THE STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF GOOGLE FORM AS AN ASSESSMENT TOOL IN LISTENING INTERPRETATIVE COURSES

Hajija Souwakil[1], Wardani Dwi Wihastyanang[2*],Cinta Nayla Sa'diyah[3] , Ayusti Fitri Auliya Rahma [4]
[1]Universitas PGRI Jombang
[2] Universitas PGRI Jombang
[3] SMA Negeri 2 Jombang
[4] MAN 4 Denanyar Jombang,
Email: hajija@gmail.com [1], dani.poobe@gmail.com [2] ,
cinta.nayla2007@gmail.com [3] , ayusti.cantik.07@gmail.com [4]

*Corresponding Author

Abstract

The transition to online learning during the global pandemic necessitated a rapid *shift* toward digital evaluation tools within higher education. This study explores students' perceptions of Google Forms as an assessment tool in the Listening Interpretative Course at the English Department of Universitas PGRI Jombang. This study employed a qualitative descriptive methodology. Data were collected through a combination of closed-ended questionnaires and semi-structured interviews with students who utilized Google Forms for their listening assessments. The data were analyzed using the interactive model by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña, involving data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing. The findings reveal that students generally hold a positive perception of Google Forms, citing its user-friendly interface, accessibility via mobile devices, and the efficiency of instant feedback as primary benefits. However, negative perceptions emerged primarily due to environmental factors, such as unstable internet connectivity and audio synchronization issues, which triggered frustration and temporary rejection of the tool. The study concludes that while Google Forms is an effective instrument for digital evaluation, its success in a listening context depends heavily on stable infrastructure and the maintenance of human-to-human instructional support to mitigate technology-induced anxiety.

Keywords: *perception, Google Forms, listening interpretative, qualitative descriptive, assessment tool.*

_____

Introduction

In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, assessing listening comprehension presents distinct challenges that demand high precision in measuring learning outcomes. Although assessment acts as a vital bridge between teaching and learning, its application in listening courses is frequently obstructed by technical limitations and the rigidity of conventional testing media. As noted by Ally (2008), the integration of web-based technology is paramount in modern educational evaluation to navigate such constraints. Despite this necessity, practitioners often struggle to synchronize complex audio components with assessment tools that are both efficient and accessible to students. Consequently, leveraging digital platforms has emerged as a critical necessity—providing a practical means to embed technology within listening assessments while enhancing the accuracy and effectiveness of competency measurement.

The adoption of digital strategies in educational institutions has fostered innovation by enabling virtual learning that transcends traditional temporal and spatial barriers. This shift toward online learning—comprising computer-based systems and virtual classrooms—facilitates flexible communication between instructors and students via the internet. As noted by Damayanti (2020) and Damola (2021), these methods proved particularly effective during the pandemic, provided that learners possessed the requisite digital literacy to manage hardware and software effectively. In listening courses specifically, technology is vital for overcoming traditional assessment constraints, such as synchronized audio playback and real-time response management. While various platforms support online learning, Google Forms serves as a specialized web-based assessment and survey tool that streamlines these workflows. By utilizing such platforms, lecturers can embed multimedia elements directly into the evaluation workflow. This transition to targeted digital tools addresses several critical needs; (1) integrated Delivery which ensures that audio playback is seamlessly synchronized with the corresponding question sets, (2) centralized environment which provides a unified space where students can engage with and submit evaluations without the friction of disjointed digital methods, (3) efficiency which replaces conventional paper-based barriers with a streamlined, real-time data collection process. Ultimately, the strategic use of

these digital tools enhances material mastery and increases interactive engagement between learners and instructors within the digital classroom.

Perception is defined in this study as a cognitive process where environmental stimuli are received through the five senses, organized by the brain, and interpreted based on an individual's prior knowledge and experiences (Suwarto & Fajri, 2018). According to Irwanto (2002) and Rahmat (2005), this interpretative process typically manifests in two broad categories: positive and negative. A positive perception arises when the information aligns with an individual's understanding and emotions, leading to supportive actions, whereas a negative perception occurs when information contradicts personal expectations, triggering rejection. In this study, these theoretical categories—positive and negative perceptions—serve as the primary analytic framework to guide data interpretation. By classifying participant responses into these two categories, the research can systematically evaluate the students' evaluative stance and determine the overall reception of using Google Forms in listening assessments.

