

EFL Students' Perception on Blended Learning amidst Covid-19 Pandemic

Novyansyah Ilyas Izzulhaq^{1*)}; Noeris Meiristiani²⁾

^{1, 2} Universitas Pancasakti Tegal

*)Corresponding author: ilyasizulhaq@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

During the Covid-19 pandemic, blended learning became an alternative way to conduct teaching. To evaluate the implementation of blended learning, this research aimed to collect students' perception and to know the implementation and the extent of blended learning. It used descriptive analysis design and qualitative approach. The research took place at SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal with an English teacher and 40 students from third grade as the participants. The teacher was interviewed to collect data on the implementation and the extent of blended learning and the students were questionnaires to share their perception on the blended learning. The results showed that SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal implemented anchor-blend type of blended learning since early 2021. Based on the students' perception, the implementation of the blended learning is not effective during online session. Students gave positive tendency on learning flexibility, offline session, students' interaction and students' motivation. However, students gave negative tendency on online session and learning management.

Keywords: *Blended learning, students' perception, education amidst pandemic*

INTRODUCTION

The education in 2020 faced a serious problem caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. It has affected all elements in every activities especially in the education sector. This situation made the government instruct every college and school to limit their teaching and learning activities to stop the virus transmission. The application of technology becomes an alternative to conduct teaching and learning online in this pandemic era. There have been a lot of online based learning application to support the online learning such as social media, video and audio conferencing app, blogs, podcast, and online videos. According to Uğur & Koç (2019), these application of technologies can support the online teaching and learning in this century.

However, the face-to-face learning was still conducted in limited schedule. One of the alternatives to this situation is blended learning. Blended learning is a combination of face-to-face learning and computer-mediated learning (Sukardjo et al., 2020). The proportion of content delivered online is 30% to 79% while the rest is face-to-face learning (Allen, 2007). The activities in face-to-face learning in blended learning is seen as structure for student learning. Having face-to-face in blended learning helps students to keep on track and managing their time

management (Adam & Nel, 2009; Hall & Villareal, 2015). Meanwhile, the online learning in blended learning is technology and Internet facilitated learning where teacher sends materials and tasks to students in online form.

Blended learning tends to be similar to self-study learning since the content delivered is dominated by online. By this statement, self-study management is needed where students have to plan, manage and share their responsibilities with their teacher (Tsai, 2010). Blended learning gives students the autonomy to be responsible for their learning, which need self-discipline and self-motivation (Smyth et al., 2012). In blended learning, students are the most important role to reflect their readiness in blended learning (Park & Choi, 2009, as cited in Firdaus et al., 2020). Students have to make a structured and organized study since the learning model demand to make students independent learning (Tsai, 2010).

SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal is one of vocational schools that applied blended learning during the Covid-19 pandemic. By this situation, self-directed learning is required in the practice of blended learning, because during the online session, students must be responsible for their study to keep maintain their performance during the face-to-face session.

The problem is students might not have a structured study schedule and not responsible for their study and school might not implement the blended learning in an effective way especially during the online session that has highest proportion. Therefore, this research aims to know the implementation and the extent of blended learning implemented at SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal and students' perception on blended learning. This research can also become a reflection of the school and students readiness in blended learning.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Blended learning

Blended learning is a learning model that combines many different media training: technologies, activities, and types of events to make a program to specific students (Bershin, 2004, as cited in Sukardjo et al., 2020). It uses various forms of e-learning combined with face-to-face learning and combines programs in different format to achieve goals (Driscoll & Carliner, 2005, as cited in Sukardjo et al., 2020). Blended learning has similarity with online learning; online learning has at least 80 percents of the course content delivered online, whereas blended learning has 30-79 percent of the course delivered online (Allen, 2007, as cited in Sukardjo et al., 2020).

To achieve an effective engagement, there are some criteria as a consideration such as course design, social presence, tailored assignments, learner expectations, in addition to a

continued interaction between course materials, learners and the instructor for a successful blended delivery of instruction to occur (Hege, 2011).

There are 4 types of classification of learning based on the proportion of content delivered online (Allen, 2007, as cited in Sukardjo et al., 2020). This table describes the prototypical classifications.

