Video Conference Application in Emergency Remote Learning: Experience, Preference, and Satisfaction

Dhimas Onny Permadi[1], Francisca Maria Ivone[2], Mirjam Anugerahwati[3]
[1]Keguruan Bahasa-Universitas Negeri Malang
[2,3]Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris-Universitas Negeri Malang

INFO ARTIKEL	ABSTRAK
	Abstract: The purpose of this study is to look at foreign language faculty members' and students' experiences, preferences, and satisfaction with video conference apps for emergency remote learning. This quantitative study collected data using a multiple-choice and *Likert* scale questionnaire. Data from the questionnaire were analysed using a single table analysis. The findings indicated that both *Zoom,* and *Google Meet* have a generally favourable opinion of video conference apps' instructional substance, efficacy, engagement, and idea-sharing. Nonetheless, *Zoom* was strongly favoured by most respondents due to its support for collaboration, teaching strategy, motivation, and material sharing. Despite that *Google Meet* had a lower rating, it can be a viable alternative for teachers to meet learning objectives, stimulate discussion, and be utilized on a variety of devices. **Abstrak:** Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk melihat pengalaman, preferensi, dan kepuasan pengajar bahasa asing dan mahasiswa dengan aplikasi konferensi video untuk pembelajaran jarak jauh darurat. Penelitian kuantitatif ini mengumpulkan data dengan menggunakan kuesioner pilihan ganda dan skala *Likert*. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa substansi instruksional aplikasi konferensi video, keberhasilan, keterlibatan, dan berbagi ide dalam aplikasi *Zoom* dan *Google Meet* secara umum mendapat respon yang baik. Meskipun demikian, *Zoom* sangat disukai oleh mayoritas responden karena dukungannya untuk kolaborasi, strategi mengajar, motivasi, dan berbagi materi. Terlepas dari *Google Meet* memiliki peringkat yang lebih rendah, aplikasi ini dapat menjadi alternatif yang layak bagi guru untuk memenuhi tujuan pembelajaran, merangsang diskusi, dan digunakan di berbagai perangkat.
Alamat Korespondensi: Dhimas Onny Permadi Keguruan Bahasa Universitas Negeri Malang Jalan Semarang 5 Malang E-mail: dhimas.onny.1802128@students.um.ac.id	

During the pandemic, the Indonesian government imposed a social distance policy, spurring innovation in the education sector. As a result, face-to-face learning in language classrooms is presently substituted with online or remote learning. Therefore, both students and teachers face unique challenges when it comes to emergency remote learning. According to Cao, Fang, Hou, Han, Xu, Dong, and Zheng (2020), these behaviours significantly influence education, particularly the teaching and learning process. Consequently, recent research often investigates stand-alone online learning technologies, instructional approaches or strategies, distinct settings within a blended learning program, and compares classroom-based and fully online learning. Many of these studies also focus on the applications used in online and remote learning.

In online learning, video conferencing as a digital media is widely utilized to replace conventional media. Computers, like teachers or any other medium, may act as tutors or aids in learning a language, according to Warschauer (1996). Furthermore, technological advancements have enabled learners to access a range of material (text, images, music, animation, and video) on a single system, allowing them to travel their course simply by pointing a mouse or tapping a single button on their smartphone. The computer is used as a tool for language acquisition in these cases. Moreover, social media is currently used by millions of individuals to communicate, cooperate, network, and entertain themselves (Warschauer & Grimes, 2007). It is, however, mostly used to interact and share users' private moments with those who have access to their accounts. Teachers can use digital material that is suitable and practical in the learning and teaching process to deal with this problem. For example, during the epidemic, video conference applications significantly promote foreign language learning and teaching.

Guzacheva (2020) performed a study titled "*Zoom* Technology as an Effective Tool for Distance Learning in Teaching English to Medical Students" on online meeting apps used by pre-se rvice instructors. This study examines the challenges of integrating successful educational technology into university-level remote learning of a foreign language. According to the study, *Zoom* allows for virtual meetings and webinars, as well as content exchange. As a result, it facilitates communication and delivery of classes between English teachers and students.

Various additional video conferencing programs may be used, which help foreign language learning throughout the epidemic. Each of them, however, has a distinct benefit and drawback when it comes to online learning. Teachers can choose a video conferencing solution that is appropriate for their foreign language pupils. However, some teachers and students are experiencing trouble shifting to emergency remote learning, particularly with video conference programs. As a result, to identify the most prevalent issues and, perhaps, find a realistic and successful solution, it is essential to learn about their experience, preferences, and satisfaction with the video conferencing program they are using. Additional elements discovered in earlier studies, such as experience, preference, and satisfaction, are investigated in this study. These considerations are critical in providing teachers with suggestions for the best video conferencing program that meets the demands of both professors and students in online classrooms.

