

The Implementation of Online Learning in Islamic Senior High School as Perceived by EFL Students

Persepsi Siswa EFL terhadap Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran Maya di Madrasah Aliyah

Rizkiatul Kamaliah, Sri Rachmajanti*, Hasti Rahmaningtyas

Universitas Negeri Malang, Jl. Semarang No. 5 Malang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

*Penulis Korespondensi, Surel: sri.rachmajanti.fs@um.ac.id

Paper received: 10-2-2022; revised: 27-2-2022; accepted: 8-3-2022

Abstract

The integration of technology in education can be seen in the implementation of online learning. The use of online learning has also increased since the spreading of the COVID-19 pandemic. It requires an instructional process to be carried out through online learning. The use of fully online learning raises various views among students. Therefore, the study investigated EFL students' perceptions on implementing online learning in MAN 1 Jembrana, Bali. The study was conducted under a mixed method design. The study involved 286 students of Grades 11 and 12 in the academic year 2020/2021. Data were collected through a 4-point Likert-scale online questionnaire, and interviews were validated by experts. The study results reveal that online and face-to-face learning have advantages and disadvantages. The students' vocabulary, reading, and writing skills improved during online learning except pronunciation, grammar, listening, and speaking skills. Two main factors affect students' perceptions of online learning. Firstly, the internal factors that had a positive impact on students were students' motivation and awareness. Secondly, the external factors included internet access (unstable internet connection and limited internet quota), an uncondusive environment, and instructional strategies. These factors could have positive and negative impacts on the students, depending on the students' learning situation.

Keywords: English; online learning; students' perceptions

Abstrak

Pengintegrasian teknologi dalam pendidikan dapat dilihat penerapannya dalam pelaksanaan pembelajaran maya. Saat ini, pelaksanaan pembelajaran maya juga meningkat akibat merebaknya pandemi COVID-19. Hal tersebut mengharuskan dilaksanakannya pembelajaran maya secara penuh tanpa tatap muka. Pelaksanaan pembelajaran maya penuh menimbulkan berbagai pandangan di kalangan siswa. Oleh sebab itu, penelitian ini menyelidiki persepsi siswa EFL terhadap pembelajaran maya Bahasa Inggris di MAN 1 Jembrana, Bali. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode campuran yaitu mengkombinasikan bentuk kuantitatif dan kualitatif dengan melibatkan 286 siswa dari kelas XI hingga XII tahun pelajaran 2020/2021. Data dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner *online* dengan 4 Skala Likert dan wawancara yang telah divalidasi oleh para ahli. Hasil dari penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pembelajaran maya dan tatap muka memiliki kelebihan dan kekurangan masing-masing. Kosakata, keterampilan membaca, dan menulis siswa meningkat saat pembelajaran maya. Hal tersebut berbanding terbalik dengan perkembangan siswa pada pengucapan dan tata bahasa Inggris serta keterampilan mendengarkan dan berbicaranya. Terdapat dua faktor utama yang memengaruhi persepsi siswa terhadap pembelajaran maya. Pertama, faktor internal yang bersifat positif yaitu motivasi dan kesadaran siswa. Kedua, faktor eksternal meliputi akses internet (ketidakstabilan koneksi internet dan kuota internet yang terbatas), lingkungan yang tidak kondusif, dan strategi pembelajaran. Faktor eksternal dapat berdampak positif maupun negatif, bergantung pada situasi belajar para siswa.

Kata kunci: bahasa Inggris; pembelajaran maya; persepsi siswa

1. Introduction

In today's modern world, the development of technology is proliferating. It can be seen that many people have been addicted to information and communication technology (ICT). The ICT use for educational purposes has increased. Technology is one of the many factors indicating 21st-century education (Insani, Suherdi, & Gustine, 2018). Educators need to implement classroom technology to help students prepare for their future in the digital era. Teachers usually use online learning to integrate the use of technology. Online learning is a learning process which is using online tools to support the teaching and learning process. In online learning, teachers and students are separated by a distance in those assignments, tests, and lectures are all accessed by online platforms (Stern, 2004).

The implementation of online learning and the use of online learning platforms have been becoming more crucial in Indonesia since the spread of COVID-19 (Atmojo & Nugroho, 2020). The principles of social distancing during this pandemic had caused offline class suspensions. Every educational place, such as schools and universities, was closed by the government. Consequently, teachers and students had to implement online learning. The Circular Letter of Minister Education and Culture of Republic Indonesia Number 4 the Year 2020 and Circular Letter *Dirjen Pendis* Minister of Religious Affairs Number 285.1 Year 2020 stated that all educational levels and units implement online learning to avoid the increasing spread of COVID-19. Besides, it was also to maintain the health of teachers, lecturers, students, and other educational staff (Mendikbud, 2020). This policy led teachers and students to study and work from home, replacing the teaching and learning process with full online learning. Before this pandemic happened, online learning platforms were only used as a supplementary tool to promote independent learning (Cakrawati, 2017). They had conducted "blended learning" before the pandemic happened. In blended learning, some meetings were done in a traditional way, and the rest was done online. Kenney and Newcombe (2011) stated that blended learning had a ratio of 30% for face-to-face and 70% for online material presentation. However, the sudden change of the learning and teaching process from face-to-face to fully online learning using a virtual platform brought out different perceptions from various parties (Allo, 2020).