Table 1. Illustration Course Table of the Prototypical Classifications

| Proportion of Content Delivered Online | Type of Course | Description |
|---|-----------------------|---|
| 0% | Traditional | Fully face-to-face learning. |
| 1 to 29% | Web Facilitated | A face to face learning that facilitated by technology, using web based platform to post syllabus or assignment. |
| 30 to 79% | Blended / Hybrid | Substantial proportion of the content delivered online, typically has online discussions and face-to-face meetings. |
| 80 to 100% | Online | Most of the content delivered online, typically has no face-to-face meetings. |

Based on the table above, it can be concluded that blended learning is a combination of online learning and face-to-face learning that has 30 to 79% of the content delivered online.

According to Rossett & Frazee (2006), there are 3 types of blended learning: (1) anchor blend—this model starts with specific events and real classes, followed by an experience that covers the interaction with online resources, structured learning activities in the workplace, reference and online learning, recognition and assessment; (2) booked blend—a model characterized by a three-part experience: an introduction, a learning experience that contains more real and important material than intrusions online or face-to-face, and then something that expands and makes the learning into work practices; and (3) field blend—most models are different from the usual training. This model is employee-centred, with each individual being surrounded by various types of assets and sustainable choices about when and where and whether to grab assets and that selection. In implementing blended learning, a school may choose one of these types that suit their needs.

In fact, there are many positive effects of blended learning that have already been proven by some research. Utami (2018) revealed that students with blended learning achieve 10% more learning achievement outcome than regular learning. Isti'anah (2017) found that blended learning was effective to assist the students to learn English grammar. Based on the students' experience, Yapici & Akbayin's (2012) study showed that students gave positive reaction on blended learning. Students revealed that the blended learning model provided students with various opportunities such as getting prepared for the lessons, reviewing the lessons as many

times as wanted, reaching the subject-related materials without being dependent on time and place, testing oneself and communicating with the teacher and other students out of the school.

Self-directed Learning

Blended learning tends to be similar to self-study learning since the content delivered is dominated by online. Self-study management is needed where students have to plan, manage and share their responsibilities with their teacher (Tsai, 2010). Self-directed learning focuses on students' ability to assess their own goals and find out what they want to know (Blumberg, 2000 in Deur & Murray-Harvey, 2005).

There are characteristics of self-directed learning. The characteristics can be seen as these points; 1) the independence of learners, 2) the autonomy of the management of learners' independency, 3) having relevance to a task, 4) portfolio, 5) computer-based learning, 6) learner-based problem solving, 7) independent study, 8) independent evaluation, and 9) the material to be studied (Brown, 2004). These characteristics are needed to achieve the self-directed learning. When students meet the characteristics, they are able to do the self-directed learning.

Students' Motivation during Blended Learning

To achieve a good output from students, they have to have a good motivation in learning. In the practice of blended learning, self-directed learning is one of the essential things to do by student which require self-motivation of learning. As stated by Park & Choi (2009) cited in Firdaus et al. (2020), students are the most important role to reflect their readiness in blended learning.

In blended learning, the students' motivation may be various because there are 2 sessions; online and offline learning. This statement is based on theory by Hamalik (2004) who stated that there are several factors that encourage students' motivation as follows: 1) meaning, 2) modelling, 3) open communication, 4) prerequisite, 5) novelty, 6) practice, 7) divided exercise, 8) systematically reduce learning compulsion and 9) favourable condition. In short, the way of content delivered affects the students' motivation.

Students-teacher Interaction in Blended Learning

The interaction in blended learning will be challenging for teacher. The key tools of human interaction are in body language, eye-contact, etc. are present in face-to-face learning. However, there are also online sessions in blended learning, which make the interaction become limited. Teacher will try harder to provide good interaction with their students. For example, Macdonald (2008) states that in a blended strategy, beside the formal interaction, teachers should use informal interaction as an opportunity to keep up with students' progress.

