Erudita: Journal of English Language Teaching

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2022, 1-14
https://e-journal.uingusdur.ac.id/erudita
p-ISSN: 2809-2023; e-ISSN: 2809-2465

Examining Google Classroom-assisted blended learning in Indonesian EFL grammar classes

Nur Muthmainnah[✉1]

[1] IAIN Salatiga, Central Java, Indonesia
✉E-mail: nur_muthmainnah@iainsalatiga.ac.id (corresponding author)

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to examine the effectiveness of Google Classroom-assisted blended learning in two EFL grammar classes. It investigates the difference between EFL students' grammar mastery applying blended learning and discussion method. Framed in experimental research, this study recruited 52 EFL student teachers in an Indonesian university to participate. Data were garnered through multiple choice tests. Study findings reveal that the significance value of paired sample t-test was 0.00 < 0.05, showing that there was significant influence of blended learning toward the EFL students' grammar mastery. The significance value of t-test (2.029) > t-table (0.2732) indicates that there was a difference in the students' grammar mastery after giving treatment in experimental and control groups. The N-gain value was 0.1164 > 0.7, proving that Google Classroom-aided blended learning was effective to foster the students' grammar mastery. Since the t-test (2.029) > t-table (0.2732), H1 was accepted and Ho was rejected. This means that Google Classroom-assisted blended learning gave a positive impact on the students' grammar mastery. This study concludes with some empirical evidence that Google Classroom-mediated blended learning is promoted to be an innovative learning management system in EFL classes to boost students' grammar mastery.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: November 29, 2021
Revised: April 05, 2022
Accepted: April 25, 2022

Keywords:

Blended learning; Google Classroom; Grammar mastery; Learning management system

To cite this article: Muthmainnah, N. (2022). Examining Google Classroom-assisted blended learning in Indonesian EFL grammar classes. *Erudita: Journal of English Language Teaching, 2*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.28918/erudita.v2i1.678

To link to this article: https://e-journal.uingusdur.ac.id/erudita/article/view/678

Introduction

Grammar mastery in EFL learning becomes important since it consists of how words are ordered into meaningful messages in written or oral communication. On the other hand, many EFL learners get problems when they learn this language element. Some cases happen in the EFL classes. Students could speak English fluently but they had a problem in arranging words in order and based on grammar rules when they speak English. This phenomenon could lead to miscommunication when it is not solved (Handayani & Johan, 2018). The other

students have problems in constructing written sentences with correct spelling and tenses (Cushing & Helks, 2021). The incorrect use of grammar might cause misinterpretation of what reader and listener reads or listens. The case that happens to Indonesian students in acquiring English grammar is that students are confused with the application of grammatical structure which is different from Indonesian grammatical structure that makes them sometimes arrange English sentences using Indonesian structure (Ameliani, 2019).

Many students face problems in learning English that cause them to not use their English knowledge to produce language (spoken and written). Most students have problems in pronouncing, writing, and using grammar (Nuraeni, 2019). The causes of problems in learning English are being nervous when speaking English, lack of vocabulary memorized, lack of grammar mastery, less creativity and ideas in writing, lack of confidence, and so on. In addition, the students' problems worsen with the learning media or methods which are used in the class. They are monotonous and do not solve their learning problems. An investigation conducted by Ökmen and Kılıç (2016) shows that the teaching method implemented in language learning has meaningful and positive relation toward students' learning success.

Choosing learning methods and media is not easy for the teachers. The unmatched relation between the curriculum developed and the examination system which will be assessed cause a real confusion among the teachers and constrains their choices of teaching methods (Adhikari, 2017). There are some considerations which should be considered such as students' condition and characters, students' learning problems, students' competence level, and the development of era. The ability of students to respond in a certain way and a better grasp of the objective, contents, knowledge, or information to be conveyed are necessary for choosing the right teaching approach (Curtin & Hall, 2018).