In English teaching and learning, four necessary language skills should be mastered by students as a means of communication regardless of all situations and conditions, i. e. listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Those skills cannot be independent and relate to each other. Those statements were supported by Chitra and Thiagarajan (2001), who stated that mastering language skills would determine the students' communicative competence in the target language. Those four skills are also supported by language components, namely grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and spelling. For the receptive skills, i.e., listening and reading, online learning may create a problem. However, the problem is not as significant as the productive skills because the receptive skills are flexible regarding the medium used, whether offline or online. For the productive skills, i.e., speaking and writing, online learning would become somewhat complicated because of the limitations to interacting with teachers or peers directly (Firdi, Prebianca, Schmitt, & Andrade, 2014).

In English as a foreign language, some literature showed problems faced by students in online learning. Sun (2014) researched online foreign language students. The study indicated some problems faced by language learning students in the implementation of online learning. Those problems were studying regularly, keeping self-motivated, being a self-directed learner, following the new schedule, finding a suitable time for working with classmates, socializing

with classmates and online environment, and ensuring constant class engagement. Budiman (2015) researched Indonesia's "open" university, especially English Department students. The result of the research indicated that students' problems in a distance learning setting were vocabulary and grammar. Then, students found different ways to improve vocabulary and grammar in distance learning. They also needed more interaction with their classmates and teachers. According to Kuama and Intharaksa's study (2016), Thai university students enrolling in an online English course revealed low English proficiency. They lacked online learning skills and experiences in self-directed learning. In contrast to that study, one of Yüzer, Aydın, and Kuru-Gönen's (2009) study revealed that implementing online classes could decrease students' anxiety and make students more relaxed in advanced reading courses. They also became more familiar with the new learning system.

Other researchers conducted several studies related to students' views on online learning. Popovici and Mironov (2014) revealed that online learning made University students aware of the changes brought over by digital technologies, including their impact on the learning process. Ekmekçi (2015) researched Turkish EFL students who were taking a course through online learning. The result showed that almost half of the students were unhappy with the exams and assignments during online learning. However, it also revealed that most students liked implementing online learning because they followed the lessons at the time and place that suited them. Mockus et al. (2011) studies also revealed that students liked studying the course through a mobile device and thought it was motivating. They also preferred personalized learning. Oppositely, based on Altunay's (2019) study, EFL students thought face-to-face classrooms were more effective than online.

Furthermore, Özüdoğru and Hişmanoğlu's study (2016) showed that most EFL freshmen students in Turkey preferred face-to-face instruction to online education. It was supported by Altunay (2019) that students thought face-to-face learning was more effective than online learning in learning English because they did not have personal computers and they had internet problems. Moreover, they did not have instant interaction with the tutor. Students also had autonomous and motivation problems, such as postponing studying for the course. Nevertheless, they also liked distance language learning because it gave them time and a place to study.

Students' perceptions on online learning will vary depending on many factors. The previous research above revealed many factors affecting students' perceptions towards online learning, such as students' motivation and environment during the online learning process. Besides, some research results showed that students were happy to join the online class because of the flexible time and place. They also liked studying from a mobile device and preferred personalized learning. Nevertheless, some results of the studies indicated that students were not happy about joining the online class and stated that face-to-face class was more effective than online class. Furthermore, some studies showed that students' English skills and knowledge, especially vocabulary and grammar were low during distance learning, but other studies revealed that distance and online increased students' reading skills because it decreased their anxiety and made them relaxed. Most of the previous studies were conducted by involving university students.

Based on the background explained, the researcher came up with questions that required to be answered.

1) How are students' perceptions of the implementation of online English language learning?

- 2) What factors affect students' perceptions of the implementation of online English language learning?

This study explored students' perceptions of the implementation of online English language learning in MAN 1 Jembrana Bali since there had been a few studies that explored it before. The previous studies were mainly investigated online learning in higher education. Implementing full online learning is something new that has never been applied before the urgent situation in MAN 1 Jembrana. Knowing students' perceptions is an essential thing. Students needed to have a good perception of their learning; therefore, they could learn better (Balasubramani, Jayakumar, & Fuukey, 2014). This study was expected to contribute to English teachers and other researchers encouraging students to implement online learning in English language learning for 21st-century education or later in similar circumstances like the Covid-19 pandemic in their class. Teachers and institutions utilize students' perceptions as input to keep the online learning process running optimally. It can also determine the strengths and weaknesses of online learning implementation toward the student's English competence to get a better result and provide some material evaluation and selection guidelines.

There were two limitations in this study that needed to be addressed. The first was the scaling method. In the scaling method, the researcher needed to select options scaled carefully to obtain valid information and minimize the bias that would appear. Since each decision of choosing a particular Likert scale would come up to each consequence, it would be explained what possible problems might arise and the reasons behind the decision. This research used a 4-point Likert scale without a midpoint because the researcher wanted to encourage the respondents to fill up a questionnaire to thoroughly consider each item and express a definite opinion about it (Brown, 2001). Eliminating the midpoint using an even number of choices minimizes the social desirability bias (Garald, 1991). This bias was the tendency of some respondents to give what they consider to be socially acceptable—this bias resulted in respondents' tendency to choose the midpoint in a Likert Scale. However, the use of this scale forced respondents to choose either a disagreement or agreement option. The second was the respondents of the study. The sample of this study was from different classes and programs. Therefore, each English teacher had his/her characteristics regarding how he/she presented course content and communicated with students. The characteristics of the teachers might have influenced students' perceptions of their online learning.