In order to make an interactive classroom, teacher will work hard to make the classroom active. The social interaction will be the key to make interactive classroom. King (2002) and Schank (2001) think that social interaction is important than technical factors, social interaction often determines the success of an online classroom. However, students' response to teachers' interaction may be not going as expected. If the student-teacher interaction is not going well, the class can be considered fail to achieve interactive classroom.

METHOD

This research uses descriptive analysis design and qualitative approach to analyze the data. The research aims to know the implementation and the extent of blended learning in SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal and students' perception on blended learning. The research took place at SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal, a vocational high school that implemented blended learning. The participants were an English teacher and 40 students from third grade. The researchers interviewed the teacher to collect data on the implementation and the extent of blended learning and the researcher gave questionnaire to students to share their perception on the blended learning. The questionnaire uses Likert scale (1-5/Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, and Strongly Agree). The results of interview recording were transcribed into written texts and questionnaire data were compiled into tables. The collected data were then analyzed and interpreted. The last step was drawing the conclusions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Blended Learning Implementation at SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal

The results of the interview were collected from an English teacher in SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal which was conducted in Bahasa Indonesia. The researchers recorded the audio of the interview and transcribed it into written texts and translated the texts into English. There were 5 questions related to the implementation of blended learning in SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal. The results of the interview can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Interview table of implementation of blended learning

| No | Questions | Answers |
|----|---|--|
| 1 | How is the implementation of the blended learning program at SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal? | This school applies two types of learning, namely online learning called PJJ (Distance Learning) and offline learning called PTM (Face-to-Face Learning). The regulations are adjusted to the Central Java provincial service regulations. |
| 2 | What type of blended learning is used at SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal? | Each class has its own group and schedule of PJJ and PTM, on the same day, some do PJJ and some do PTM. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 3 | What media are used in the blended learning program? | For online learning, assignments and materials are delivered through Google Classroom and offline learning using physical media such as projectors and whiteboards. |
| 4 | What is the percentage ratio between offline and online meetings? | Comparison of offline and online learning has a portion of 50-50, 50% offline learning and 50% online learning. |
| 5 | What are the obstacles experienced by SMK Muhammadiyah Kota Tegal in implementing the blended learning program? | For offline learning there is no problem, but the problem is in online learning. The problems that arise such as; students have not entered Google Classroom, there are students who do not have smartphones, students often delay assignments given by the teacher. |

The teacher explained about the implementation of blended learning in SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal. It was based on anchor blend. This model starts with specific events and real classes, followed by an experience that covers the interaction with online resources, structured learning activities in the workplace, reference and online learning, recognition and assessment (Rossett & Frazee, 2006). SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal has two types of learning schedule; online learning and offline learning. Uniquely, the EFL class has two schedules at the same time. Some students learn in face-to-face learning while some students learn in online learning. The percentage ratio of delivered material in online and offline learning was 50%-50%. The 30%-79% of the material delivered online is considered as blended learning according to the 4 types of learning classification (Allen, 2007, as cited in Sukardjo et al., 2020). The media used by the school was Google Classroom for online session and physical media such as projector and whiteboard were used for offline session. However, there was some issues faced by the school especially in online learning such as; students have not entered Google Classroom, there are students who do not have smartphones, and students often delay assignments given by the teacher.

The Extent of Blended Learning Implemented by SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal

There were 5 questions related to the extent of the blended learning implemented by SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal. The results of the interview can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Interview table of the extent of blended learning implementation

| No | Questions | Answers |
|----|---|--|
| 1 | Why is the blended learning program implemented? | The blended learning program was implemented due to the pandemic. |
| 2 | How long has the blended learning program been implemented? | Online learning has been carried out since the pandemic until the end of 2020. Then, the blended program has been implemented in early 2021 until now. |
| 3 | Are there any changes to the blended learning system during this program? | There is no change in the learning system during this program. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 4 | Is SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal quick to respond the obstacles experienced during the blended learning program? | We are very quick to respond to problems that arise. |
| 5 | How does SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal overcome with the problem? | We create a chat group for parents of the students to remind their child of their learning duties and responsibilities during the program. |

Based on table 3, blended learning was implemented due to Covid-19 pandemic which was in the early 2021. During the implementation, SMK Muhammadiyah had not changed its learning system. SMK Muhammadiyah was responsive to the problem arising during blended learning. For example, one of the solutions to the learning management was creating a chat group for parents of the students to remind their child of their learning duties and responsibilities during the program. This is an important thing to do because learning responsibility is part of building learning management. As stated by Tsai (2010), self-study management is needed where students have to plan, manage and share their responsibilities with their teacher. Overall, SMK Muhammadiyah is experienced enough to implement blended learning during the pandemic.

