a TOEFL course platform was necessary to improve the quality of the TOEFL course that the Language Center conducted in the future.

Based on the description above, the researcher was interested in finding out the users' acceptance of Google Meet as an online learning platform, especially in the online TOEFL course conducted by Language Center.

2. Methods

The researcher used qualitative and quantitative designs with a descriptive type in this study. Then, the researcher took 94 the Halu Oleo University students who attended the online TOEFL course organized by Language Center (*UPT Bahasa*) as the study population. Furthermore, the researcher used the purposive sampling technique to determine the sample of this study. There were two provisions for the researcher in determining the study sample. First, the researcher only selected the students who had not graduated because it aimed to make it easier for the researcher to conduct the study. Secondly, the researcher only selected students who actively took the online TOEFL course. Therefore, the researcher got 15 students as a sample for this study. Furthermore, to support this study, the researcher used two instruments to collect data, namely the interview guide and questionnaire. The researcher used the interview to find out the data related to the students' acceptance of Google Meet in the online TOEFL course and the constraints they faced during the TOEFL course with Google Meet. Then, the researcher used the questionnaire to

collect additional data related to students' acceptance of Google Meet as a platform in the online TOEFL course. The questionnaire was a close-ended questionnaire consisting of 48 items. The items were positive statements formed based on variables in TAM3 adapted from (Venkatesh & Bala 2008). In this case, this questionnaire used a five-point Likert scale measurement by Morissan (2012:89), as follows:

Table 1. Likert Scale

Positive Statement Point	Scale
5	Strongly Agree
4	Agree
3	Neutral
2	Disagree
1	Strongly Disagree

The table above showed that each answer option in the Likert scale of this study had its points. Strongly Agree with 5 points, Agree with 4 points, Neutral with 3 points, Disagree with 2 points, and Strongly Disagree with 1 point.

Afterward, this study used three data collection techniques, namely in-depth interview, questionnaire, and triangulation. Regarding the triangulation, the researcher used cross-triangulation methods in this study because, as the researcher stated earlier, the researcher used two data collection techniques from two different study designs, qualitative and quantitave. Then, there were two technique of data analysis, namely thematic coding analysis and descriptive statistics. The researcher used thematic coding analysis to analyze the interview results in this case. Then, the researcher processed the result of questionnaire data in this study using descriptive statistics. In this case, the researcher interpreted the data from the questionnaire result based on the mean score of each questionnaire item. The researcher used the five-box method guidelines for categorizing the mean score by Sugiyono (2016) in Kusumah (2017), as shown in the table below:

Table 2. Level of Data Criteria According to Mean Score

Mean Score	Level of Data Criteria
1.00 – 1.80	Very Bad
1.81 – 2.60	Bad
2.61 – 3.40	Enough
3.41 – 4.20	Good
4.21 – 5.00	Very Good

The table above showed that the categorization of mean scores according to empirical assessment standards was classified into several categories. In this case, there were five categories of mean scores, namely very bad, bad, enough, good, and very good. Regarding this, the interpretation of such categories was not only limited to the name of categories (Khairani, Daud, and Adnan, 2020). But, the researcher could interpret it according to the needs of the study. Therefore, the researcher interpreted that if the mean score in the bad or even very bad category meant that the students' acceptance of Google Meet in the course was unacceptable or that the students' acceptance was negative. Then, if the mean score was in enough category meant students' acceptance of Google Meet in the TOEFL course was in the middle. In this case, it meant that Google Meet was not good but also not bad. So, students

can still accept the use of Google Meet. Then, if the mean score was a good criterion, it showed that students received Google Meet in the TOEFL course well. It meant that students still benefited from using Google Meet in TOEFL courses, but in practice, it was not perfect because students still found some constraints. Therefore, their acceptance was limited to being good, not to the point of reaching the category of a very good category. The last, if the mean score was very high, students were very receptive to using Google Meet in the TOEFL course. In other words, students did not encounter any constraints during the course through Google Meet, so students' acceptance of Google Meet in the TOEFL course was very positive.