The purposes of this study are to learn more about foreign language faculty members' and students' experience of video conference application in emergency remote learning, foreign language faculty members' and students' preference for video conference application in emergency remote learning, and to know how satisfied are foreign language faculty members and students with the video conference application they use in emergency remote learning from the point of view of cognitive, social, and teaching presence.

METHOD

A survey research design that looked at the attitudes, views, behaviours, or characteristics of the population (Creswell, 2012) was utilized in the study. The experience, preference, and satisfaction of foreign language lecturers and students in utilizing a video conferencing program for emergency remote learning are described in this survey investigation. Following data collection, the researcher utilized the information to answer questions on the teachers' and students' experiences, preferences, and satisfaction with utilizing a video conference program for emergency remote learning.

Foreign language faculty members and students at a private university in Malang in the 2020/2021 academic year were the study's respondents. The 55 respondents were chosen utilizing purposive sampling. Because of the pandemic scenario, data were collected using an online questionnaire. The respondents filled out a *Google Form* questionnaire. Each class's representative disseminated the form's URL. A multiple-choice and a rating scale/*Likert* scale questionnaire were used in this study. The multiple-choice items presented the respondents with a list of answer options, and they could select only one answer. The rating scale/*Likert* scale items asked the respondents to provide a value to the rated object on a scale of one to four. The researcher utilized percentages acquired from the multiple-choice questionnaire items to assess the teachers' and students' preferences for emergency remote learning video conference applications.

FINDINGS
The Video Conference Application Used by the Respondents

The percentage of use of video conference applications in emergency remote learning is presented in Table 1. First, 28 (51%) students used the *Zoom* application, while three lectures (5.35%) used the application. Then, the *Google Meet* application users were 22 students with a percentage of 40%, while two lecturers were the users of the *Google Meet* application with a percentage of 3.7%. Whereas none of the respondents in the study used *Skype* in Emergency Remote Learning (ERL). Thus, the *Zoom* application has the most usage in emergency remote learning. Unfortunately, there was no data recorded on the use of other video conference applications.

Table 1. Video Conference Application Used in Emergency Remote Learning

Video Conference Application	Student		Lecturer		All Respondents	
	f	%	*f*	%	f	%
Zoom	28	51	3	5.3	31	56.3
Google Meet	22	40	2	3.7	24	43.7
Total	50	91	5	9	55	100

Experience of Using the Two Video Conference Applications

Zoom was the video conferencing tool that delivered the best teaching and learning experience. In general, *Google Meet* only reached a percentage of 50—66.9% with an average score of 56%. This is far less than its counterpart. *Zoom* got a higher percentage with 75.8—86.2% and an average of 83% of its users have a high level of satisfaction with the use of video conferencing apps that can support cognitive, social, and teaching presence in remote learning.

Table 2. Experience of Using Video Conference Application

Indicator		Statement	Zoom n=31	Google Meet n=24
Cognitive	Discussion	The video conference application facilitates effective discussion.	83.0 %	63.7 %
	Contextuality	The video conference application is easy to use to convey contextual material.	83.8 %	62.0 %
	Contribution	This video conference application has features that enable participants/students to contribute to teaching and learning actively and easily.	84.6 %	65.3 %
	Motivation	The user interface and user experience make the video conference application easy-to-use.	84.6 %	66.1 %
		Average (Cognitive Presence Support)	85.5 %	51.3 %
Social	Communication	This video conference application makes teachers interact and deliver material efficiently.	80.6 %	63.7 %
	Collaboration	This video conference application can divide and split the class into several group discussions and several sessions.	86.2 %	50.0 %
	Material sharing	This video conference application provides a very efficient and easy-to-use screen-sharing feature.	84.6 %	65.3 %
		Average (Social Presence Support)	84.7 %	44.7 %
Teaching	Instruction	Teacher' teaching instruction (media, voice, display) is clearly conveyed using the application.	75.8 %	62.9 %
	Strategy	The features in this video conference application can support the teaching strategies effectively.	82.2 %	64.5 %
	Feedback	Giving feedback and comment in this video conference application is useful for learning and teaching.	84.6 %	64.5 %
	Media	The teacher can easily add other media to this video conference application for learning.	80.6 %	62.9 %
	Objective	This video conference application can help the teacher reach the learning objective.	80.6 %	66.9 %
	Device	All my learning devices can operate this video conference application.	83.0 %	66.1 %
		Average (Teaching Presence Support)	79.3 %	51.8 %
		Total Average	83.0 %	56.0 %

The most positive aspect for Zoom was the cognitive presence support with an average percentage of 85.5 percent. It was followed by social presence support with an average percentage of 84.7 percent. Teaching presence got fewer positive experiences than the other two presences with a percentage of 79.3 percent. Among the three presences, the aspect that received the most positive response was Collaboration with a percentage value of 86.2 percent. While the lowest aspect compared to other percentage values was Instruction with a percentage value of 75.8 percent.