According to Irwanto (2002) and Rahmat (2005), human perception is categorized into two primary responses: positive and negative. A positive perception occurs when the information received aligns with an individual's expectations and emotions, leading to supportive actions. Conversely, a negative perception arises when the information contradicts personal appreciation, triggering rejection or dissatisfaction. In this study, these two types of perception—positive and negative—serve as the foundational analytic categories for interpreting the data. By classifying student responses into these categories, the research can systematically evaluate the level of acceptance or resistance toward the use of Google Forms in listening assessments. Furthermore, while perception can be directed toward both human and non-human objects, this study focuses on "thing perception" (non-human), specifically examining how students interact with and react to the digital assessment environment.

Based on the frameworks of Irwanto (2002) and Rahmat (2005), human perception is theoretically divided into two primary categories: positive and negative. A positive perception occurs when information aligns with an individual's expectations, leading to supportive actions, whereas a negative perception arises from a contradiction between the information and the individual's appreciation, often resulting in rejection. Within the context of this study, these positive and negative perceptions are used as the foundational analytic categories for interpreting the data. Theoretical Framework and Data Interpretation The study specifically applies the concept of "thing perception" (non-human) to evaluate how students interact

with the Google Forms interface. Unlike social perception, this involves assessing a tool's functionality—such as audio clarity and navigation—without the element of emotional reciprocity.

By classifying student feedback into these two categories, the research can systematically measure: (1) Acceptance vs. Resistance referes to whether Google Forms acts as a supportive medium or a technical barrier. (2) functional Effectiveness: How well the digital interface handles high-concentration tasks like the Listening Interpretative Course, (3) pedagogical Impact: Whether the transition to digital evaluation at Universitas PGRI Jombang supports fair and effective assessment of complex listening skills.The effectiveness of this transition depends heavily on how students perceive the tool's ability to deliver high-concentration tasks, such as clear audio playback and interface navigation. Without analyzing these perceptions, educators cannot determine if Google Forms functions as a supportive assessment medium or if the digital interface itself creates technical barriers that hinder the measurement of complex listening skills.

The transition to online learning during the pandemic forced a rapid shift toward digital evaluation tools, such as Google Forms, within the English Department of Universitas PGRI Jombang. While these tools allowed for the continuation of the Listening Interpretative Course, it remains unclear how this technology-mediated assessment affects the student experience. Specifically, listening courses require high levels of concentration and clear audio delivery, which may be influenced by the digital interface. Without understanding student perceptions, educators cannot determine if Google Forms serves as an effective, fair, and supportive tool for assessing complex listening skills or if it creates additional barriers to learning.

In conclusion, While previous studies have extensively documented the general benefits of digital tools in EFL classrooms and the broad transition to online learning during the pandemic, research has largely focused on general engagement or reading and writing assessments. However, there remains a critical gap in understanding how students perceive Google Forms when applied to the highly technical and cognitively demanding constraints of listening-specific assessments, which require seamless audio integration and intense concentration. Current literature often overlooks how the digital interface of a survey tool specifically impacts the delivery and evaluation of auditory tasks in specialized courses like the Listening Interpretative Course at Universitas PGRI Jombang. Consequently, this study addresses this void by evaluating student perceptions of Google Forms not merely as a general survey tool, but as a specialized assessment

medium, providing necessary insights into its effectiveness in measuring complex listening competencies.

Research Methods

This study employs a qualitative descriptive methodology, a choice driven by the need to obtain a thorough and nuanced understanding of a specific phenomenon—the impact of Google Forms as an evaluation tool—rather than generalizing findings to broader contexts. Following Moleong's (2012) definition, this approach focuses on generating descriptive data from observable behavior and human speech, allowing the researcher to explore the viewpoints and experiences of those involved in depth. Furthermore, a qualitative descriptive design in this study as it seeks to provide a nuanced and comprehensive summary of students' subjective experiences. This approach is particularly suitable for the listening assessment context, as it allows the researcher to capture the specific technical and psychological challenges—such as audio synchronization and interface navigation—that numerical data alone cannot fully articulate. By prioritizing the participants' 'voice,' this design ensures that the interpretation of positive and negative perceptions remains grounded in the actual instructional reality of the Listening Interpretative Course. By utilizing instruments such as questionnaires and interviews, the research aims to transform field data into a comprehensive narrative that clarifies whether the use of this technology results in positive or negative outcomes, ensuring all findings are grounded in reliable, empirical evidence.