3. Result

The results of the acceptance of Google Meet as the online TOEFL course platform can be seen in the interview result and questionnaire. In the interview result, two major themes are found, perceived advantages and disadvantages of Google Meet. These can explain students' acceptance of Google Meet and the constraints students face while taking the TOEFL course with Google Meet, as shown in the table below:

Table 3. Perceived of Advantages and Disadvantages of Google Meet

No	Advantages	F.C	P.C	F.I	P.I	Disadvantages	F.C	P.C	F.I	P.I
1.	Increasing the interaction between students and lecturers	23F	20%	10	67%	Required a stable internet network	30F	29%	11	73%
2.	Effective as the online TOEFL course platform	17F	15%	10	67%	Ineffective for the delivery of listening material	28F	27%	11	73%
3.	Fun or interesting learning experience	15F	13%	11	73%	Vulnerable to ineffectiveness as a TOEFL course platform	10F	10%	5	33%
4.	Features that support TOEFL course learning	11F	10%	7	47%	The display of the material was not optimal	10F	10%	2	13%
5.	Effective for delivering structure and reading materials	10F	9%	10	67%	Difficult to understand the material	9F	9%	5	33%
6.	Flexible and practical	7F	6%	6	40%	Limited time duration	8F	8%	5	33%
7.	User friendly	5F	4%	4	27%	The students' focus disrupted	4F	4%	3	20%
8.	Easy to join the online course	5F	4%	4	27%	It covered much of the data	3F	3%	3	20%
9.	Easy access to course material	4F	4%	3	20%	Lack of disciplined	2F	2%	2	13%
10.	Training student to discipline	4F	4%	1	7%					
11.	No network	4F	4%	4	27%					

	constraint									
12.	Learning comfort	4F	4%	2	13%					
13.	Effective for delivering listening material	4F	4%	4	27%					

Note: F.C = The frequency of how often informants saying such comments; P.C = The percentage of comments; F.I = The frequency of informants; and P.I = The percentage of informants.

The table above shows 13 advantages of using Google Meet in the online TOEFL course with 113 total frequencies and 9 the disadvantages of using Google Meet in the online TOEFL course with 104 total frequencies. It means that the frequency of advantages was more than disadvantages. It means that students can receive Google Meet in the TOEFL course. However, the researcher finds much different frequency comparisons in some of the same sub-themes on both themes. Some of these sub-themes are regarding the internet, the role of Google Meet in delivering listening materials, and Google Meet as a TOEFL course platform.

Based on some of the sub-themes, the researcher concludes that students can accept Google Meet as a TOEFL course platform because it can bridge the implementation of the online TOEFL course. But overall, students are less accepting because it turns out that not all TOEFL materials are suitable for delivery through Google Meet, such as in the delivery of listening material.

Furthermore, the questionnaire results are the additional data to explain the students' acceptance of Google Meet based on the mean score, as mentioned in the table below:

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics

No	Item	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q1	SN1	15	2.00	5.00	3.6667	.81650
Q2	SN2	15	2.00	4.00	2.9333	.79881
Q3	SN3	15	2.00	5.00	4.2000	.94112
Q4	SN4	15	1.00	4.00	2.2667	.70373
Q5	IMG1	15	2.00	5.00	3.9333	.79881
Q6	IMG2	15	2.00	5.00	3.2667	.88372
Q7	REL1	15	2.00	5.00	3.5333	.74322
Q8	REL2	15	2.00	5.00	4.0000	.84515
Q9	REL3	15	1.00	4.00	2.8000	1.01419
Q10	OUT1	15	3.00	5.00	4.0667	.59362
Q11	OUT2	15	2.00	4.00	3.2000	.86189
Q12	OUT3	15	2.00	5.00	3.2667	.70373
Q13	RES1	15	1.00	4.00	2.4667	.83381
Q14	CSE1	15	2.00	5.00	3.9333	.88372
Q15	CSE2	15	2.00	4.00	3.2000	.77460
Q16	CSE3	15	3.00	5.00	4.1333	.51640
Q17	CSE4	15	1.00	5.00	3.4000	1.24212
Q18	PEC1	15	1.00	5.00	3.4667	.91548
Q19	PEC2	15	2.00	5.00	3.6000	.73679
Q20	PEC3	15	2.00	5.00	3.6000	.82808
Q21	CANX1	15	3.00	5.00	4.1333	.51640
Q22	CANX2	15	2.00	5.00	3.8667	.83381