For Google Meet, the aspect that was considered the most positive was the teaching presence support with an average of 51.8 percent. It was followed by cognitive presence support with an average percentage of 51.3 percent. Meanwhile, social presence had the least positive experience compared to the other two presences with an average percentage of 44.7 percent. From the three presences, the aspect that received the most positive response was Objective with a percentage of 66.9 percent. While the aspect that got the lowest score compared to other percentage values was Collaboration with a percentage of 50.0 percent. From the three presences, *Zoom* and *Google Meet* have different strengths and weaknesses. *Zoom*'s strength was in the Collaboration aspect and its weakness was in the Instruction aspect. While *Google Meet*'s strength was in the Objective aspect but has shortcomings in the Collaboration aspect.

The preference for Zoom was most evident from its social presence score of 87.2 percent on average, which is the highest. This figure was closely followed by teaching presence with an average of 86.9 percent. Cognitive presence received slightly less preference than the other two presences with a proportion of 84.1 percent on average. From these three presences, the support for Strategy, with an average percentage of 86.2 percent, earned the most positive feedback. Contextuality, on the other hand, earned the least when compared to the other supports with a percentage value of 79.8 percent.

Preference for the Two Video Conference Applications Used

Zoom was picked as the preferred video conferencing application over *Google Meet* based on the preferences of the participants. In the cognitive, social, and teaching presences, it earned the scores of 79.8—86.2 percent with an overall preference percentage of 83 percent. *Google Meet* earned the scores of 52.4—65.3 percent with the average percentage of 52 percent, which was lower than *Zoom*'s.

Table 3. Preference for Video Conference Application Use

Indicator		Statement	Zoom n=31	Google Meet n=24
Cognitive	Discussion	I prefer this video conference application because it has the best features to support effective discussions.	82.2 %	65.3 %
	Contextuality	I prefer this video conference application because it supports the delivery of contextual material.	79.8 %	62.9 %
	Contribution	I prefer his video conference application because it has the best feature that enables participants/students to contribute on some comment and actively ask a question.	82.2 %	63.7 %
	Motivation	I prefer this video conference application because it has the best user interface and user experience.	84.6 %	65.3 %
		Average (Cognitive Presence Support)	84.1 %	51.3 %
Social	Communication	I prefer this video conference application because it provides the best feature which aids meaningful communication in class.	83.8 %	62.9 %
	Collaboration	I prefer this video conference application because it provides the best breakout room feature for group discussion sessions.	83.0 %	52.4 %
	Material sharing	I prefer this video conference application because it has the best features to make sharing material simple, faster, and more manageable.	84.6 %	62.0 %
		Average (Social Presence Support)	87.2 %	43.6 %
Teaching	Instruction	I prefer this video conference application because teaching instruction is best delivered on it.	85.4 %	63.0 %
	Strategy	I prefer this video conference application because it has the best features to combine the teaching strategies effectively.	86.2 %	63.7 %
	Feedback	I prefer this video conference application because it has the best features to let the teacher and students give feedback immediately and accurately.	84.6 %	62.0 %
	Media	I prefer this video conference application because it has the best features to use other media to aid emergency remote learning.	82.2 %	58.8 %
	Objective	I prefer this video conference application because it has the best features to fulfill the learning objectives.	82.2 %	62.0 %
	Device	I prefer this video conference application because it is best supported to be used on most devices.	81.4 %	65.3 %
		Average (Teaching Presence Support)	86.9 %	48.5 %
		Total Average	83.0 %	62.0 %

In comparison, Google Meet was the most preferred for supporting cognitive presence with an average proportion of 51.3 percent. It was followed by support for teaching presence, which received an average of 48.5 percent. Social presence received the least preference, with an average of 43.6 percent. Of the three presences, Google Meet was considered the most suitable for the Discussion, Motivation, and Device supports with an average percentage of 65.3 percent. Collaboration, with a percentage of 52.4 percent, receives the lowest score when compared to other supports.

Based on the preferences of the participants, *Zoom* and *Google Meet* appeared to have different strong and weak areas. *Zoom*'s strengths lie in the support for Strategy, while its weaknesses lie in the support for Contextuality. While *Google Meet* had advantages in the areas of Discussion, Motivation, and Device, it fell short in Collaboration.