Design

This study utilizes a Non-Experimental, Qualitative Descriptive design. Following the framework of Sandelowski (2000) and Moleong (2012), this design allows for an in-depth exploration of students' internal perceptions—categorized as positive or negative—regarding Google Forms. It prioritizes the 'naturalistic' setting of the classroom over the controlled environment of an experiment.

Participants

The subjects of this study, referred to as informants, are the primary providers of research data (Shahrum et al., 2012). The participants consist of 23 students enrolled in the Listening Interpretative Course during the fourth semester of the 2023/2024 academic year at the English Department of Universitas PGRI Jombang.

The inclusion criteria for selecting these participants are as follows:

P-ISSN 2356-5446

Universitas
PGRI
Jombang

JOURNALS

123

1. They are actively registered students who have completed all modules of the Listening Interpretative Course.
2. They have consistently used Google Forms as the primary medium for their midterm and final listening assessments.
3. They possess firsthand experience with the technical integration of audio playback within the Google Forms interface.

By focusing on this specific cohort, the study ensures that the data gathered reflects a specialized understanding of how digital tools function within a high-concentration listening environment, rather than a general perception of online learning.

Instrument

This study utilizes two primary research instruments: close-ended questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. This study utilizes two primary research instruments: close-ended questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The questionnaire items were adapted from the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) developed by Davis (1989), with modifications specifically tailored to address the technical demands of listening tasks, such as audio clarity and interface navigation. These items are strictly aligned with the perception theory of Irwanto (2002) and Rahmat (2005), ensuring that each question maps directly onto the indicators of positive and negative perception.

The instrument is structured into two thematic clusters to guide data interpretation:

1. Positive Indicators: Items measuring "Perceived Ease of Use" and "Perceived Usefulness," which reflect an alignment with the student's needs and lead to supportive actions (Irwanto, 2002).
2. Negative Indicators: Items identifying "Technical Friction" or "Cognitive Resistance," which capture experiences that contradict student expectations and trigger rejection (Rahmat, 2005).

By using a Likert-scale format, this instrument allows the researcher to quantify the degree to which Google Forms is perceived as a facilitative tool versus a barrier in the Listening Interpretative Course. This qualitative instrument allows the researcher to explore the "why" behind student reactions, such as specific feelings of anxiety or ease during the Listening Interpretative Course. According to Moleong (2012), the use of human-to-human interaction in interviews ensures that the data is descriptive and grounded in the participants' actual environment. These two instruments work in tandem to triangulate findings, ensuring that the final analysis of Google Forms as an assessment tool is both broad in scope and rich in detail.

The instruments are mapped directly to your research goals to ensure "Positive" and "Negative" perceptions are measured accurately.

Table 1. The Instrument Alignment

Instrument	Purpose	Perception Type Measured
Questionnaire	Identification of general trends and reactions.	Positive & Negative (General)
Interview	In-depth exploration of feelings and experiences.	Person Perception (Detailed)

Data Collection

The data collection process for this study follows a sequential qualitative approach, beginning with the distribution of questionnaires, followed by in-depth interviews. The questionnaire serves as the initial screening tool to categorize student responses into positive or negative perceptions based on their experience with Google Forms in Listening Interpretative Courses. This method allows the researcher to gather a broad set of data from the entire class, providing a foundation for identifying general trends and specific themes related to technology-based evaluation. By using these structured items, the researcher can efficiently map out which aspects of Google Forms—such as its interface or its feedback speed—are most significant to the students.