The development of technology has affected many sides of life including education. There are many technological innovations invented in the education world. Since it is used in language learning, the development and innovation has given many benefits to the teachers and students. The integration of ICT in language learning makes it easier to meet the needs and language proficiency of the students, enhance the creativity of the teachers (Ali & Sofa, 2018), speed up access to the necessary teaching resources, promote interactive work, foster a positive attitude in the students toward their learning, and assist them in the learning-teaching process (Taghizadeh & Yourdshahi, 2020).

In addition, ICT development also affects the invention of a new learning model which uses ICT as its learning medium. Some learning models which employ the technology such as online learning, blended learning, mobile language learning, computerized language learning, and so on. These models have been implemented in language classrooms although there are problems faced when they are implemented (Botero et al., 2018; Shortt et al., 2021).

One of the learning models which employs the ICT media is blended learning. Blended learning could make students study English anywhere and anytime they want without being limited to groups or partners (Albiladi & Alshareef, 2019). Since the language learning model has shifted from teacher-centered to student-centered, it affects the choosing of learning model which supports the student-centered language learning. Blended learning mixes the traditional teaching (face to face meeting) with the use of online media that supports students to be active in English learning either inside or outside the classroom (Al Bataineh et al., 2019). To blend the offline and online language learning, teachers need to choose one

application or media such as a website, learning management system (LMS), social media, and so on. Google Classroom is a learning management system (LMS) which helps students easily retrieve learning material and connect with other students through online application (Heggart & Yoo, 2018). An open-source program called Google Classroom was created to make it easier for teachers and students to collaborate, organize, and generate assignments. It makes learning paperless (McGinnis, 2021).

There is much research which investigates the use of Google Classroom at EFL classrooms. The first research was conducted by Qindah (2018). It investigated the tenth class of junior high school in Palestine. This research applied mixed method which is purposed to see the influence of blended learning in grammar class and students' perception on the implementation of blending grammar class. The research revealed that the experimental group who are taught using blended learning have more learning improvement than students who are taught using other models in the control group. In addition, students who are taught using blended learning model also have positive perception on the application of blended learning in grammar class. The second research was conducted by Al Bataineh et al. (2019). They applied Moodle application as media used in teaching using blended learning. This research also applied a mixed method to collect the data which was conducted to Jordanian EFL learners. The research shows that the students who are from the experimental group have better performance in language learning rather than the control group. The interview result shows that blended learning brings good effect on the students' performance in learning grammar and most students have high satisfaction with the implementation of blended learning model in grammar class and they are motivated to use such learning model in studying English.

Few studies investigated the effectiveness of blended learning using Google Classroom to teach grammar at university level. It has become an impressing issue since university students are accustomed to using any application for learning language, especially grammar but few researchers are investigating it. There are researchers investigating blended learning but they do not use Google Classroom as the assisted application to implement it. Moreover, there are researchers investigating blended learning in teaching grammar, but there are no researches that use Google Classroom even if it is taught to university level. The objectives of this research are to examine the influence of blended learning using Google Classroom toward the students' grammar mastery; to assess the significance differences on students' grammar mastery taught using blended learning with Google Classroom and students who are taught using discussion method; and to know the improvement of students' grammar mastery after students are taught using blended learning with Google Classroom and discussion method.

Method

This research was an experimental study which was conducted at two classes which were divided into experimental and control classes. It applied quasi experimental because it is impossible for the researcher to have the whole control during the treatment (Thomas, 2020a). Since the experimental study was not assigned to a random sample, the researcher had decided the sample based on the cluster random sampling (Thomas, 2020b) of which the groups have similar competence in language skills. They were Class C and D of the fourth semester students of the English Education Department of a higher education institution in

Salatiga, Central Java. Each class consisted of 26 students. Class C became the experimental group and class D became the control group. To explain the process of implementing quasi experimental study, it is described on the following research design:

Table 1. Quasi experimental design

Group	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
Experimental	O_1	X_1	O_2
Control	O_3	X_2	O_4

O_1= Pretest for experimental group
O_2= Posttest for experimental group
O_3= Pretest for control group
O_4= Posttest for control group
X_1 = treatment given to experimental group using blended learning with Google classroom application
X_2= treatment given to control group using discussion method