Satisfaction with the Two Video Conference Applications Used

Zoom, according to the findings, was the most satisfying video conferencing app. In the aspects of cognitive, social, and teaching presences, *Zoom* had the satisfaction scores of 80.6-85.4 percent with an average satisfaction percentage of 83 percent. In comparison to *Zoom*, the satisfaction scores for *Google Meet* were 56.4-66.1 percent with the overall score of 62 percent.

Zoom had strong satisfaction scores in the social presence aspect with an average percentage of 87.7 percent. Cognitive presence came in second, with an average percentage of 85.5 percent. With a score of 83.7 percent, teaching presence obtained less favourable satisfaction than the other two presences. Meanwhile, the support that obtained the most positive satisfaction

response were for Motivation and Material Sharing with a percentage score of 85.4 percent. While Objective and Device had the lowest satisfaction scores compared to other supports, with a percentage value of 80.6 percent.

Table 4. Satisfaction with the Use of Video Conference Application Percentages

Indicator		Statement	Zoom n=31	Google Meet n=24
Cognitive	Discussion	I feel this video conference application is good to increase the effectiveness of the discussion.	81.4 %	60.4 %
	Contextuality	I feel this video conference application is good to use in delivering contextual material.	81.4 %	62.0 %
	Contribution	I am satisfied with this video conference application for making students actively contribute easily to class.	83.8 %	60.4 %
	Motivation	The user interface of this video conference application makes me satisfied in using the application.	85.4 %	64.5 %
		Average (Cognitive Presence Support)	85.5 %	45.6 %
Social	Communication	This application makes teachers/students interact in the teaching and learning process more manageable.	83.8 %	66.1 %
	Collaboration	I am satisfied that this video conference application is easy to use for group discussion and group sessions.	83.0 %	56.4 %
	Material sharing	I am satisfied that this video conference application is helpful and easy to share material in class.	85.4 %	64.5 %
		Average (Social Presence Support)	87.7 %	46.6 %
	Instruction	I am satisfied that this application is straightforward and smooth (media, voice, display) to provide teaching instructions.	81.4 %	63.7 %
	Strategy	I am satisfied that this video conference application features make it easy to cover the teaching strategies.	83.8 %	63.7 %
	Feedback	I am satisfied that this video conference application provides feedback and a comment column for online meetings.	83.8 %	62.0 %
Teaching	Media	I am satisfied that this video conference application lets the teacher share other media with the student while running.	83.8 %	64.5 %
	Objective	I am satisfied using this application for fulfilling learning objectives.	80.6 %	65.3 %
	Device	I am very satisfied using this video conference application on my devices.	80.6 %	64.5%
		Average (Teaching Presence Support)	83.7 %	48.8 %
		Total Average	83.0%	62.0%

On the other hand, *Google Meet* was best appreciated for its teaching presence support, which received a score of 48,8 percent on average. Appreciation for social presence support follows with an average percentage of 46.6 percent. When compared to the other two presences, cognitive presence had the lowest positive satisfaction response, with an average score of 45.6 percent. Of the three presences, Communication support obtained the highest positive response with a score of 66.1 percent. Collaboration support, with a percentage of 56.4 percent, obtained the lowest satisfaction score.

In terms of satisfaction, *Zoom* and *Google Meet* have different qualities. *Zoom*'s strengths were in the areas of Motivation and Material Sharing, while its weaknesses were in the areas of Objective and Device support. *Google Meet* appeared to be superior in terms of communication support but was deemed unable to meet satisfaction in Collaboration support.

DISCUSSION
Experience with Video Conference Application in Emergency Remote Learning

According to the study's findings, the overall degree of experience with Zoom and Google Meet in emergency remote learning was high, with an average proportion of 83 percent and 56 percent, respectively. Thus, based on the experience levels of faculty members and students, such apps may meet the demands of cognitive, social, and teaching presence.

In emergency remote learning, cognitive presence is essential. According to Kanuka and Garrison (2004), cognitive presence is a fundamental component of critical thinking and is required for higher levels of thinking and learning. An application that can support cognitive presence is required for emergency remote learning. Based on finding, both Zoom, and Google Meet can improve cognitive presence in the learning and teaching process by facilitating conversation, contextuality, contribution, and enhancing motivation. This is proven by the average positive response value of Zoom which reaches 84.0 percent. This positive response is the highest average value compared to other presences. The finding is comparable to a study by Ratnawati and Nurhasanah (2021) who reported that the Zoom meeting learning platform made the learning process more pleasant. Meanwhile, Google Meet has an average cognitive presence value of 64.3 percent. Google Meet's positive experience response gets a high

percentage value on Motivation compared to other aspects. This is in line with Ningsih (2020) that the use of Google Meet in online learning has a positive impact on students. It is because the Google Meet user interface and user experience are simple and easy to use.