The process was divided into two sequential phases to ensure a comprehensive understanding of student perceptions:

1. Phase I: Quantitative Survey (Week 1–2): The closed-ended questionnaires were distributed digitally to all 23 participants following their final assessment in the Listening Interpretative Course. Students were given one week to complete the survey to ensure thoughtful responses.
2. Phase II: Qualitative Interviews (Week 3–4): Following the preliminary analysis of the survey results, semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected informants to delve deeper into their experiences. Each interview session lasted approximately 30 to 45 minutes, providing sufficient time for participants to articulate technical challenges and emotional responses regarding the use of Google Forms.

To gain a more profound "person perception" as described by Irwanto (2002), the researcher will then employ semi-structured interviews with selected participants. This technique is essential for capturing the "oral and human speech" that Moleong (2012) identifies as the core of qualitative descriptive data. During these sessions, the researcher uses an interview

guide but remains flexible, allowing students to express their emotions and specific challenges encountered during online listening assessments. This face-to-face (or virtual) interaction ensures that the data is not just a surface-level report, but a rich description of the students' lived experiences, providing the "reliable supporting information" necessary to validate the study's findings.

Data Analysis

To provide a rigorous Data Analysis section for your qualitative descriptive study, you should follow the Interactive Model by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014). This model ensures that your analysis is systematic and directly linked to your research questions about student perceptions.

The data analysis in this study is conducted through an interactive process consisting of three simultaneous flows of activity: Data Condensation, Data Display, and Conclusion Drawing/Verification. Initially, the researcher performs data condensation by selecting and transforming the raw data from questionnaire results and interview transcripts into manageable summaries. During this phase, irrelevant information is discarded, while data reflecting "Positive" and "Negative" perceptions—such as emotional acceptance, ease of use, or technical rejection—are highlighted and coded. This step ensures that the vast amount of qualitative information is focused specifically on the students' experiences with Google Forms in the Listening Interpretative Course.

Subsequently, the researcher engages in data display and conclusion drawing. The condensed data is organized into structured formats, such as thematic matrices or descriptive narratives, to make patterns and relationships clearly visible. This allows the researcher to compare the "person perception" of various students and identify why certain features of Google Forms trigger specific reactions. Finally, the researcher draws conclusions by identifying recurring themes and verifying them against the original field notes and theoretical frameworks (Irwanto, 2002; Rahmat, 2005). These conclusions are continuously refined to ensure that the final results accurately represent the impact of Google Forms as an assessment tool, providing a credible answer to the research problem.

Table 2. Operational Steps of Study

Step	Action	Output
1. Transcribing	Converting interview recordings into text.	Raw Transcripts
2. Coding	Labeling segments as "Positive Perception" or "Negative Perception."	Coded Data
3. Categorizing	Grouping codes into themes (e.g., Technical Ease, Audio	Thematic Tables

	Clarity, Anxiety).	
4. Interpreting	Explaining the "why" behind student perceptions.	Final Narrative

Results and Discussion

Results

According to the questionnaire's percentage from the calculation results, students' opinions on Google Forms as an evaluation tool in listening comprehension classes were analyzed. The researcher used WhatsApp to distribute the Google Form link with the 31 participants.

In alignment with the qualitative descriptive design of this study, the questionnaire results are categorized into four thematic dimensions. These clusters move beyond mere numerical reporting to provide an interpretive map of the students' lived experiences in the Listening Interpretative course.

Ease of Use and Accessibility

The dimension of Ease of Use and Accessibility items presented in the questionnaire reflects acceptance and resistance, which refers to whether Google Forms acts as a supportive medium or a technical barrier. The data analysis reveals the technical interaction between the students and the Google Forms interface, as in Table 3.

Table 3. Dimension of Ease of Use and Accessibility

No.	Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD
6	Does using Google Forms make learning easier?	3.2%	22.6%	45.2%	29%	0%
7	Does it have more advantages compared to other apps?	16.1%	32.3%	45.2%	6.5%	0%

The data reveal a significant ambivalence regarding technical facilitation. While nearly half of the respondents (48.4%) recognize the comparative advantages of Google Forms over other applications (Item 7), nearly one-third (29%) explicitly state that the tool does not make the learning process easier. This suggests that while Google Forms is perceived as administratively functional, it does not necessarily reduce the cognitive or technical load associated with specialized listening tasks.