2. Method

The study was conducted under a mixed method design. It is intended to examine quantitative and qualitative data together to better understand the research problems than either by itself (Creswell and Clark, 2011). By combining both data types, the researcher obtained more detailed and specific information. The study examined Islamic senior high school students' development of implementing English language learning since government regulation in March 2020. The study was conducted during the 2020/2021 school year (7 December 2021–24 December 2021).

The combination of stratified and cluster random sampling was applied in this research to determine the number of the samples. It was because the population had levels and spreaded into eight regencies and one city in the province of Bali i.e., Jembrana, Buleleng, Tabanan, Karangasem, Gianyar, Bangli, Klungkung, Badung, and Denpasar. The population of this research was MAN 1 Jembrana students of IPA, IPS, IPB, and Agama program, consisting of 988 students

from grades 10–11. The ages ranged from 16 to 18 years old. The respondents of study were students of grades 11 and 12 in 2020/2021. The researcher did not use tenth graders because they had just experienced fully online learning in senior high school for only one semester. To determine the number of the samples, the researcher used the “Slovin Formula” with a level of significance of 5%. The formula used was “ N ” was divided by “1” plus “ n ” multiple “ α^2 ”. will be presented below. “ N ” meant population, “ n ” was a sample size, and “ α ” was a level of significance. The calculation using the formula above obtained the results of the sample size was 286 students.

Two types of instruments were employed in this research: an online questionnaire and a follow-up interview guide. The questionnaire was adapted from the study conducted by Altunay (2019). The researcher modified and paraphrased the items in the previous study to make the respondent easier to understand and avoid plagiarism. The modified and paraphrased items were for metacognitive, resources management, and affective items. Besides, the researcher also changed and added some of the items in the questionnaire, especially for the items related to English knowledge and skills.

The online questionnaire consisted of 16 items using a 4-point Likert scale. The 4-point Likert scale had no neutral point. The reason for choosing the scale was to encourage the participants or subjects to fill up a questionnaire to thoroughly consider each item and express a definite opinion about it (Brown, 2001). The 16 items in the questionnaire were related to metacognitive strategy (items 1–3), resources management (items 4–5), affective strategy (items 7–9), English knowledge (items 10–12), and English skills (13–16).

The questionnaire validity and reliability needed to be checked before it was administered. Two experienced experts (in TEFL, Language Learning Technologies, and Skill Courses) validated the questionnaire. After being validated, the questionnaire was also tried out to the 5 students of MAN 1 Jembrana. The result of the try out showed that students could understand the general contents of the questionnaire, but there were some typos in item numbers 8 and 10. Besides, it was also suggested that they be given Indonesian words for ‘knowledge’ (*pengetahuan*) and ‘skill’ (*keterampilan*) to better understand the questionnaire items. The reliability of the questionnaire was checked by calculating Cronbach’s Alpha. Cronbach’s Alpha is a measure of internal consistency. The coefficient was 0.683 and categorized as “high” based on Arikunto (2013), which means that the questionnaire items were consistent and could be used to collect the data. The raw data from the questionnaire were statistically computed using descriptive statistics through SPSS 20.0 to find out the frequency mode and percentage of each statement to be interpreted descriptively.

The second instrument was the interview guide. The interview guide was aimed to know things from respondents more deeply and as a complementary method to complete information (Sugiyono, 2014). The interview guide collected the information about students’ perceptions not obtained through the questionnaire and why they had such perceptions. It consisted of 6 questions with the same variable as the questionnaire. Therefore, the interview guide related to metacognitive strategy (question 1), resources management (question 2–3), affective strategy (question 4), English knowledge (question 5), and English skills (question 6). The interview was conducted by involving 12 students from the sample. The researcher chose 12 students because only a few students were willing to be interviewed. Besides, it was also chosen by seeing their answers from the result of the questionnaire to get comprehensive and to

ensure the data from the students who had more negative or positive tendencies about distance learning. The interviewees were chosen from questionnaire respondents with different grades and programs.

The interview guide was in the form of semi-close-ended questions and it provided students with key comments to the questions and allowed them to write the additional answers. This research conducted online interviews through WhatsApp chatting. It took about 30–45 minutes for each student (35 minutes on average). The researcher asked the question in the form of written language using Bahasa Indonesia, and then, the interviewees answered it in the form of written language also by using Bahasa Indonesia. The data from the interview were transcribed and analyzed based on critical comments, which were responded to repeatedly and enriched with the students' voices. Those responses would be transformed into numbers by using percentages and interpreted descriptively.

3. Findings and Discussion

The following are the discussions of the findings dealing with students' perceptions on the implementation of online learning in terms of metacognitive strategy, resources management, affective strategy, English knowledge, and English skills.

3.1. Metacognitive Strategy

Table 1 presents the distribution of central tendency and summarizes the students' perceptions towards the implementation of online learning in terms of students' metacognitive strategy for each statement.

Table 1. Online Learning in Terms of Metacognitive Strategy

No.	Statements	Responses of the Respondents			
		SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)
		F/(%)	F/(%)	F/(%)	F/(%)
1	I need face-to-face communication to learn English.	40.20%	48.60%	8.40%	2.80%
2	I need the flexibility of participating in the lesson without the time and place constraints.	31.80%	52.60%	10.50%	1.00%
3	I have the habit of postponing to accomplish the given assignments or exercises.	34.30%	40.60%	16.80%	8.40%

Based on the analysis result in Table 1, it revealed the majority of respondents (totally 88.80%, in which 40.20% SA and 48.60% A) needed to do face-to-face communication to learn English, as a student stated in the interview session shown in the Excerpt 1.