Q23	CANX3	15	3.00	5.00	4.1333	.51640
Q24	CANX4	15	1.00	4.00	2.2667	.70373
Q25	CPLAY1	15	3.00	5.00	4.0667	.70373
Q26	CPLAY2	15	4.00	5.00	4.4000	.50709
Q27	CPLAY3	15	3.00	5.00	3.8000	.67612
Q28	CPLAY4	15	2.00	5.00	3.6000	.91026
Q29	ENJ1	15	2.00	5.00	3.9333	.70373
Q30	ENJ2	15	2.00	4.00	3.0667	.79881
Q31	ENJ3	15	2.00	5.00	3.8000	.77460
Q32	OU1	15	2.00	5.00	3.0000	1.13389
Q33	PU1	15	3.00	5.00	3.6667	.61721
Q34	PU2	15	3.00	5.00	3.6667	.61721
Q35	PU3	15	3.00	5.00	4.0667	.59362
Q36	PU4	15	3.00	5.00	4.2000	.67612
Q37	PEOU1	15	2.00	5.00	3.8000	.67612
Q38	PEOU2	15	3.00	5.00	3.8000	.67612
Q39	PEOU3	15	3.00	5.00	4.1333	.51640
Q40	PEOU4	15	4.00	5.00	4.0667	.25820
Q41	BI1	15	2.00	4.00	3.1333	.74322
Q42	BI2	15	2.00	4.00	3.5333	.74322
Q43	BI3	15	2.00	4.00	2.7333	.70373
Q44	USE1	15	1.00	5.00	3.2667	1.22280
Q45	EXP1	15	2.00	5.00	3.9333	.88372
Q46	VOL1	15	3.00	5.00	4.2000	.56061
Q47	VOL2	15	4.00	5.00	4.3333	.48795
Q48	VOL3	15	2.00	5.00	3.4667	.83381
Valid N (listwise)		15				
Total Mean Score					3. 604167	

Note: N (Number of respondents); SN (Subjective Norm); IMG (Image); REL (Job Relevance); OUT (Output Quality); RES (Result Demonstrability); CSE (Computer Self-Efficacy); PEC (Perception of External Control); CANX (Computer Anxiety); CPLAY (Computer Playfulness); ENJ (Perceived Enjoyment); OU (Objective Usability); PU (Perceived Usefulness); PEOU (Perceived Ease of Use); BI (Behavioral Intention); USE (Use Behavioral); EXP (Experience); and VOL (Voluntariness).

The table above shows the mean score of each questionnaire item. There are 48 questionnaire items presented in the table above, with other information as a complement to the questionnaire data of this study. But in this case, the researcher shows it only as complementary data. The researcher wanted to show the mean score of each questionnaire item as evidence of obtaining a total mean score. It is because one of the purposes of this study is to find out students' acceptance of Google Meet, not to find out or test between one construct and another. Therefore, the researcher only looked at the total mean score of the questionnaire to determine students' acceptance of Google Meet in the TOEFL course and based on the total mean score above was 3.60. If guided by provision a level of data criteria according to the mean score, the total mean score was in the "Good" category. So this meant that Google Meet in the TOEFL course was good as a platform and suitable for some TOEFL materials because Google Meet cannot meet all the needs of the TOEFL course. The researcher can say most respondents received Google Meet in the TOEFL course.

4. Discussion

Based on all study findings, the researcher thinks these findings could answer the research questions of this study. The first research question asked about students' acceptance of Google Meet in the TOEFL course. Then, the answer is that students accept the use of Google Meet. Their acceptance could be categorized as good acceptance because it could be a platform for the online TOEFL course even though, in its implementation, students found many constraints that were quite a problem for students in the TOEFL course. Then, the second research question asked about the constraints students faced when taking the TOEFL course through Google Meet, and the answer was that there were nine constraints students faced in the TOEFL course via Google Meet. The two most commonly reported constraints were poor networking and Google Meet not fitting about delivering listening material.

Regarding this, the researcher assumes that it turned out that the use of Google Meet in activity could not always be free from constraints as in previous studies, such as those conducted by Purwanto and Tannady (2020), entitled "The Factors Affecting Intentions to Use Google Meet Amid Online Meeting Platforms Competition in Indonesia," which found that students' acceptance of Google Meet was positive because they felt that Google Meet was easy to use and they could feel the benefits directly. Likewise, the study by Radzi, Ismail, and Ya'akob (2021), entitled "The Acceptance of Google Meet Platform: An Assessment of Students' Perception," found that students accepted using Google Meet because they found Google Meet was valuable and easy to use. So, the two previous studies found that using Google Meet was free from constraints. However, it turned out that reality was only sometimes the case. As in this study, there was a constraint when applying Google Meet in the activity, such as network constraint. It was the same in a previous study by Bintara and Kocimaheni (2020). The title was "Persepsi Mahasiswa terhadap Penggunaan Aplikasi Google Meets pada Mata Kuliah Hyouki Level Shokyu," finding that one constraint that caused the Hyouki Level Shokyu course to be disrupted was signal. Based on this, the researcher thinks these constraints can be common problems when someone uses an online learning platform such as Google Meet. In addition, it turned out that the researcher found another constraint in this study, namely that not all TOEFL material was suitable for delivery through Google Meet, such as in the delivery of listening material. It was also, as Ramadhan, Lestari, Rizqy, and Mega (2021) said, that the effectiveness of the application was certainly different and made for different purposes. Therefore, Google Meet in the TOEFL course can only cover some course materials or only meets some TOEFL course needs.