A second essential component of emergency remote learning is social presence. Zoom might be used to offer communication, collaboration, and material exchange efficiently. Similarly, Palupi and Raharjo (2020) claimed that Zoom is successful since it offers unique characteristics such as virtual communication, chat, recording, and simple access. It is revealed in this study that Zoom got a higher positive response in Collaboration about 86.2 percent. In addition, it is simple to install not only on a laptop or computer but also on a smartphone. The rate of collaboration using Google Meet, on the other hand, was only 50% in this study. This reveals that when utilizing Google Meet, the degree of collaboration is lower than when using Zoom. This indicates that the respondents' Google Meet collaboration experience was not as easy, effective, or fluid as it was with Zoom. This is in line with the findings in Ratnawati and Nurhasanah's (2021) study in which the respondents encountered disruptions such as instability and loudness when utilizing Google Meet.

Teaching presence is also a key factor in emergency remote learning. While cognitive and social presence are necessary for supporting higher levels of learning, whether or not those two key aspects can be attained is dependent on the instructor or facilitator of the learning activities or the teaching presence Kanuka and Garrison (2004). Zoom and Google Meet both can support various teaching strategies, feedback, media, learning aims, and learning devices. However, on the Instruction aspect, Zoom received less positive response compared to other aspects. In teaching presence support, Zoom's Instruction aspect gets a score of 75.8 percent. Meanwhile, Google Meet garnered a more positive response by its users on the Objective aspect with a score of 66.9 percent. Learning objectives are very important to determine the direction of student development. Therefore, it is critical for attaining emergency remote learning objectives. Presenting images is another strategy used in the teaching and learning process, particularly in writing classes (Irikawati, 2017). Ratnawati and Nurhasanah (2021) agreed that zoom and Google Meet could give good and entirely collaborative feedback while also achieving the learning goal.

In terms of experience, Zoom provided the best support for facilitating cognitive, social, and teaching presence, with Collaboration as the main strength. Zoom got a positive response in the Collaboration aspect compared to Google Meet which received a much less positive response in this aspect. This is because Zoom has a breakout room feature that is easy and free to use compared to breakout rooms in the Google Meet application, which is not free for users (Fathurrahman, 2021). On the other hand, Zoom got less positive response in the Instruction aspect. It shows that the experience of teacher' teaching instruction is not clearly conveyed enough using these apps. On the other hand, Google Meet only provided moderate support, with Objective as its best advantage. The objective aspect of Google Meet earned the most positive feedback. It has been established that Google Meet can support the teacher in achieving the learning objective.

Preferences for Video Conference Application in Emergency Remote Learning

According to the present data, Zoom was favoured by more than half of the respondents (56.3 percent), whereas Google Meet was preferred by less than half of the respondents (43.7 percent). With an average percentage of 83 percent and 62 percent, respectively, the preference level for using Zoom and Google Meet in emergency remote learning was usually high. Those applications were highly favored for emergency remote learning according to the respondents' preference level.

Both Zoom and Google Meet were chosen for emergency remote learning because they provide elements that enhance cognitive presence in the learning and teaching process in terms of conversation, contextuality, contribution, and incentive. However, from several aspects, Zoom got a less positive response on the Contextuality aspect with a value of 79.8 percent. Meanwhile, Google Meet received a more positive preference response in the Discussion and Motivation aspects compared to other aspects. Even though such programs were well-liked, Zoom received a higher rating percentage and was favoured by more people. As a result, Guzacheva (2020) can support the idea that Zoom can improve learning or perhaps give more effective methods to motivate students.

Zoom was highly preferred because it supports communication, collaboration, and material sharing with percentages above 80 percent with average social presence support about 83.8 percent, which is the second most essential factor of emergency remote learning. A previous study by Ogwunte and Ahmadi (2020) reported that Zoom offers a variety of features that make it simple for students to have face-to-face virtual meetings, such as a share screen for sharing visual and audio-visual assets, asking questions via chat capabilities, and so on. Furthermore, Guzacheva (2020) noted that when utilizing Zoom, English teachers may use the breakout rooms to organize learners in pairs, threes, or whatever size group they choose, which is a fantastic method to encourage pair work or group work while allowing medical students to work independently. Google Meet, on the other hand, was less liked in this survey, particularly when it came to cooperation. Only 52.4 percent of people collaborated using Google Meet. As a result, it is demonstrated that the preference level for collaboration is lower than that of others. This is in contrast to past research findings, students chose Google Meet because it is simple to use and meant to be user-friendly (Aswir, Hadi, & Dewi, 2021; Purwanto & Tannady, 2020).