Excerpt 1

"In my opinion, the interactions that occurred during online learning are uncomfortable. Direct interaction and indirect interaction feel very different for me, and I am not satisfied with this kind of interaction."

Most of the respondents (totally 82.4%, in which 31.80% SA and 52.60% A) indicated that they needed the flexibility of time and place in participating lessons. More than half of the respondents (totally 74.90%, in which 34.30% SA and 40.60% A) had a habit of postponing the assignment or exercises given by teachers.

In other words, face-to-face interaction in learning English is essential for students. This current result aligned with Özüdođru and Hişmanođlu's (2016) research. Without face-to-face

interaction, the communication between teacher and students was only through an online platform. This type of communication resulted in delayed communication which was included in one of the weaknesses of online learning. Of course, direct physical interaction can be replaced by conducting synchronous meetings, but unfortunately, the students also experienced a lack of synchronous meetings during the practices. They rarely conducted synchronous meetings, and some of them never conducted synchronous meetings. The absence of face-to-face interaction among students and between students and the teacher leads to negative perceptions of many students. It causes students' insecurity in guidance when teachers' feedback and clarification is delayed. Even worse, it is very limited.

Unlike the face-to-face interaction, in the point of online learning flexibility, the students gave positive perceptions. The flexibility of online learning has always been related to positive things, and it was considered advantageous for students. This finding was relevant to Finch and Jacobs (2012) stating that through flexibility, students could access the course at their convenience. Students could read and do assignments into their schedule wherever and whenever it worked best. Additionally, they also could be more relaxed.

The next point is students' habit of postponing assignments during distance learning. That activity is called academic procrastination (Sepehrian & Jabari, 2011). However, whether it positively or negatively impacted the students were still debatable among the previous studies. Postponing doing the tasks more was often interpreted that the students did them close to the deadline, which made the process not optimal since they could miss the chance to re-check their assignments even if the worst possibility was if they were careless in doing so it. Students with active procrastination purposefully decided to delay, yet they could finally complete their tasks and achieve satisfactory results with strong motivation under pressure. On the other hand, inactive procrastination students postponed their tasks until the last minutes. Yet, it was accompanied by guilty and depression, leading to failure to do the tasks (Seo, 2013). This study suggests that a more serious identification of procrastination there should be conducted to prevent it.

Furthermore, this current finding corroborated Moonaghi and Beydokhti's study (2017) that three main factors caused procrastination. Those factors were individual, organizational, and environmental factors. The case of procrastination experienced by students of MAN 1 Jembrana was mainly affected by the three factors above. Those factors were lack of synchronous meetings (only a few teachers conducted synchronous meetings), lack of knowledge and skill (students need further explanation and practice), and low self-consciousness (students need to be forced by the system and strict rules). The homey environment also brought laziness and low motivation. In addition, students mainly did not study regularly. Therefore, they did not perform autonomous learning. This finding was in line with Sun's (2014). Students needed to be forced by the system to study. Consequently, to become autonomous learners, they needed to be encouraged.

3.2. Resources Management

Table 2 shows the distribution of central tendency and describes the students' perceptions towards the resources management of their online learning for each statement.

Table 2. Online Learning in terms of Resources Management

No.	Statements	Responses of the Respondents			
		SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)
		F/(%)	F/(%)	F/(%)	F/(%)
4	Communication in face-to-face English learning is more instant and more evident than in online learning.	57.70%	27.60%	9.40%	5.20%
5	My teacher always gives me feedback.	7.00%	15.00%	51.00%	26.90%

The result of analysis in Table 2 showed that the majority of respondents (totally 85.50%, of which 57.70% SA and 27.60% A) agreed that face-to-face communication during offline learning was clearer than online learning. Besides, unpredictably sometimes respondents found it difficult to contact their friends to do group work as seen in Excerpt 2.

Excerpt 2

“I find it difficult when doing group assignments because my friends are difficult to contact.”

Students also stated during the interview session that they needed more explanations from the teacher. During online learning, the teacher just gave them the materials and assignments then students should study them independently. That method often made students feel bored, even though they felt happy to conduct distance learning at first. Besides, they also stated that there was no socialization with their friends, making them miss the vibes of offline school. Most of the respondents (totally 77.90%, in which 51.00% D and 26.90% SD) did not receive feedback from the teachers, as a student stated in Excerpt 3.

Excerpt 3

“In the learning process, the teacher gives feedback when students ask for the question, but in terms of the assignments given by the teacher, the teacher does not provide feedback. The teacher usually only shows the result or gives comments “good job” in Google Classroom.”

Teachers’ and students’ communication during online learning was more diminutive than face-to-face learning to rephrase it. Routinely, teachers only gave them the materials and exercises. Just a few students ever conducted synchronous communication. The rest of them only conducted asynchronous communication interacting through chatting by using written language. The impression of communication among students was also negative. This research found that group projects often did not work well in many cases since many of the students were non-cooperative. Besides, the students also needed to do group discussions with their peers to resolve their problems in studying. Since communication was only limited via an online platform, some students were not responsive in answering messages. Thus, the discussion did not run smoothly. This result also corresponded to Sun’s (2014) and contradicted Petrides’ study (2002). It was hard for students to find a suitable time to work together with classmates and ensure constant engagement with the class. The delayed communication during online learning while using written language could not be avoided by teachers with students or students with students.