5. Conclusion

Based on the results of this study, the researcher confirms that students accept Google Meet in the online TOEFL course. From the results, the overall mean score is 3.60, which is included in the "Good" category. It shows that Google Meet as the online TOEFL course platform is good because the total mean score is above the scoring standard even though it does not reach the "Very Good" category. So it indicates that Google Meet is good but not very good because Google Meet in the

TOEFL course still has disadvantages. The two most common disadvantages are poor internet networking, and Google Meet is inappropriate for delivering TOEFL listening material. So, the researcher suggests several things to the TOEFL course organizer, namely, to pay more attention to how to deliver the TOEFL material or what kind of material should be delivered to be more in line with Google Meet. Another suggestion is to use additional applications. Although Google Meet can be an alternative online learning platform, it cannot always meet the needs of online learning, especially in the online TOEFL course. Or another choice is for the organizer to replace the applications used with applications that can meet the needs of the TOEFL course and do not require a strong internet network so that the network problems that interfere with the learning process do not happen again in the future.

References

Bintara, A. P. P., & Kocimaheni, A. A. (2020). Persepsi Mahasiswa terhadap Penggunaan Aplikasi Google Meets pada Mata Kuliah Hyouki Level Shokyu. *HIKARI (Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Jurusan Bahasa Dan Sastra Jepang Universitas Negeri Surabaya)*, *4*(2), 234–245.

Handayani, L. (2020). Keuntungan, kendala dan solusi pembelajaran online selama pandemi COVID-19: Studi ekploratif di SMPN 3 Bae Kudus. *Journal of Industrial Engineering & Management Research*, *1*(2), 15–23.

Ismail, I., & Othman, R. (2020). A review of literature on the English language entry requirement for international students into postgraduate programs in Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, *7*(11), 543–549.

Jundullah, M., Umar, R., & Yudhana, A. (2019). Analisis Penerimaan Sistem E-Learning Smk Negeri 4 Kota Sorong Dengan Menggunakan Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). *PROSIDING SEMNASTEK 2019*, *1*(1).

Kayyis, R., Pratiwi, D., Tristiana, N. E., & Wulandari, F. (2021). PELATIHAN TOEFL UNTUK UMUM MENGGUNAKAN APLIKASI ZOOM. *Abdimas Siliwangi*, *4*(2), 188–196.

Khairani, A., Daud, A., & Adnan, M. (2020). STUDENTS'ACCEPTANCE OF THE USE OF GOOGLE CLASSROOM AS A PLATFORM IN BLENDED LEARNING. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *12*(1), 1–16.

Kusumah, E. P. (2017). *Technology acceptance model (TAM) of statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) applications*.

Morissan. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Survei* (KELIMA). PRENADAMEDIA GROUP.

Mulyatiningsih, E., Palupi, S., Ekawatiningsih, P., & Firdausa, A. R. (2021). The Characteristics of Enjoyable Online Learning for Culinary Arts Student. *ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:2107.14043*.

Mun, Y. Y., & Hwang, Y. (2003). Predicting the use of web-based information systems: self-efficacy, enjoyment, learning goal orientation, and the technology acceptance model. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, *59*(4), 431–449.

Purwanto, E., & Tannady, H. (2020). The Factors Affecting Intention to Use Google Meet Amid Online Meeting Platforms Competition in Indonesia. *Technology*

Reports of Kansai University, *62*(06), 2829–2838.

Radzi, N. F., Ismail, M. F., & Ya'akob, H. (2021). THE ACCEPTANCE OF GOOGLE MEET PLATFORM: AN ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS'PERCEPTION. *Journal of BIMP-EAGA Regional Development*, *7*(1), 18–24.

Ramadhan, S., Lestari, L., Rizqy, M., & Mega, I. R. (2021). The Effect of Google Meet in Literal Listening Class for Students of English Education Study Program. *EEdJ: English Education Journal*, *1*(2), 29–35.

Syamsuddin, I. A. (2014). Assessing Moodle as learning management system platform for English course based TOEFL. *International Journal of Computer Trends and Technology*, *18*(6), 276–279.

Venkatesh, V., & Bala, H. (2008). Technology acceptance model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. *Decision Sciences*, *39*(2), 273–315.