Students' Perception on Blended Learning

The third objective of this research is to know the students' perception on the blended learning. Students were given a questionnaire about their perception on blended learning on EFL classroom during Covid-19 pandemic. There are six categories on blended learning perception in the questionnaire; perception on learning flexibility, online session, offline session, learning management, students' interaction and students' motivation. The results can be seen on the table 4.

Table 4. Students' perception on learning flexibility

| No | Questionnaire statement | Scale (Frequency and Percentage) | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | This program allows me to learn English anywhere. | 1 (2.50%) | 5 (12.50%) | 8 (20.00%) | 25 (62.50%) | 1 (2.50%) |
| 2 | This program allows me to learn English anytime. | 1 (2.50%) | 8 (20.00%) | 6 (15.00%) | 24 (60.00%) | 1 (2.50%) |
| 3 | This program allows me to access all English materials given by teacher. | 2 (5.00%) | 7 (17.50%) | 13 (32.50%) | 17 (42.50%) | 1 (2.50%) |
| 4 | I'm free to do homework anytime. | 1 (2.50%) | 7 (17.50%) | 13 (32.50%) | 17 (42.50%) | 2 (5.00%) |
| 5 | I'm free to do homework anywhere. | 1 (2.50%) | 5 (12.50%) | 11 (27.50%) | 20 (50.00%) | 3 (7.50%) |

Table 5. Average answers of students' perception on learning flexibility

| | Scale | Percentage |
|---|-------------------|------------|
| 1 | Strongly disagree | 3.00% |
| 2 | Disagree | 16.00% |
| 3 | Neutral | 25.50% |
| 4 | Agree | 51.50% |
| 5 | Strongly agree | 4.00% |

The first perception is learning flexibility on blended learning. Based on table 4, 62.50% of the students agree that students can learn English anywhere, 60.00% of the students agree that students can learn English anytime, 42.50% of students agree that allows them to access all English materials given by teacher, 42.50% of students agree that they can be free to do homework anytime, and 50.00% of students agree that they can be free to do homework anywhere. The data average shows 51.50% students agree and 4.00% students strongly agree that blended learning offers flexibility. The learning flexibility is important because it supports independence learning which affects students' learning management. Brown (2004) stated that one of the requirements to do self-directed learning is the independence learning.

Table 6. Students' perception on online session

| No | Questionnaire statement | Scale (Frequency and Percentage) | | | | |
|----|---|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | Online session in English class is comfortable. | 4 (10.00%) | 16 (40.00%) | 11 (27.50%) | 8 (20.00%) | 1 (2.50%) |
| 2 | English teacher's explanation is clear during online session. | 4 (10.00%) | 18 (45.00%) | 7 (17.50%) | 10 (25.00%) | 1 (2.50%) |
| 3 | The online session in English class is interactive. | 3 (7.50%) | 17 (42.50%) | 12 (30.00%) | 7 (17.50%) | 1 (2.50%) |
| 4 | English teacher is creative during online session. | 4 (10.00%) | 12 (30.00%) | 11 (27.50%) | 12 (30.00%) | 1 (2.50%) |
| 5 | The online session in English class is fun. | 5 (12.50%) | 12 (30.00%) | 12 (30.00%) | 10 (25.00%) | 1 (2.50%) |

Table 7. Average answer of students' perception on online session

| | Scale | Percentage |
|---|-------------------|------------|
| 1 | Strongly disagree | 10.00% |
| 2 | Disagree | 37.50% |
| 3 | Neutral | 26.50% |
| 4 | Agree | 23.50% |
| 5 | Strongly agree | 2.50% |

The second perception is the online session in blended learning. Based on table 6, negative responses dominate their perception on online sessions with most students choose disagree with the statements. From data average on table 7, 10.00% and 37.50% students prefer categories strongly disagree and disagree on perceiving online session as having good atmosphere and situation. Only 23.50% and 2.50% students agree/strongly agree to have good

learning experience during the online session. It means that based on the students' perception the implementation of online session does not really support the students' learning.