It was a non-equivalent control group design in which each group is given treatment without conducting pre-experimental sampling equivalence (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Both groups were spread pre-test before the treatments were conducted. The test which was given was similar. The treatment was given twice in two weeks. The experimental group was taught using blended learning using Google classroom while the control group was given treatment using a method of Discussion. After the treatments had been given, the groups were tested to know the differences of before and after the treatment. The treatments which were implemented in the experimental and control group used the following teaching activities:

Table 2. Experimental and control group learning activities

Experimental group	Control group
Face-to-face meeting 1. Teacher asked students to observe provided sentences. 2. Teacher asked students whether the sentences had one clause or two clauses, dependent-independent clause, etc. 3. Teacher showed the adverbial clause formula. 4. Teacher provided some sentences with errors in words and students were asked to analyze the errors. Online class 1. Teacher shared Google Classroom code with students to access the material and exercises. 2. Students could access the adverbial clause taught before. 3. Students were asked to share their comprehension and questions through the comments box. 4. Teacher gave feedback and answered the question.	1. Teacher divided the class into some groups. 2. Teacher shared sentences into groups and asked them to see how many clauses provided, what clauses consisted of, etc. 3. One of the group members shared the answers in front of the class. 4. Teacher shared feedback and answers. 5. Teacher shared the clues of adverbial clauses, then the groups were asked to guess the name of the clause and the function. 6. Teacher asked every group to write the result of the discussion in front of the class. 7. Teacher shared the feedback and the complete material. 8. Students were asked to do the task of adverbial clause in form of error analysis and multiple choice in group. 9. Teacher shared feedback and answers.

5. Teacher asked students to do the task in form of answering some questions in form of multiple choice. 6. Teacher checked the task and gave feedback and score.	

This research had two variables. They were independent and dependent variables. Independent variable is a variable which might give effect to dependent variable (Creswell, 2009). The independent variables of this research were blended learning using Google classroom and discussion method while the grammar mastery became the dependent variable. The two independent variables were used to teach grammar so that the research would see whether there is effect or not after the treatment was done. The grammar material used and taught in this research was adverbial clause. After treatment, students are expected to master one of grammar material, adverbial clauses. This material was chosen since it was one of the materials taught in the class and some students thought that the adverbial class is more confusing than other clauses.

The instrument of research which was used in this research was a multiple-choice test. This test was aimed to collect the data from Post-test and Pre-test. The test consisted of twenty multiple choice questions which were spread before and after the treatment. The test was also used to examine the students' grammar mastery in adverbial clauses. Thus, the test consists of an adverbial clause test. The multiple choice was chosen as the method of collecting data since it is easy to score. After the treatments and tests were conducted, the data which had been collected were analyzed using SPSS 21 application to know the homogeneity, the normality, hypothesis checking and N-Gain test. To know whether the data is normal or not, the research used *kolmogorof-Smirnov* and *Sapiro Wilk* test and One Way *Anova* to check the homogeneity. After the data were normal and homogeneous, the researcher tested the hypothesis using Paired Sample t-test for pre-posttest for experimental and control group. The independent t-test was also used to analyze whether there is a different mean score of unmatched samples.

Based on the research design and related theories, it can be drawn statistical hypothesis as follow:

H_0: $\mu = \mu_0$

H_1: $\mu \neq \mu_0$

H_0 = null hypothesis

H_1 = alternative hypothesis

μ = the mean score of students' grammar mastery after being taught using blended learning with Google Classroom.

μ_0 = the mean score of students' grammar mastery after being taught using a discussion method.

H_0 = null hypothesis is accepted if there is no difference and significance influence of blended learning using Google classroom and discussion method towards students' grammar mastery and the alternative hypothesis is rejected.

H_1 = alternative hypothesis is accepted if there are differences and significance influence of blended learning using Google classroom and discussion method towards students' grammar mastery and the null hypothesis is rejected.

The N-gain data analysis was also used in this research to know the different scores of pre-tests and post-tests. The N-gain was used to know the improvement of treatment that was given to the sample. The formula which was used in to get the N-gain score is presented in Table 3.