Zoom might aid in the facilitation of teaching presence by supporting the teaching method, feedback, media, learning aim, and learning device. As a result, it was strongly favoured, with more than 80 percent of the vote. Guzacheva, (2020) backs it up, stating that by using Zoom, English teachers may adapt to each student's proficiency level and learning goals by offering diverse online materials to individual students so they can work on them at their own pace. Furthermore, the Zoom Cloud Meetings performance demonstrated a good and well-impact on instructional change in business education programs (Ogwunte and Ahmadi, 2020). Another study by Palupi and Raharjo (2020) found that Zoom's visualization is adequate for displaying presentations. Meanwhile, Google Meet has a low proportion in the media support in this research, 58.8 percent. It shows that the use of media to support emergency remote learning is not optimal yet.

Based on user preferences, Zoom received a more positive response on the aspect of Strategy compared to other aspects. It demonstrates the respondent's preference for Zoom's features that make implementing instructional techniques easier. Teachers and students may use interactive tools like screen sharing, videos, and audio to connect interactively. Through Zoom, teachers can directly communicate visually, by providing various subjects with direct instructions to their students (Setiani, 2020) Besides, Google Meet got positive responses in the Discussion, Motivation, and Device aspects. This app can support teaching and learning needs during emergency remote learning. Jumrah, Syahrudin, & Syamsuri (2020) in their research also stated that Google Meet is an internet-based service e-learning system that can be used by teachers to create discussion forums, give teaching directions, and can be used on various devices. The Collaboration support by Google Meet had the least positive feedback from its users, like the results from user experience. This demonstrates that the use of Google Meet's collaboration features seems to be more complicated than using other apps.

Satisfaction with the Use of Video Conference Application in Emergency Remote Learning

Based on the study's findings, the satisfaction level of utilizing Zoom and Google Meet in emergency remote learning was usually high, with an average percentage of 83 percent and 62 percent, respectively. According to the satisfaction levels of faculty members and students, such apps may meet the demands of cognitive, social, and teaching presence. According to the study's findings, the cognitive presence percentage from both Zoom and Google Meet revealed that the respondent's degree of pleasure was high. Furthermore, in terms of conversation, contextuality, contribution, and motivation, the respondents were happy with the characteristics supplied by those programs to help learning and teaching go smoothly. It can be seen from the findings, the average positive response to the level of satisfaction in the cognitive presence aspect has a high percentage of about 83.0 percent. It is because users feel that these apps can fulfill all cognitive aspects to facilitate online learning. According to research by Laili and Nashir (2021), Zoom enhances distance learning and allows for dialogue between lecturers and students and among students, much as in a real classroom. Furthermore, referring to a research conducted by Setyawan, Aznam, Paidi, Citrawati, & Kusdianto (2020), using the Google Meet media-assisted lecture technique while studying at home aided in the development of student knowledge and learning outcomes. It is proven by the current study that Google Meet got a positive response with a percentage value of 64.5 percent for the aspect of user interface satisfaction. Besides that, Google Meet has a very simple interface with a light size, efficient management priority, and easy to use (user friendly) that can be applied by all users (Dewi, Pratisia, & Putra, 2021).

Zoom has a high average satisfaction level of 84.1 percent when it comes to the application's capacity to meet the indications of social presence. As a result, it may make it easier for instructors and students to communicate, collaborate, and share materials. Zoom is an asynchronous approach for interactive audio, video, and data communication between two or more groups, according to Al-Samarraie (2019). It allows teachers and students to communicate in real-time via video and voice and share and message information. It also provides instant feedback and encourages students to work together to learn. On the other side, the percentages of respondents satisfied with Google Meet were lower, particularly the collaboration indication. Only 56.4 percent of respondents were happy with collaborating via Google Meet, whereas Zoom had more than 60 percent. As a result, collaborative satisfaction has been shown to be lower. As a result, it's probable that Google Meet's collaboration capabilities might not be as intuitive as Zoom's. Respondents expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the teaching presence indicator. The teaching method, feedback, material, learning aim, and learning device may all be supported by Zoom and Google Meet. It agrees with Candarli and Yuksel (2012), who found that despite technical issues with sound quality and connectivity, students had a good assessment of the educational content, efficacy, engagement, and idea-sharing using video conferencing applications.