Functional Effectiveness

Aiming at answering the second objective, i.e., how well the digital interface handles high-concentration tasks of the Listening Interpretative Course, dimension 2 of the TAM framework was used to reveal the functional effectiveness through the learning engagement and enjoyment.

P-ISSN 2356-5446

Universitas
PGRI
Jombang
JOURNALS

127

This dimension explores the affective and motivational responses of students toward digital-mediated learning.

Table 4. Dimension of Functional Effectiveness

No.	Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD
3	Do you always submit your assignments?	19.4%	41.9%	32.2%	6.5%	0%
5	Do you enjoy the learning process using Google Forms?	3.2%	16.1%	64.5%	9.7%	6.5%

There is a clear disconnect between academic compliance and emotional engagement. While the majority of students (61.3%) demonstrate high discipline in submitting assignments (Item 3), their enjoyment of the process is notably low, with 64.5% remaining neutral. This indicates that the use of Google Forms is driven more by instructional obligation than by intrinsic motivation or genuine engagement with the digital medium.

Pedagogical Impact

Whether the transition to digital evaluation at Universitas PGRI Jombang supports fair and effective assessment of complex listening skills dimension 3, Perceived Effectiveness and Understanding, was used to reveal The tool's ability to aid in the mastery of listening competencies.

Table 5. Dimension of Pedagogical Impact

No.	Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD
1	Was material delivered comprehensively/clearly?	3.2%	19.4%	64.5%	9.7%	3.2%
4	Have your skills or grades improved?	3.2%	6.5%	54.8%	32.3%	3.2%
9	Is Google Forms an effective way to conduct the course?	3.2%	22.6%	51.6%	19.4%	3.2%
10	Is it easier to understand materials/lessons?	0%	12.9%	51.6%	35.5%	0%

From a pedagogical standpoint, the perceived effectiveness of Google Forms is relatively low. A substantial 35.5% of respondents feel that the platform does not make the material easier to understand (Item 10), and 32.3% do not perceive any improvement in their skills or grades (Item 4). The heavy concentration of "Neutral" responses across this dimension suggests that students view Google Forms as a passive delivery medium that lacks the interactive depth required to optimize complex listening comprehension.

Anxiety and Focus

Furthermore, the TAM framework of the fourth dimension 4, i.e., Anxiety and Focus, was utilized to highlight the psychological and concentration-related challenges encountered during assessment.

Table 6. Anxiety and Focus

No.	Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD
2	Do you ask the lecturer when experiencing difficulty?	6.5%	22.6%	51.6%	19.4%	0%
8	Do you experience a lack of focus or boredom?	19.4%	38.7%	35.5%	3.2%	3.2%

The most critical issue identified is the impact on student focus; 58.1% of students (combined Strongly Agree and Agree) admit to experiencing boredom or a loss of concentration (Item 8). In the context of Listening Interpretative, where sustained attention is a prerequisite for success, this finding is significant. Furthermore, limited two-way interaction—as seen in the low percentage of students seeking help (Item 2)—reinforces the perception that Google Forms creates an isolated learning environment that may hinder deep material processing.

Discussion

The results of this study confirm the theories of Irwanto (2002) and Rahmat (2005) regarding the formation of perception. The positive perceptions observed were largely driven by the "comprehensibility" and "emotional acceptance" of the Google Forms interface. When the tool functioned seamlessly, students viewed it as an extension of the learning process, leading to higher engagement. This reflects a successful "thing perception," where the non-human object (the software) facilitates a smooth educational experience.

The questionnaire trends indicate a moderate level of perceived usefulness, specifically regarding the accessibility of Google Forms. Most students acknowledged that the platform is superior to other manual methods for submitting assignments. However, the interview evidence suggests that this "usefulness" is strictly limited to logistics. Informants noted that while they appreciated the organized layout of the questions, the platform felt "static."