The following table was used to know in which the N-gain result was categorized:

Table 3. Classification of N-gain result

Classification	Category
N-gain > 0.7	High
N-gain 0.3 – 0.7	Medium
N – gain < 0.3	Low

Findings and discussion

Effect of Google Classroom-assisted blended learning on EFL students' grammar mastery

Data are obtained from the pre-test which was spread before the treatment was conducted and the implementation of the post-test after the treatment was done. Based on the pre-posttest which had been conducted to the experimental and control group, it can be shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics of pre-test and post-test result

Group	Pre-test				Post-test			
	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard deviation	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard deviation
Experimental	46	45	45	9.3	51	50	50	10.2
Control	43	45	45	8	48	50	50	9

Table 4 shows that there are differences in the mean score of each group and test. There are 3 points differences between experimental group and control group mean score for pre and posttest. The mean score of the pre-test for the experimental group is 46 and the control group is 43 while the post-test mean score of the experimental group is 51 and the control group is 48.

Besides, there is an improvement of score of each group from pre-test to their post-test score that is from 46 to 51 and 43 to 48. Although the median and mode score for each group has similar scores, they are different in deviation standard. As we know, the deviation standard is used to decide the score of the t-test. It can be noticed that the students' who are taught using blended learning with Google Classroom have higher mean scores than students who are taught using the discussion method.

Normality and Homogeneity are the requirements for the data analysis before it is used to decide the t-test. If the data are not normal and homogenous the t-test could not be conducted. The result of *Kolmogorof Smirnov* and *Shapiro Wilk* test which are analyzed using SPSS 21 is described on the following table:

Table 5. Test of normality

	Group	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Post-test		
		Statistics	df	Sig.	Statistics	df	Sig.
Grammar mastery test	Pre-test (experimental group)	.116	26	.200*	.967	26	.555
	Post-test (experimental group)	.137	26	.200*	.955	26	.302
	Pre-test (control group)	.161	26	.080*	.952	26	.255
	Post-test (control group)	.152	26	.126	.962	26	.435

a. Lilliefors significance correction

This is lower bound of the true significance.

Table 5 shows that the significance of normality pre-test of the experimental group is 0.200 and the control group is 0.080. It shows that the data are normally distributed because the significance score is higher than 0.05 or α=0.05 (0.200> 0.05; 0.080> 0.05). In addition, the significance of the post-test score of the experimental group is 0.200 and the control group is 0.126. It can be concluded that the post-test significance is also normally distributed because α=0.05 (0.200> 0.05; 0.126> 0.05). It means that the significance score of post-tests of experimental and control groups are in normal distribution.

The homogeneity test used in this research is One-way ANOVA which is analyzed using SPSS 21 application. The following table shows the result of homogeneity test:

Table 6. Result of homogeneity test

Grammar mastery test			
Levene's statistics	df1	df2	Sig.
2.473	1	50	.122

Informed by the result of the homogeneity test between the result of post-test of the experimental and control group, Table 6 demonstrates that the significance of the homogeneity test is 0.122. Since the significance difference is higher than 0.005 it can be concluded that the data are homogeneous. α=0.05 (0.122> 0.05).

Meanwhile, the paired sample t-test was applied to test the pre-post test scores of experimental and control groups. To know the different effect of each treatment from both groups, the scores are compared using paired sample t-tests. The result of the test is described below:

Table 7. Paired sample statistics

Grammar mastery test		Mean	N	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Pair 1	Pre-test experiment	47.88	26	9.917	1.945
	Post-test experiment	53.85	26	10.983	2.154

Table 8. Paired sample test result

		Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean	95% Confidence interval of the difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre-test experiment Post-test experiment	-5.962	6.003	1.177	-8.386	-3.537	-5.064	25	.000

Based on the paired sample t-test result in Table 8, it can be seen that the 2-tailed significant level is 0.00. It means that the H_1 is accepted and H_0 is rejected because 0.00 is lower than 0.05. it is based on the hypothesis formula that H_0 is accepted if the significant level is higher than 0.05 ($\alpha > 0.05$) and H_1 is accepted if the significant level is lower than 0.05 ($\alpha > 0.05$). Thus, there is a difference of students' grammar mastery before and after being taught using blended learning using Google Classroom.