Moreover, this current study also revealed that the students did not receive enough feedback from the teachers. Although it was delayed, students always received feedback from teachers during distance learning and teaching. This happened when students asked some-

thing they did not understand during the online class. However, students rarely received feedback about their assignments. Some teachers did not provide feedback to students. Therefore, it confused them whether their understanding was right or wrong because most materials were not explained directly. This current finding was in support of Howland and Moore’s study (2002). The most important thing for students was the information given by the teacher. They did not feel confident enough with their self-learning. Consequently, they needed clarification to ensure that what they gained from reading and researching knowledge was accurate.

3.3. Affective Strategy

Table 3 shows the distribution of central tendency and summarizes the students' perceptions towards their affective strategy of online learning for each statement.

Table 3. Online Learning in Terms of Affective Strategy

No.	Statements	Responses of the Respondents			
		SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)
		F/(%)	F/(%)	F/(%)	F/(%)
6	It is convenient for me to learn English through online education.	7.70%	22.40%	51.70%	18.20%
7	Online learning can lead students to cheat and other unethical practices.	29.00%	47.20%	19.20%	4.50%
8	Online learning has motivated me to succeed.	7.70%	35.30%	40.60%	16.40%
9	Slow internet connectivity is a problem for online learning.	61.90%	28.00%	5.60%	4.50%

The analysis results in Table 3 indicated learning English through online was not convenient for most of the respondents (totally 69.90%, of which 51.70% D and 18.20% SD). Then, more than half of respondents (totally 76.20%, of which 29.00% SA and 47.20% A) agreed that online learning could lead them to cheat during a test. Similar to the previous result, more than half of respondents (totally 57%, of which 40.60% D and 16.40% SD) felt that online learning did not motivate them to succeed. The majority of respondents (totally 88.90%, of which 61.90% SA and 28.00 A) said that slow internet connectivity was an issue during online learning. Additionally, anything related to the internet could be an issue, as students stated in Excerpts 4, 5, and 6.

Excerpt 4

“Internet connection issue is unpredictable. The internet connection can run smoothly then immediately disrupted.”

Excerpt 5

“Problems related to the internet are not only network problems, but also internet quotas.”

Excerpt 6

“The device that I used is only my cell phone. If I use it continuously, it will get trouble such as lagging.”

As they were, convenience became one of the most important factors to investigate under the affective strategy. Highly positive views toward the convenience of online learning will indicate the success of the new learning model (Yang & Cornelius, 2004). Students mostly did not feel the convenience during online learning. Students saw that learning from home was

more a problem than a convenience since it often brought laziness beside an uncondusive environment. The other inconvenience was that the students felt the workload was more extensive than in face-to-face learning. They got more assignments than the usual conventional learning, which corroborated with Ekmekçi's (2015) research.

The next discussion of the affective strategy was that online learning could lead to cheating and other unethical practices during examinations or test sessions. It supported Rahmawati's (2016) and Arkorful and Abaidoo's (2014) studies. As students' study at their home through the proxy, it causes loss of control or regulation in the context of destructive activities like cheating. The teachers would not know what students were doing because they could only see through the monitor. Students could access resources freely by surfing some sites, looking for material from the internet, copying and pasting them, and asking their friends or others during the test. Teachers needed to be aware of these. Therefore, the teacher could check the students' plagiarism or give them limited time during the test session.

The next point was that most students had low motivation to learn English online. It was previously explained that students needed encouragement from someone else or a particular regulation to motivate them to achieve the learning objectives. Like Kuama and Intharaksa's (2016) and Sun's (2014) findings, this finding clearly showed that students have motivational problems. According to Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011), motivation can be suggested as three types, i.e., intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation. The definition of intrinsic motivation is performing behavior for its own sake for satisfying curiosity or pleasure (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). The meaning of extrinsic motivation is performing behavior to achieve a goal, such as receiving an extrinsic reward (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Amotivation defines as a lack of any desire. The current findings of the research believed that the learners had an intrinsic desire for learning English to reach their goals, and that was why they could compete with other students to advance to the next grade and get good grades. Somehow, the sudden implementation of online learning somewhat made students shocked. Consequently, they needed extrinsic motivation to keep them on the right path to achieve their goal. Students should know how to study by putting away the habits and ideas that make studying unpleasant and burdensome. They should take on habits and ideas that make study more pleasant and fruitful.

The last point under the affective strategy was internet access or internet connectivity. Internet access was one of the problems that could not be avoided in online learning. The internet connection was one of the essential elements in online learning. Without internet access, they could do distance learning. The first problem with internet access was the unstable internet connection. This finding corresponded to Rahmawati's study (2016). Unstable or slow internet connection was a big problem for students, especially those who lived in the lack of signal area. The second crucial problem was the limited internet quota. The internet quota assistance from the government had not been entirely evenly distributed, but they also had to access much material, not only text but also videos. In addition, most of the students only had one device to join the learning and teaching process. Not all of them had home computers or laptops. Using only one device continuously could make the device hang and lag.

3.4. English Knowledge

Table 4 shows the distribution of central tendency and summarizes the students' perceptions towards their English knowledge during online learning for each statement.