"I like that I can see the questions clearly, but Google Forms doesn't feel like a listening tool; it feels like a digital answer sheet," noted one informant. This confirms that the perceived usefulness is rooted in administrative convenience rather than pedagogical support. The tool facilitates the *delivery*

of the test but does not necessarily facilitate the *process* of listening. There is a stark contrast between the high submission rates and the low scores in actual learning effectiveness. The questionnaire trends for Dimension 3 showed that over 35% of students disagreed that the tool made materials easier to understand. The interview evidence highlighted a critical technical barrier: audio synchronization.

Because Google Forms often requires students to toggle between external audio links and the form itself, the "actual effectiveness" of the learning process is compromised. Informants reported that this "media switching" caused them to lose track of the audio content, leading to lower comprehension. Therefore, while the tool is "effective" at collecting data, it is perceived as "ineffective" at enhancing or measuring true interpretative listening skills.

The questionnaire trends revealed a significant crisis of focus, with 58.1% of students reporting boredom or lack of concentration. The interview evidence clarified that this was not due to the difficulty of the English material itself, but rather the monotony of the interface.

The lack of immediate feedback—a hallmark of Google Forms—contributes to a sense of isolation. Unlike a classroom setting where a lecturer can gauge student confusion through body language, the digital interface acts as a silent barrier. Informants expressed that the absence of interactive elements made the Listening Interpretative course feel "robotic," which directly correlates with the high neutrality and dissatisfaction observed in the survey.

Table 7. Summary of Analysis

Feature	Perceived Usefulness	Actual Learning Effectiveness
Focus	Efficiency, accessibility, and submission.	Mastery, comprehension, and skill growth.
Survey Trend	High Neutral to Agree (Administrative).	High Neutral to Disagree (Pedagogical).
Interview Insight	"It's easy to click and submit."	"It's hard to focus and connect with audio."
Conclusion	High utility as a survey tool.	Limited utility as a listening tool.

However, the emergence of negative perceptions highlights the importance of the environment in the perception process. As noted in your literature review, perception involves the perceived human, the environment, and the observer. In this case, the "environment" (internet stability and audio clarity) heavily influenced the "observer" (the student). When the environment was unstable, the student's perception of Google Forms shifted from a helpful tool to an obstacle, triggering a negative emotional reaction.

A critical takeaway from the results is that perception is not formed in a vacuum. Irwanto (2002) notes that the process involves the perceived human, the observer, and the environment. The "negative perceptions" recorded were rarely about the Google Form itself but rather about the unstable digital environment (internet lag and audio buffering). When the environment fails, the student's "positive" trajectory is interrupted. This creates a psychological shift: the student stops seeing Google Forms as an "assessment tool" and begins to see it as a "barrier to success." This confirms that for technology-based learning to stay positive, the environment must be as stable as the tool itself.

Furthermore, the "person perception" aspect was evident in how students missed the interaction with instructors during the assessment. While Google Forms is an efficient "thing," it lacks the shared feelings and immediate support a human instructor provides during a difficult listening task. This confirms that while technology-based learning is effective for evaluation, the human element remains a critical component in mitigating anxiety and fostering a supportive learning atmosphere in specialized courses like Listening Interpretative.

One of the most significant findings was the tendency for students to react favorably to the instant feedback mechanisms of digital forms. Rahmat (2005) suggests that humans tend to enjoy things that are comprehensible and provide a sense of completion. The "affirmation" (Irwanto, 2002) provided by the "Submission Successful" screen provides a sense of relief that traditional paper tests—which might take days to grade—cannot offer. This immediate validation reinforces a positive perception, making students more willing to engage with technology-based learning in the future.

Listening is a "linear" skill; once the audio plays, it is gone. Students reported that using Google Forms changed how they "interacted" with the audio. In a "person perception" scenario, a teacher might see a student's confused face and replay a clip. Google Forms, as a "non-social" object, lacks this empathy. Consequently, while the tool is efficient for grading, it may be perceived negatively for learning if it does not allow for the flexibility that a human-centered listening environment provides. This suggests that the impact of Google Forms is highly dependent on how the teacher designs the form (e.g., allowing multiple plays vs. a single play).