Furthermore, independent sample t-test is used to know the significant differences of students' who are taught using blended learning with Google Classroom and the discussion method.

Table 9. Group statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Students' grammar mastery	Experimental	26	53.85	10.983	2.154
	Control	26	48.27	8.711	1.708

Based on Table 9, the mean score of the experimental class is 53.85 and the mean score of the control class is 48.27 which means that the mean score of the experimental class is higher than control class (Ma > Mb).

Table 10. Independent sample t-test

		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std. error difference	95% Confidence interval of the difference	
									Lower	Upper
Students' grammar mastery	Equal variances assumed	2.473	.122	2.029	50	.048	5.577	2.749	.055	11.099
	Equal variances not assumed			2.029	47.54	.048	5.577	2.749	.048	11.106

Drawn in Table 10, it is seen that the result of an independent sample t-test the p-value or sig (2-tailed) =0.48. Since the p-value (0.48) is lower than sig $\alpha = 0.05$ (5%) which shows

that there is static significance at experimental class. Besides, the coefficient of t-test is 2.029 compared to the t-table. The coefficient of t-table at the level of α= 0.05 with the df= 50 is 0.2732. Thus, the significance of t-test (2.029) > t-table (0.2732). It means that the null hypothesis is rejected (H_0) and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted. Based on the result of the independent sample t-test can be concluded that there is a significant influence of students' grammar mastery after taught using blended learning with Google Classroom and the grammar class taught using blended learning with Google Classroom is more effective than the class taught using discussion method.

Concerning the N-Gain test, the following table is the result of the N-Gain test which is aimed to find out the improvement of students' grammar mastery after given treatments.

Table 11. Description of N-Gain result

				Statistics	Std. error
N-Gain score	Experimental	Mean		.1164	.02287
		95% Confidence interval for mean	Lower bound	.0693	
			Upper bound	.1635.	.
		5% Trimmed mean		.1045.	
		Median		.1181	
		Variance		.014	
		Std. deviation		.11664	
		Minimum		.00	
		Maximum		.50	
		Range		.50	
		Interquartile range		.17	
		Skewness		1.377	.456
		Kurtosis		3.309	.887
	Control	Mean		.0898	.01245
		95% Confidence interval for mean	Lower bound	.0641	
			Upper bound	.1154	
		5% Trimmed mean		.0898	
		Median		.0909	
		Variance		.004	
		Std. deviation		.06347	
		Minimum		.00	
		Maximum		.30	
		Range		.30	
		Interquartile range		.04	

Skewness	1.118	.456
Kurtosis	3.938	.887

Lastly, Table 11 reveals that based on the N-Gain test, the main score of experimental class with the total students 26 is 0.1164, with the maximum score is 0.00 and the minimum score is 0.50. Since the N-gain score is (0.1164) > 0.7, it means that teaching grammar using blended learning with Google Classroom has a high effectiveness level. In addition, based on the result of the N-gain test, the mean score of the control class is 0.0898, with the minimum score is 0.00 and the maximum score is 0.30. Since the mean score of the N-Gain test is (0.0898) < 0.3, it can be concluded that the discussion method has low effectiveness. It can be drawn from the conclusion that the class taught using blended learning with Google Classroom has higher effectiveness in teaching grammar than the class who is taught using discussion methods.

The score of statistical analysis of Paired Sample t-test to the pre-posttest data at Experimental Class proves that there is influence of implementing blended learning using Google Classroom toward students' grammar mastery. It is proven with the result of the Paired Sample t-test which shows that the level of significance of the t-test is 0.00 which is lower than 0.05. This result clarifies that the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. It means that blended learning significantly influences the students' grammar mastery.