Table 4. Online Learning in terms of English Knowledge

No	Statements	Responses of the Respondents			
		SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)
		F/(%)	F/(%)	F/(%)	F/(%)
10	Online learning makes my pronunciation knowledge better.	5.60%	31.50%	47.90%	15.00%
11	Online learning makes my vocabulary knowledge better.	6.30%	44.10%	42.30%	7.30%
12	Online learning makes my grammatical knowledge better.	4.90%	35.00%	49.30%	10.80%

According to the result analysis in Table 4, there was no improvement in respondents' pronunciation during online learning (totally 62.90%, of which 47.90% D and 15.00% SD). Half of the respondents (totally 50.40%, of which 6.30% SA and 44.10% A) believed that their vocabulary skills improved during online learning. However, most of the respondents (totally 60.10%, 49.30% D and 10.80% SD) indicated that their grammatical knowledge was not improved during online learning. Most of the respondents stated that the limitation of communication made speaking sessions during distance learning was rarely done in the interview session.

On the side of English knowledge, students' pronunciations did not increase significantly. Some felt that their knowledge had increased only slightly, and some felt that it had decreased. This argument was supported by Martin's study (2020). Teachers also did not emphasize pronunciation too much during online learning. The method and media used by them were also not very supportive of improving this knowledge, even though some of the materials were audio and video. It was different from conventional class interaction. Direct communication during conventional learning made teachers easier give feedback to the students when they interacted in the learning and teaching process. Although students got video assignments during online learning, it did not support the improvement of pronunciation maximally. The video assignments were insufficient to improve their pronunciation and substitute the practicing language in conventional learning.

On the other hand, students' vocabulary knowledge improved significantly. This current finding was contradictory to Budiman's study (2015). The improvement of students' vocabulary was caused by reading activities during online learning. They had to read many texts and materials or other relevant English resources to do assignments from teachers. Then, they would find new words in the reading process and look for their meaning. The method used by the teacher required and supported them always reading. The teacher gave the exercises and also helped them get and memorize new vocabulary. The exercises were usually in a text (synonym and antonym) and a video of memorization vocabulary. Nevertheless, teachers' monotonous methods and media, mostly only just in text, made students feel bored. They needed other various media and methods to study vocabulary during online learning.

The finding was in line with Budiman's (2015) result of the study. There was no significant improvement in terms of grammatical knowledge and competence. Students needed and preferred direct communication for studying grammar, and they needed explanation and clarification to get more understanding. Unfortunately, only a few teachers conducted synchronous meetings related to grammar materials. The lack of understanding impacted the other things, such as the exercises given, which made them not help them maximally.

3.5. English Skills

Table 5 shows central tendency distribution and summarizes the students' perceptions of their English skills of online learning for each statement.

Table 5. Online Learning in Terms of English Skill

No.	Statements	Responses of the Respondents			
		SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)
		F/(%)	F/(%)	F/(%)	F/(%)
13	Online learning makes my listening skill better.	6.30%	41.30%	46.20%	6.30%
14	Online learning makes my speaking skill better.	6.60%	40.60%	42.70%	10.10%
15	Online learning makes my reading skill better.	12.60%	53.50%	28.30%	5.60%
16	Online learning makes my writing skill better.	12.20%	52.80%	30.10%	4.90%

The result of the analysis in Table 5 revealed that respondents (totally 52.50%, in which 46.20% D and 6.30% SD) did not feel an improvement in their listening skills. Like the result of listening skills, more than half of respondents (totally 52.80%, in which 42.70% D and 10.10% SD) felt there was no improvement in their speaking skills. Different from that, on the reading skills, most of the respondents (totally 66.10%, in which 12.60% SA and 53.50% A) felt there was an improvement. Similar to the reading skill, there was an improvement in the respondents (totally 65.00%, in which 12.20% SA and 52.80% A) writing skills.

The situation in the current finding was opposite to Elsayw's (2021) study. Firstly, in terms of listening skills and competence, the finding showed no improvement in students' listening skills or, worse, decreased. During online learning, students lacked listening exposure even though they got some of the materials in audio and video. Besides, teachers did not emphasize students' listening skills, such as giving students specific material or assignments to evaluate listening skills. That situation was different from conventional learning, where students could get exposure from interacting with teachers and friends and learn specific material and exercises in listening. Exposure to language was needed in learning a foreign language.

Secondly, in terms of speaking skills and competence, the current study showed a similar result in pronunciation and listening skills. There was no improvement in students' speaking skills or even worse it was also decreasing. This finding was supported by Finardi et al.'s (2014) research but with a different root of the problem. In this study, the lowest chance of discussing with peers and teachers seemed problematic for the learning English courses since the student's needed explanation, clarification, and feedback. Besides, the media used by the teacher was only through video and audio. Sometimes the students got bored because there was no innovation in learning to speak. Although some speaking exercises required them to make videos, students still felt that it was not enough to improve their speaking skills.

Thirdly, in terms of reading skills and competence, the study showed that students' reading skills were improved. This result was not much different from students' vocabulary knowledge and aligned with Yüzer et al.'s (2009) study on the students' reading course during online learning. The learning media used was in texts, ppt, and articles that supported students' improvement. Students had to read the materials given by the teacher because many of the

materials provided were not explained directly. The teacher also did not always conduct synchronous meetings. Besides, students also needed to read materials from other sources such as articles or other relevant resources in English on the internet. They did this to complete the tasks given by the teacher, which also helped them improve their reading competence.