From the three presence, Zoom's high positive responses come from the Motivation and Material Sharing. The ease of the user interface will affect the level of user satisfaction. In addition, the use of screen sharing on Zoom makes it easy for teachers to distribute learning materials to their students. In their research, Kuntarto, Sofwan, & Mulyani (2021) states that teachers easily provide, display, explain learning material directly so that it makes students easier to understand the lesson. On the other hand, Google Meet got a positive response from its users in the Communication aspect. It is because Google Meet can be used flexibly at any time for the learning process so that the teaching and learning process is more manageable. The link that Google Meet provided during the class can be used by the students to connect with the teacher any time (Al-Maroof, Salloum, Hassanien, & Shaalan, 2020). Behind its benefits, Google Meet received a lower degree of favourable reaction in the Collaboration aspect, as

well as a lower level of positive response in the experience and preference levels. In terms of collaboration, Google Meet is less likely to receive favourable feedback, which might hinder the learning process. This makes Google Meet less suitable as a learning platform because, according to Zaky (2018), lecturers have three major responsibilities in collaborative learning ventures: shaping groups, preparing their students to be effective supporters and partners, and overseeing shared meetings, all of which Google Meet is unable to fulfill satisfactorily.

CONCLUSIONS

This study drew several conclusions based on the findings regarding foreign language faculty members' and students' experience with, preference for, and satisfaction with video conferencing applications in emergency remote learning from the point of view of cognitive, social, and teaching presence. First, foreign language faculty and students have extensive familiarity with video conferencing technologies, particularly *Zoom* and *Google Meet*. These apps can readily accommodate and enable emergency remote learning activity. To facilitate efficient online learning and teaching, these application characteristics can enhance cognitive, social, and instructional presence. In terms of the experience, preference, and satisfaction, *Zoom* got an overall positive response and was chosen by most respondents. In the experience aspect, *Zoom* got a higher positive response for Collaboration support in cognitive presence, but it got less positive response for Instruction support in teaching presence. In the preference aspect, *Zoom* received a more positive response for teaching presence on the aspect of Strategy, but it got less positive response for Contextuality support in social presence. In the satisfaction aspect, *Zoom* got a higher positive response for the areas of Motivation and Material Sharing support in cognitive and social presence but have weaknesses for Objective and Device support in teaching presence. On the other hand, *Google Meet* was less favourable in all aspects. In the Experience aspect, *Google Meet*'s strength was on the Objective support in social presence.

In preference, *Google Meet* got advantage on Discussion, Motivation, and Device support in cognitive and teaching presence. In the Satisfaction aspect, *Google Meet* got positive response for Communication support in social presence. Regrettably, *Google Meet* has a significant flaw in terms of user experience, preference, and satisfaction, specifically the support for collaboration. The conclusion is that foreign language professors and students are generally pleased with *Zoom* and *Google Meet*. This is since such programs offer real-time, two-way video and audio contact, as well as material sharing and messaging between teachers and students in a group discussion. *Zoom* was favoured by most respondents because of its usefulness. It may be used for group discussion and group sessions by combining and conducting the teaching strategy efficiently, and it is simple to share content. In addition, respondents likely find *Zoom*'s user interface to be user-friendly. Although *Google Meet* received a lower rating, it does have some nice feedback from its consumers. *Google Meet* may be utilized by multiple devices in online learning and can help teachers meet learning objectives and promote discussion. Both *Zoom* and *Google Meet* have a favourable opinion of video conference apps' instructional substance, efficacy, engagement, and idea-sharing. This study recognizes a limitation from the sample size. This study only included less than 70 respondents. Faculty members had only five respondents. Therefore, it is recommended that the data for future research are to be collected from a larger population. Because this study was conducted in only one faculty at a single institution, the diversity of the population should also be addressed. As the recommendation for the instrument, further research should employ open-ended instruments such as interviews. This is because this study only used a close-ended instrument which is a questionnaire. Employing open-ended instruments will enable further research to gain in depth data.

REFERENCES

Al-Maroof, R. S., Salloum, S. A., Hassanien, A. E., & Shaalan, K. (2020). Fear from COVID-19 and technology adoption: the impact of Google Meet during Coronavirus pandemic. *Interactive Learning Environments*. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1830121

Al-Samarraie, H. (2019). A scoping review of videoconferencing systems in higher education: Learning paradigms, opportunities, and challenges. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 20(3).

Aswir, A., Hadi, M. S., & Dewi, F. R. (2021). Google Meet Application as an Online Learning Media for Descriptive Text Material. *Jurnal Studi Guru Dan Pembelajaran*, 4(1), 189–194.