The research findings show that a brand-new learning model would create a new atmosphere and improvement in learning grammar. In addition, the additional learning material and exercises which are designed and presented online in Google Classroom application make students easier to access and learn anywhere. This result is proven with the research conducted by Murtikusuma et al. (2019) that 77.27% of respondents think that blended learning assisted with Google Classroom is effective to activate students' activeness and support the students' centered learning model. Moreover, Google Classroom which is used to assist the implementation of blended learning could increase students' involvement in learning and develop classroom dynamics. In one of the studies, the use of Google Classroom in blended learning also shows concerns around pace and students' experience in learning using Google Classroom (Heggart & Yoo, 2018). Other research conducted by Shaharanee et al. (2016) also reveals that the majority of students are satisfied with the learning using Google Classroom which is proven with the improvement of students' achievement. The menu which is provided in Google Classroom helps students to keep communicating and interact with teachers even students although they are not in the face-to-face classroom. Students also think that the ease of accessing material and tasks could make them more active in the class.

Differences of students' grammar mastery taught in blended learning with Google Classroom and discussion

The result of Independent Sample t-test toward the students' grammar comprehension taught using blended learning with Google Classroom and discussion method shows that the level of significance of p-value or sig (2-tailed) = 0.48 which is lower than sig α = 0.05 (5%) which means that there is static significance at experimental class. In addition, the coefficient

score of the t-test is 2.029. The t-table with the coefficient level of α= 0.05 with the df= 50 is 0.2732. Thus, it can be concluded that the significance level of t-test (2.029) > t-table (0.2732). It means that there is a difference between students' grammar mastery who are taught using blended learning with Google Classroom and students who are taught using discussion methods.

A study conducted by Qindah (2018) shows that experimental classes which get treatment by blending the face-to-face meeting with the online meeting on Google Classroom has higher performance rather than control class. In addition, students also have a better attitude in studying grammar which could support them to improve their grammar mastery. Moreover, blended learning also helps students to improve their pronunciation when they want to share their ideas and feedback. Besides the quantitative data which proves the effectiveness of blended learning, another study conducted by Al Bataineh et al. (2019) which applied mixed-method in their research shows that blended learning which was implemented in EFL classroom shows positive impact on the learners' grammar performances that is proven with the result of interview that students are strongly satisfied and motivated to learn grammar using blended learning model.

Discussion is one of active learning which could support students to elaborate their idea, and it could help students to improve their language skills especially productive skills. Iman and Angraini (2019) said "using discussion task models in EFL classrooms significantly improved the EFL learners' oral proficiency and critical thinking achievements". It is apparent that discussion is effective to improve students' oral proficiency. On the other hand, grammar is one of the language components which should be mastered by the students that most grammar classes still focus on form. Although some scholars are against the "focus on form" approach and focus on task-based grammar and how grammar is used in communication, practically the focus on form concept is still found (Baleghizadeh & Mozaheb, 2011). Thus, the grammar class applying the discussion method has not met the learning objectives since the focus on form and more practices could not be applied in the discussion method. Students tend to discuss the material, the formula of certain tenses, and how they are applied and less practice in applying the grammar knowledge.

Likewise, the N-Gain test was conducted to know the differences and improvement of students' grammar mastery before and after being taught using blended learning with Google Classroom and Discussion method. The N-Gain score for the experimental group with the total student 26 possessing the mean score for the control group is 0.1164 with the minimum score 0.00 and the maximum score 0.50. Based on the N-Gain category analysis the mean score of the experimental group is classified into high effective because the result of N Gain (0.1164) > 0.7. The N-Gain result shows that blended learning using Google Classroom is effective to teach Grammar. In addition, there is improvement of mean score result of pre-posttest from 46 to 51. Based on the result of the N-gain test, the mean score of the control class is 0.0898, with the minimum score is 0.00 and the maximum score is 0.30. Since the mean score of the N-Gain test is (0.0898) < 0.3, it can be concluded that the discussion method has low effectiveness.