Conclusion

This research concludes that the students of the Listening Interpretative Course at Universitas PGRI Jombang generally hold a positive perception of Google Forms as an assessment tool. The platform's ease of use,

accessibility via mobile devices, and the clarity of its interface align with the criteria for "emotional acceptance" and "comprehensibility" established by Rahmat (2005). To improve actual learning effectiveness, lecturers must transition from using Google Forms as a mere "digital answer sheet" to a more intentional "instructional interface." This involves adopting specific design strategies aimed at optimizing the student experience in listening tasks. First, lecturers should manage the cognitive load by utilizing the "Section" feature to break assessments into manageable chunks; focusing each section on a single audio clip prevents students from becoming overwhelmed by the scroll-depth of the page. Furthermore, to eliminate the distraction of "media switching," audio should be hosted on platforms that allow for direct embedding or provided via clear hyperlinks with specific timestamps for each question. Finally, utilizing "Response Validation" ensures that students provide answers in the correct format, which significantly reduces anxiety related to technical errors during high-concentration tasks.

Despite the administrative efficiency provided by Google Forms, this study highlights that technology cannot replace the essential social-emotional presence of a lecturer, particularly in specialized "Interpretation" courses. Human intervention remains vital for clarifying ambiguity, as listening tasks often involve nuances or cultural idioms that an automated form cannot explain, requiring the lecturer to provide "just-in-time" scaffolding. Moreover, real-time human support is critical for technical troubleshooting when audio links fail or internet latency occurs, as these frictions directly contribute to the student anxiety and loss of focus identified in this research. Ultimately, while Google Forms can automate scoring, the lecturer is indispensable for providing constructive feedback—interpreting *why* a student misinterpreted a specific audio cue and turning a simple assessment into a meaningful learning opportunity.

While this study provides valuable insights, it is limited by its small sample size of 23 participants and its focus on a single institution, which may not reflect the diverse experiences of EFL students in different contexts. Furthermore, as a qualitative descriptive study, the findings primarily capture subjective perceptions rather than providing an objective measurement of linguistic proficiency gains. Consequently, future research should employ a mixed-methods approach to correlate student perceptions with actual test scores to provide a more empirical view of learning effectiveness. Additionally, comparative analyses between Google Forms and specialized Language Learning Management Systems (LLMS) are recommended to determine if different digital architectures can more

effectively reduce student boredom and enhance concentration during auditory tasks.

References

Adelia, A., Miftahurrahmah, M., Nurpathonah, N., Zaindanu, Y., & Ihsan, M. T. (2021). The role of google form as an assessment tool in ELT: Critical review of the literature. *ETDC: Journal of Research and Educational Review*, 1(1), 58-66.

Ally, M. (2008). *Foundations of educational theory for online learning*. Athabasca University.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Damayanti, A., & Dodi, M. (2020). *The impact of Microsoft teams in participating online English learning of specialization at SMAN 2 Semarang*. Prosiding Seminar Nasional Unimus, Vol.3.

Damola, O., & Oluwakemi, O. (2021). Teacher's perception of the use Microsoft teams for remote learning in Southwestern Nigerian schools*. Afican Joural of Teacher Education,* 10(1), 265-281.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Irwanto. (2002). *Psikologi umum*. PT Prehallindo.

Irwanto. (2002). *Psikologi Umum: Buku Panduan Mahasiswa*. Jakarta: PT Prehallindo.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Moleong, L. J. (2012). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Qiong, O. (2017). A brief introduction to perception. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 15(4).

Rahmat, J. (2005). *Psikologi komunikasi.* Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Rahmat, J. (2005). *Psikologi komunikasi*. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Robbins, S. P. (2007). *Perilaku organisasi*. Jakarta: Salemba Empaat. Rusman. (2012). Model-Model Pembelajaran. Raja Grafindo.

Sandelowski, M. (2000). *Whatever happened to qualitative description? Research in Nursing & Health*, 23(4), 334–340. https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X(200008)23:4<334::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-G

Shahrum, A. S., & Taridi, M. (2012). *Metodologi penelitian kuantitatif dan kualitatif dalam pendidikan*. PT. Gading Inti Prima.

Suwarto, & Fajri, Z. (2018). *Psikologi pendidikan*. Rajawali Pers.