

OUTLINE

1. INTRODUCTION
2. LITERATURE REVIEW
3. METHODOLOGY
4. RESULTS & DISCUSSION
5. RECOMMENDATIONS & CONCLUSION



Google Meet



INTRODUCTION

- With the outbreak of the Covid 19 pandemic across the world, education institutions have turned to online teaching via video conferencing platforms.
- Among them is Google Meet, a platform well-known for its simplicity, user-friendliness and convenience.
- Until the last week of April, 2020, daily traffic to Google Meet was up to 100 million people and the number increase 3 million people every day (Boland, 2020).
- Despite its simplicity, there are still limitations in its functions and teachers still need a certain level of technical skills to use it effectively.
- This study was an attempt to investigate the actual use of Google Meet in teaching and learning English at a tertiary institution.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Video conferencing or virtual conferencing (VC) is a kind of technology that allows users from different places to participate in meetings without travelling to the same place with the connection of sound and video.

Most researchers have positive views on the use of video conferencing in L2 education:

- Freeman (1998): VC assists lecturers in duplicating their lectures, reducing the teaching time, saving more time for preparing material. Learners have the equal chance to approach the lecturers and the course.
- Wang (2004): VC provides effective learning environment in which the learners not only communicate with the target language but can also use non-verbal language.
- Lee (2006): VC provides a less-pressure environment for communication than the face-to-face one.
- Jung, S. K. (2009) VC can replace the direct interaction between learners and foreign teachers which is beneficial regarding time and space issues.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Some researchers have negative views on the use of video conferencing in L2 education:

Mason (2013) : VC is not appropriate with the lecturing method used in higher education and more suitable for young learners.

Knipe, D., & Lee, M. (2002): learners in online classes felt that they were lost and their learning time was reduced.

Freeman (1998) : the activities and interaction were at a slow pace, and more time spent for technical problems and the learners' neglectfulness, especially in remote areas.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Assessment criteria for video conferencing tools in classrooms:

Le Huu Nghia et al. (2021):

1. The quality of sound transmission
2. The quality of image transmission
3. The user friendliness
4. The interaction between lecturers and learners
5. The sign-in process

LITERATURE REVIEW

Assessment criteria for video conferencing tools in classrooms:

Lauren M, A and Gavan P.L. W (2018) designed and suggested 08 assessment criteria :

- 1. Functionality** (Scale, Ease of use , Tech support)
- 2. Accessibility** (Accessibility standard, User-focused participation, Required equipment, Cost of use)
- 3. Technical** (Integration/ Embedding within a Learning Management System (LMS), Desktop / Laptop/ Operating systems, Browser, Additional downloads)
- 4. Mobile design** (Access, functionality, offline access)
- 5. Privacy, Data protection, and Rights** (Sign up/ sign in, Data privacy and ownership, Archiving, saving, and exporting Data)
- 6. Social Presence** (Collaboration, User accountability, Diffusion)
- 7. Teaching Presence** (Facilitation, Customization, Learning Analytics)
- 8. Cognitive Presence** (Enhancement of cognitive tasks, High order thinking, Metacognitive engagement)

LITERATURE REVIEW

Assessment criteria for video conferencing tools in classrooms:

Based on Lauren M, A and Gavan P.L. W (2018), we come up with 7 criteria to assess the use of video-conferencing for L2 teaching and learning

1. The simplicity and convenience of use
2. The interaction between lecturers and classmates
3. The compatibility with different devices, platforms and systems
4. The capacity of importing, exporting and sharing data
5. The data and information security
6. The support for varied teaching activities
7. The support for classroom and learner management

METHODOLOGY

Research design: Mixed method

Sampling method: Convenient sampling

Participants: 31 teachers, 230 students at USSH-VNU.HCM

Research tools: a questionnaire, a semi-structured interview

Research questions:

- What is the teachers' perceived effectiveness of using Google Meet to teach English online?
- What is the students' perceived effectiveness of using Google Meet to learn English online?

FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

RQ1: Teachers' perception of Google Meet functions

	Mean (M)	Range	Std. Deviation (SD)
1 The simplicity and convenience of use	4.46	Agree	.48
2 The interaction between lecturers and classmates	3.74	Agree	.78
3 The compatibility with different devices, platforms and systems	3.91	Agree	.67
4 The capacity of importing, exporting and sharing data	3.82	Agree	.74
5 The data and information confidentiality	3.63	Agree	1.00
6 The support for varied teaching activities	3.78	Agree	.69
7 The support for classroom and learner management	2.89	Neutral	.79

FINDINGS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE

6 out of 7 aspects of Google Meeting were regarded satisfying for teachers' online teaching of English ($3.63 \leq M \leq 4.46$). Among them, the simplicity and convenience of use of Google Meet ranked the first ($M=4.46, SD=.48$)

Data and information security of Google Meet was the least appreciated and received the most various evaluations ($M=3.63, SD=1.00$).

Teachers held a neutral view about the capability of Google Meet to support classroom and learner management ($M=2.89$).

FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

RQ1: Teachers' perception of Google Meet functions

FINDINGS FROM THE INTERVIEW

04 out of 05 teachers said that Google had a simple and easy-to-use interface which enabled them to use it without prior training. Three of them also added that Google Meet could be used right on the web browser and no application installment was required.

All the participants shared that they found it challenging to restrict access of strangers into their meeting on Google Meet.

03 out 05 teachers asserted that functions of Google Meet could aid in classroom and learner management only to an adequate extent.

SUMMARY

→ For teachers, Google Meet showed tremendous strength in its simple and easy-to-use interface; nevertheless, it was still in need of improvement in its support for data security and management of classrooms and learners.

FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

Students' perception of Google Meet functions

FEATURES OF GOOGLE MEET	MEAN	RANGE	STD
1 The simplicity and convenience of use	4.57	Strongly agree	.51
2 The interaction between lecturers and classmates	3.62	Agree	.73
3 The compatibility with different devices, platforms and systems	4.56	Strongly agree	.54
4 The capacity of importing, exporting and sharing data	3.74	Agree	.76
5 The data and information security	3.94	Agree	.57
6 The assistance in varied teaching activities	4.19	Agree	.63
7 The assistance in classroom and learner management	3.81	Agree	.87

FINDINGS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The means score of all the functions range from **3.62 to 4.57**, showing that all of the functions of Google Meet was considered satisfying for students' online learning of English.

The simplicity and convenience in use of Google Meet and its compatibility with different devices, platforms and systems received the most appreciation from the students (**M=4.57, SD=.51 & M=4.56, SD=.54 respectively**).

Meanwhile, its support for interaction between lecturers and classmates of Google Meet was the lowest rated (**M=3.62, SD=.73**).

FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

RQ2: Students' perception of Google Meet functions

FINDINGS FROM THE INTERVIEW

- **13 out of 15** students said that they liked the simple interface of Google Meet.
- **11 out of 15** students in the interview who said they enjoyed using Google Meet most because it could run on almost any devices, or systems they had.
- a majority of the interviewed students (**12 out of 15**) all wished that Google Meet could have allowed breakout rooms as in Zoom so that they could work in pairs or in groups more easily.
- This contrasts Jung, S. K. (2009) in the way that the online interaction could not replace the direct interaction between teachers and students.
- This is also partly in line with Knipe, D., & Lee, M. (2002) when students in their study figured that they had fewer opportunities to interact in groups when learning on the video conferencing platform

SUMMARY

→ Google Meet, according to students in the study, had the advantages of a user-friendly interface and capability to work with different gadgets and platforms despite its weak support for different types of classroom communication.

RECOMMENDATIONS & CONCLUSION

Future researchers should cater for:

- Larger sample sizes
- Other aspects of the use of Google Meet
- Other similar video-conferencing tools

Teachers and platform developers should include alternative ways/
add-ons/apps:

- to support interactions between teacher and students.
- to support classroom management and data security.

REFERENCES

- Boland, H. (2020b, April 29). Google launches free version of Meet in bid to topple Zoom. Retrieved July 27, 2021, from <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/2020/04/29/google-launches-free-version-meet-video-calling-app-bid-topple/>
- Freeman, M. (1998). Video conferencing: a solution to the multi-campus large classes problem?. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 29(3), 197-210.
- Jung, S. K. (2009). Students' evaluation of the effect of video conferencing on promoting speaking fluency. *Multimedia Assisted Language Learning*, 12(2), 105-133.
- Knipe, D., & Lee, M. (2002). The quality of teaching and learning via videoconferencing. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 33(3), 301-311
- Lauren M. Anstey and Gavan P.L. Watson. 2018. Rubric for eLearning Tool Evaluation. EDUCAUSE Review, September 10. Available online: <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2018/9/a-rubric-for-evaluating-e-learningtools-in-higher-education>. Accessed on 27.07.2021
- Laurillard, D. (1993). *Rethinking University Teaching: Rethinking University Teaching: a Framework for the Effective Use of Educational Technology*. Routledge.
- Lee, H-G. (2006). Meaning negotiation in task-based video-conferencing. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, 9(2), 128-153.
- Lerman, R. (2020, April 30). Big Tech is coming for Zoom: Google makes video chatting service Meet free. Retrieved July 27, 2021, from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2020/04/29/google-meet-zoom-competitor/>
- Lương Đình Hải, Nguyễn Xuân An, Nguyễn Hoài Thu, & Vũ Thị Phương Thảo. (2020). Nhận thức và thái độ của sinh viên đối với việc học tập thông qua các công cụ hội nghị trực tuyến trong bối cảnh đại dịch Covid-19. *Tạp Chí Giáo Dục*, 2(480), 60–64. Retrieved from <https://sti.vista.gov.vn/tw/Lists/TaiLieuKHCCN/Attachments/308306/CVv216S4802020060.pdf>
- Mason, R. (2013). *Using communications media in open and flexible learning*. Routledge.
- Wang, Y. (2004). Distance language learning: Interactivity and fourth-generation internet-based videoconferencing. *CALICO Journal*, 21(2), 373-395.



THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!