Teaching grammar using blended learning with Google Classroom that involves two ways of teaching (online and offline) has brought new innovation to the foreign language teaching, especially grammar class. The collaboration of two ways of teaching (online and offline) leads teachers to have more ideas to creatively design their foreign language learning

(Hubackova et al., 2011). Various techniques of language learning will give a new atmosphere for students to learn grammar that makes them improve their grammar mastery. "The use of blended learning has the potential to support EFL learning and maximize EFL learners' opportunities to practice the English language freely at their convenience" (Sheerah, 2020). This statement supports what has been revealed from this research that with the more opportunities to learn and interact with the teacher and other students, students could learn and practice more grammar so that they could improve their grammar mastery.

In contrast, the discussion method has low effectiveness in grammar mastery because this method only focuses on grammar knowledge and discussion with less exercises and makes students not have more chances to acquire the grammar material. It has become the main weakness of the discussion method applied in grammar class. The discussion method is actually effective to teach foreign languages, especially speaking skills. By practicing speaking through discussion, students are able to use the language components (pronunciation, grammar, intonation, etc.) in producing oral language (Arifin et al., 2015). However, discussion is less meaningful when it is only taught in grammar form only.

Conclusion

The findings and discussion presented in the earlier section has led the author to conclude that blended learning assisted with Google Classroom is effective to teach grammar to the fourth semester students of the English Education Department rather than taught using discussion method. The Paired Sample t-test value proves the static significance level of teaching grammar using Blended Learning with Google Classroom. The effectiveness of blended learning using Google Classroom is also approved with the yield of Independent Sample t-test that proves that the blended learning is significantly more influencing than taught using Discussion method. The result of the N-Gain test also shows the development of students' grammar mastery after being taught using blended learning with Google Classroom. Although the students' grammar mastery taught using the discussion method is also increasing, the mean score is lower than the mean score yielded in the Blended Learning with Google Classroom class.

The effectiveness of Google Classroom-aided blended learning to teach grammar to the university students might also be implemented in the other English as Foreign Language Classes since the menu of Google Classroom applications are various which could support teaching any foreign language skills and components. Blending the language teaching will bring a new atmosphere to the class and improve the students' motivation. Since the researches of examining blended learning using Google Classroom have been examined many times, the next research could contribute to this topic related to the ideas on designing foreign language learning using blended learning with Google Classroom. On the other hand, teachers need to pay attention to technical things such as internet connection and data since it becomes a problem when blended learning is used in the class. Thus, optimizing the face-to-face classroom feedback and the technical explanation could be used by the EFL teachers who would use blended learning aided with Google Classroom to minimize the technical problems in the online class. Teachers could also create a community group such as WhatsApp group to share information dealing with problems faced by students in accessing the Google Classroom outside the face-to-face class. Hopefully the result of this research

could give contribution for other teachers on choosing an effective learning model to teach grammar in EFL Classroom especially on the use of ICT in language learning.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to acknowledge the Research and Community Service Unit (LP2M) IAIN Salatiga who has funded this research.

References

Adhikari, K. (2017). *Factors influencing the selection of teaching methods in an EFL context* [Master's thesis, Michigan State University]. MSU Libraries Digital Repository. https://d.lib.msu.edu/etd/6703

Al Bataineh, K. B., Abdullah Ahmed Banikalef, A., & H. Albashtawi, A. (2019). The effect of blended learning on EFL students' grammar performance and attitudes: An investigation of Moodle. *Arab World English Journal*, *10*(1), 324–334. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no1.27

Albiladi, W. S., & Alshareef, K. K. (2019). Blended learning in English teaching and learning: A review of the current literature. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *10*(2), 232-238. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1002.03

Ameliani, A. N. (2019). Students' difficulties in grammar of seventh grade junior high school 1 Magelang. *Proceedings of the 1st Conference of English Language and Literature (CELL)* (pp. 1-8).