Last but not least, in terms of writing skills and competence, students experienced an improvement. This current finding was supported by Choi, Moon, Paek, & Kang's (2018) research. Reading comprehension and writing performance were significantly correlated. By reading a lot, they could find out many new vocabularies that helped them write better. The vocabulary knowledge also significantly affected both literacy abilities, reading and writing. Therefore, in the process of reading indirectly, students also gained new information for their writing materials. That activity during online learning supported students' ability in writing. Besides, materials and exercises given by the teacher also support their improvement. The exercises were usually about writing text in English. Unfortunately, the monotony methods and media used often made students get bored. Teachers needed to make some variations in teaching to prevent students from getting bored.

4. Conclusions

Concerning the media of learning in the study, online and face-to-face learning have advantages and disadvantages. The students' vocabulary, reading, and writing skills improved during online learning except pronunciation, grammar, listening, and speaking. Two main factors affected EFL students' perceptions of online English learning. Those were internal and external factors. The internal factors were students' motivation and awareness. These factors had a positive impact on students. It led students to do positive action during the implementation of online learning, such as studying regularly and doing homework. Students who had high motivation and awareness toward their learning process would try their best to achieve their goals. The external factors consisted of Internet access (unstable internet connection and limited internet quota), an uncondusive environment, and instructional strategies (the method, media, and exercise used by teachers). These external factors could have positive and negative impacts on the students. It depended on the students' online learning situation at that time. If their internet access runs smoothly, the environment is conducive, and the teacher uses an interesting method, it will positively affect students and vice versa. The findings suggest that teaching and learning English can be implemented by hybrid or blended learning in the future. Along with time, students and teachers adapt and get used to online learning because the integration of technology is increasing. Therefore, they can combine the advantages of using online and offline learning. For example, students and teachers can get the flexibility of time and place (online learning), communicate directly, and improve productive skills (offline learning). The use of two media (offline and online) will complete each other's weaknesses. In addition, the researcher recommends that if students want to succeed in online learning, firstly, they need to keep their motivation high. They did not only keep their motivation high, but also, they should realize that they took another step along the path to their ambition. That is why the students should prioritize the learning process and work diligently to digest the course materials, finish the obligatory tasks, and get the most out of the online classes they have taken. Secondly, students must be practical communicators. They should ask their teachers when the explanations are unclear. Thirdly, online learners should act sedulous. Students interacted with their teachers differently when they attended online classes. No matter what challenges will happen, successful learners should not quit studying if there are internet connection problems and an uncondusive environment.

Teachers should teach and interact with students differently by using different strategies and interesting techniques, confirming to the students if there is an unclear explanation, and giving students rewards to keep their motivation high. Besides, teachers should design various course materials, activities, and sites during online learning to minimize monotonous activities and provide a meaningful learning experience. They also need to provide feedback on students' works and encourage interaction between them and their students. This study deals with only students' points of view in MAN 1 Jembrana as Senior High School. The theory generated from this study is only based on the interpretation of the questionnaire and interview supported by several previous research findings. Therefore, future researchers can conduct a more comprehensive study related to online learning.

References

- Allo, M. G. (2020). Is online learning good in the midst of Covid-19 pandemic? The case of EFL learners. *Jurnal Sinestesia*, 10(1), 1–10. Retrieved from <https://sinestesia.pustaka.my.id/journal/article/view/24>
- Altunay, D. (2019). EFL students' views on distance English language learning in a public university in Turkey. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 7(1), 121–134. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/selt.v7n1p121>
- Arikunto, S. (2013). *Prosedur penelitian suatu pendekatan praktik* (edisi revisi). Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Arkorful, V., & Abaidoo, N. (2014). The role of e-Learning, the advantages and disadvantages of its adoption in higher education. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(12), 397–410. Retrieved from <https://www.ijern.com/journal/2014/December-2014/34.pdf>
- Atmojo, A. E. P., & Nugroho, A. (2021). EFL classes must go online! teaching activities and challenges during COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Register Journal*, 13(1), 49–76. doi: <https://doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v13i1.49-76>
- Balasubramani, K., Jayakumar, V. & Fuukey, L. N. (2014). A study on “Student preference towards the use of Edmodo as a learning platform to create a responsible learning environment”. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 144, 416–422. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.311>
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles an integrative approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Longman.
- Budiman, R. (2015). Distance language learning: Students' views of challenges and solutions. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and their Implications*, 6(3), 137–147. Retrieved from <http://www.ijonte.org/FileUpload/ks63207/File/14.budiman.pdf>
- Cakrawati. (2017). Students' perceptions on the use of online learning platforms in EFL classrooms. *English Language Teaching and Technology Journal (ELT Tech Journal)*, 1(1), 22–30. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/ELTTech/article/view/9428>
- Chitra, J. U., & Thiagarajan, A. P. (2001). Teaching writing skills through a silent movie: An experiment. *Indian Journal of Open Learning*, 10(1), 93–99. Retrieved from https://www.cemca.org/ckfinder/userfiles/Chitra_JU_Ponnambala_TA_0124.pdf
- Choi, J., Moon, Y., Paek, J. K., Kang, Y. (2018). Examining the relationship between reading and writing of advanced Korean EFL learners. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 34(1), 91–116. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17154/kjal.2018.3.34.1.91>
- Creswell, J., & Clark, V. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching: Motivation* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Longman Pearson.
- Ekmekçi, E. (2015). Distance education in foreign language teaching: Evaluations from the perspectives of freshmen students. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 176, 390–397. doi: [10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.487](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.487)
- Elsawy, H. E. A. (2021). Maximizing EFL students' exposure to listening and speaking through MALL: Daily voice WhatsApp messages between students and the teacher. *Asian EFL Journal Research Articles*, 28(1.2), 111–140. Retrieved from <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/monthly-editions-new/2021-monthly-edition/volume-28-issue-1-2-february-2021/index.htm>