Candarli, D., & Yuksel, H. G. (2012). Students' perceptions of video conferencing in the classrooms in higher education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 357–361.

Cao, W., Fang, Z., Hou, G., Han, M., Xu, X., Dong, J., & Zheng, J. (2020). The psychological impact of the COVID-19 epidemic on college students in China. *Psychiatry Research*, 287, 112934.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative (4th Edition)*. Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Dewi, K., Pratisia, T., & Putra, A. K. (2021). Implementasi pemanfaatan google classroom, google meet, dan instagram dalam proses pembelajaran online menuju abad 21. *Jurnal Integrasi Dan Harmoni Inovatif Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial*, 1(5), 533–541. https://doi.org/10.17977/um063v1i5p533-541

Fathurrahman. (2021). Google Meet vs Zoom: Perbedaan dan Perbandingannya. Retrieved November 13, 2021, from Google Meet vs Zoom: Perbedaan dan Perbandingannya website: https://teknoding.com/google-meet-Zoom-perbedaan-perbandingan/ 2.44 wib 12/11/2021

Guzacheva, N. (2020). Zoom Technology as an Effective Tool for Distance Learning in Teaching English to Medical Students. *Bulletin of Science and Practice*, *6*(5), 457–460. https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/54/61

Irikawati, I. (2017). Identifying Teacher's Strategies In Teaching Writing. *Al-Lisan: Jurnal Bahasa (e-Journal)*, *2*(1), 10–16.

Jumrah., Syahrudin, H., & Syamsuri. (2020). Meningkatkan Motivasi Belajar Siswa Melalui Kombinasi Google Classroom dan Google Meet Sebagai Media Pembelajaran Akibat Pandemi Covid-19 Pada Mata Pelajaran Kewirausahaan Siswa Kelas XI RPL di SMK Koperasi Pontianak. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajara Khatulistiwa, 10*(9), 1-10.

Kanuka, H., & Garrison, D. R. (2004). Cognitive presence in online learning. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, *15*(2), 21.

Kuntarto, E., Sofwan, M., & Mulyani, N. (2021). Analisis Manfaat Penggunaan Aplikasi Zoom dalam Pembelajaran Daring Bagi Guru dan Siswa di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Nusantara*, *7*(1), 49–62. https://doi.org/10.29407/jpdn.v7i1.15742

Laili, R. N., & Nashir, M. (2021). The Use of Zoom Meeting for Distance Learning in Teaching English to Nursing Students during Covid-19 Pandemic. *UICELL Conference Proceeding*, 235–244.

Ningsih, S. (2020). Persepsi Mahasiswa Terhadap Pembelajaran Daring Pada Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *JINOTEP (Jurnal Inovasi dan Teknologi Pembelajaran): Kajian dan Riset Dalam Teknologi Pembelajaran*, *7*(2), 124–132. https://doi.org/10.17977/um031v7i22020p124

Ogwunte, P. C., & EA, A. (2020). *Perceived Influence of Zoom Cloud and Whatsapp Technologies on Instructional Delivery in University Business Education Classroom in Rivers State*.

Palupi, I. R., & Raharjo, W. (2020). *Zoom As a Tool For Online Learning*. *1*(1), 161–165. https://doi.org/10.31098/pss.v1i1.192

Purwanto, E., & Tannady, H. (2020). The Factors Affecting Intention to Use Google Meet Amid Online Meeting Platforms Competition in Indonesia. *Technology Reports of Kansai University*, *62*(06), 2829–2838.

Ratnawati, R., & Nurhasanah, I. (2021). Investigating Students' Experiences and Preferences on Tools and Activities in Emergency Remote Learning Amidst Covid-19 Pandemic. *Al-Lisan: Jurnal Bahasa (e-Journal)*, *6*(1), 36–57.

Setiani, A. (2020). Efektivitas proses belajar melalui aplikasi Zoom di masa pandemi Covid-19. *Proceedings Seminar Nasional Pascasarjana UNNES*. Semarang: Universitas Negeri Semarang. Retrieved from unnes.ac.id

Setyawan, A., Aznam, N., Paidi, P., Citrawati, T., & Kusdianto, K. (2020). Effects of the Google Meet Assisted Method of Learning on Building Student Knowledge and Learning Outcomes. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(9), 3924–3936.

Warschauer, M., & Grimes, D. (2007). Audience, authorship, and artifact: The emergent semiotics of Web 2.0. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *27*, 1–23.

Zaky, H. (2018). Collaborative writing as a method to spur transformational learning in adult education classes. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, *7*(1), 47–58. https://doi.org/10.15640/jehd.v7n1a1