Arifin, M., Salim, M., Syukrisamsuri, A., & Akib, H. (2015). Developing discussion method in English classroom. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 1-6. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2604402

Ali, F., & Sofa, E. M. (2018). Students' perceptions of the implementation of blended learning in a large English class. *Edulitics (Education, Literature, and Linguistics) Journal*, *3*(1), 15-28. http://www.e-jurnal.unisda.ac.id/index.php/edulitic/article/view/878

Baleghizadeh, S., & Mozaheb, M. A. (2011). A profile of an effective EFL grammar teacher. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *2*(2), 364–369. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.2.364-369

Botero, G. G., Questier, F., Cincinnato, S., He, T., & Zhu, C. (2018). Acceptance and usage of mobile assisted language learning by higher education students. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, *30*, 426-451. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-018-9177-1

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi experimental design for research*. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE Publication.

Curtin, A., & Hall, K. (2018). Research methods for pedagogy: Seeing the hidden and hard to know. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, *41*(4), 367-371. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2018.1495366

Cushing, I., & Helks, M. (2021). Exploring primary and secondary students' experiences of grammar teaching and testing in England. *English in Education: Research Journal of the National Association for the Teaching of English*, *55*(3), 239-250. https://doi.org/10.1080/04250494.2021.1898282

Handayani, N. D., & Johan, M. (2018). Correlation between problem faced in grammar and writing ability of EFL university students. *JEE (Journal of English Education)*, *4*(2), 33–41. https://journal.upp.ac.id/index.php/JEE/article/view/523

Heggart, K. R., & Yoo, J. (2018). Getting the most from Google Classroom: A pedagogical framework for tertiary educators. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *43*(3), 140–153. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n3.9

Hubackova, S., Semradova, I., & Klimova, B. F. (2011). Blended learning in a foreign language teaching. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *28*, 281–285. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.054

Iman, J. N., & Angraini, N. (2019). Discussion task model in EFL classroom: EFL learners' perception, oral proficiency, and critical thinking achievements. *Pedagogika*, *133*(1), 43–62. https://doi.org/10.15823/p.2019.133.3

McGinnis, K. (2021, May 26). *What is Google Classroom? And how are teachers using it? Learn more about this popular platform and how to use it with your students*. Common Sense Education. https://www.commonsense.org/education/articles/teachers-essential-guide-to-google-classroom

Murtikusuma, R. P., Hobri, Fatahillah, A., Hussen, S., Prasetyo, R. R., & Alfarisi, M. A. (2019). Development of blended learning based on Google Classroom with using culture theme in Mathematics learning. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, *1165*, 012017. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1165/1/012017

Nuraeni. (2019). Problems encountered by learners and how to deal with them in learning English as a foreign language. *Proceedings of UHAMKA International Conference on ELT and CALL (UICELL) 2019*. https://journal.uhamka.ac.id/index.php/uicell/article/download/4142/1263/

Ökmen, B., & Kılıç, A. (2016). The effect of language teaching methods on academic success in Turkey. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, *4*(10), 193–199. https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v4i10.1767

Qindah, S. (2018). The effects of blended learning on EFL students' usage of grammar in context. *The Eurasia Proceedings of Educational & Social Sciences (EPESS) 2018* (pp. 11-22). ISRES Publishing. http://www.epess.net/en/download/article-file/534204

Shaharanee, I. N. M., Jamil, J. M., & Rodzi, S. S. M. (2016). Google Classroom as a tool for active learning. *AIP Conference Proceedings*. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4960909

Sheerah, H. A. S. (2020). Using blended learning to support the teaching of English as a foreign language. *Arab World English Journal*, *6*, 191–211. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/call6.13

Shortt, M., Tilak, S., Kuznetcova, I., Martens, B., & Akinkuolie, B. (2021). Gamification in mobile-assisted language learning: A systematic review of Duolingo literature from public release of 2012 to early 2020. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1933540

Taghizadeh, M., & Yourdshahi, Z. H. (2020). Integrating technology into young learners' classes: language teachers' perceptions. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *33*(8), 982-1006. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1618876

Thomas, L. (2020a, July 21). *Quasi-experimental design: Definition, types & examples*. SCRIBBR. https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/quasi-experimental-design/

Thomas, L. (2020b, September 7). *Cluster sampling: A simple step-by-step guide with examples*. SCRIBBR. https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/cluster-sampling/