- Finardi, K. R., Prebianca, G. V. V., Schmitt, J., & Andrade, D. F. (2014). Technology, English language teaching and internationalization at a crossroad: Insights from the analysis of a virtual learning environment in Brazil. *Proceedings of International Conference of Education, Research and Innovation (ICERI)*, 1, 1–12. Retrieved from <https://blog.ufes.br/kyriafinardi/files/2018/01/Finardi-et-al-ICERI-2014.pdf>
- Finch, D., & Jacobs, K. (2012). Online education: Best practices to promote learning. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics 56th Annual Meeting Sage Journal*, 56(1), 546–550. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1071181312561114>.
- Howland, J. L., & Moore, J. L. (2002). Student perceptions as distance learners in internet-based courses. *Distance Education*, 23(2), 183–195. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/015879102200009196>
- Insani, H. N., Suherdi, D., & Gustine, G. G. (2018). Undergraduate students' perspectives in using Edmodo as an educational social network. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 6(2), 61–68. doi: <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v6i2.1254>
- Kenney, J., & Newcombe, E. (2011). Adopting a blended learning approach: Challenges encountered and lesson learned in an action research study. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Network*, 15(1), 45–57. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ918218>
- Kuama, S., & Intharaksa, U. (2016). Is online learning suitable for all English language students? *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 52, 53–82. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1134684>
- Martin, I. A. (2020). Pronunciation development and instruction in distance language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 24(1), 86–106. Retrieved from https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/44711/1/24_1_10125-44711.pdf
- Mendikbud. (2020). *Surat edaran Mendikbud: Pelaksanaan kebijakan pendidikan dalam masa darurat penyebaran Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19)*. Retrieved from <http://kemdikbud.go.id/main/files/download/51e9b72ef92c6d8>
- Mockus, L., Dawson, H., Edel-Malizia, S., Shaffer, D., An, J-S., & Swaggerty, A. (2011). *The impact of mobile access on motivation: Distance education student perceptions* (Unpublished research study, World Campus Learning Design). Retrieved from <https://www.learningdesign.psu.edu/assets/uploads/pdf/MLRTWhitePaper.pdf>
- Moonaghi, K. H., & Beydokhti, B. T. (2017). Academic procrastination and its characteristics: A narrative review. *Future of Medical Educational Journal*, 7(2), 43–50. doi:10.22038/FMEJ.2017.9049
- Özüdoğru, F., & Hişmanoğlu, M. (2016). Views of university students on foreign language courses delivered via e learning. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education (TOJDE)*, 17(1), 31–47. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1092808>
- Petrides, L. A. (2002). Web-based technologies for distributed (or distance) learning: Creating learning-centered educational experiences in the higher education classroom. *International Journal of Instructional Media Volume*, 29(1), 69–77. Retrieved from <http://www.learntechlib.org/p/64241/>
- Popovici, A., & Mironov, C. (2014). Students' perception on using eLearning technologies. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 180, 1514–1519. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.300>
- Rahmawati, F. (2016). E-learning implementation: Its opportunities and drawbacks perceived by EFL students. *Journal of Foreign Language, Teaching & Learning*, 1(1), 1–15. doi: <https://doi.org/10.18196/ftl.111>
- Seo, E. H. (2013). A comparison of active and passive procrastination in relation to academic motivation. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 41(5), 777–786. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2013.41.5.777>
- Sepehrian, F., & Jabari L. J. (2011). The effect of copying styles and gender on academic procrastination among university students. *Journal of Basic & Applied Scientific Research*, 1(12), 2987–2993. Retrieved from [https://www.textroad.com/pdf/JBASR/J.%20Basic.%20Appl.%20Sci.%20Res.,%201\(12\)2987-2993,%202011.pdf](https://www.textroad.com/pdf/JBASR/J.%20Basic.%20Appl.%20Sci.%20Res.,%201(12)2987-2993,%202011.pdf)
- Stern, B. S. (2004). A comparison of online and face-to-face instruction in an undergraduate foundations of American education course. *CITE Journal*, 4(2), 196–213. Retrieved from <https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/19939/>

- Sugiyono. (2014). *Metode penelitian pendidikan pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sun, S. Y. H. (2014). Learner perspectives on fully online language learning. *Distance Education Journal*, 35(1), 18–42. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2014.89142>
- Yang, Y., & Cornelius, L. F. (2004). Students' perceptions towards the quality of online education: A qualitative approach. *Proceedings of Association for Educational Communications and Technology 27th*, 861–877. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED485012>
- Yüzer, V. T., Aydın, B., & Kuru-Gönen, S. İ. (2009). Learners' perceptions toward online learning: An application for a synchronous e-class. *i-Manager's: Journal of Educational Technology*, 6(2), 30–40. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325109987_Learners'_Perceptions_Toward_Online_Learning_An_Application_For_A_Synchronous_E-Class