Table 8. Students' perception on offline session

| No | Questionnaire statement | Scale (Frequency and Percentage) | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | The offline session in English class is comfortable. | 0 (0.00%) | 1 (2.50%) | 15 (37.50%) | 20 (50.00%) | 4 (10.00%) |
| 2 | English teacher explanation is clear during offline session. | 0 (0.00%) | 2 (5.00%) | 12 (30.00%) | 23 (57.50%) | 3 (7.50%) |
| 3 | The offline session in English class is interactive. | 0 (0.00%) | 4 (10.00%) | 13 (32.50%) | 19 (47.50%) | 4 (10.00%) |
| 4 | English teacher is creative during offline session. | 1 (2.50%) | 5 (12.50%) | 11 (27.50%) | 20 (50.00%) | 3 (7.50%) |
| 5 | The offline session in English class is fun. | 1 (2.50%) | 4 (10.00%) | 12 (30.00%) | 20 (50.00%) | 3 (7.50%) |

Table 9. Average answers of students' perception on offline session

| Scale | Percentage |
|---------------------|------------|
| 1 Strongly disagree | 1.00% |
| 2 Disagree | 8.00% |
| 3 Neutral | 31.50% |
| 4 Agree | 51.00% |
| 5 Strongly agree | 8.50% |

The third perception is the offline session in blended learning. Based on tables 8 and 9, in contrast to online session, the data average of students (51.00% agree and 8.50% strongly agree) mostly shows that they perceive offline learning as comfortable, interactive, fun, and the teacher gives clearer explanation and teaches more creatively. It can be concluded that more students perceive offline session as more favorable than online session.

Table 10. Students' perception on learning management

| No | Questionnaire statement | Scale (Frequency and Percentage) | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | I learn English outside the program. | 0 (0.00%) | 16 (40.00%) | 15 (37.50%) | 7 (17.50%) | 2 (5.00%) |
| 2 | I record my English skill development every time I learn new things. | 0 (0.00%) | 11 (27.50%) | 14 (35.00%) | 13 (32.50%) | 2 (5.00%) |
| 3 | I practice everything that I just learned in English class. | 0 (0.00%) | 10 (25.00%) | 16 (40.00%) | 11 (27.50%) | 3 (7.50%) |
| 4 | I have a schedule to learn English outside the program. | 1 (2.50%) | 19 (47.50%) | 12 (30.00%) | 5 (12.50%) | 3 (7.50%) |
| 5 | I study one day before the English class begins. | 0 (0.00%) | 11 (27.50%) | 19 (47.50%) | 7 (17.50%) | 3 (7.50%) |

Table 11. Average answers of students' perception on learning management

| | Scale | Percentage |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Strongly disagree | 0.50% |
| 2 | Disagree | 33.50% |
| 3 | Neutral | 38.00% |
| 4 | Agree | 21.50% |
| 5 | Strongly agree | 6.50% |

The fourth perception is the students' perception on learning management in blended learning. Table 10 shows that 40.00% of students disagree that they learn English outside the program, 35.00% neutral on recording their English skill development every time they learn new things, 40.00% neutral on practice everything that they just learned in English class, 47.50% disagree on having a schedule to learn English outside the program, 47.50% neutral on study one day before the English class begins. The average result of the data obtained on table 11 showed the highest frequency with a percentage of 38.00% neutral with the questionnaire and 33.50% disagree and 0.50% disagree. These indicate that most students do not have good learning management in blended learning and do not have good desire on learning. This problem might be caused by students' motivation.

Table 12. Students' perception on students' interactions

| No | Questionnaire statement | Scale (Frequency and Percentage) | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | I always ask questions if there's something that I don't know in English class. | 1 (2.50%) | 4 (10.00%) | 16 (40.00%) | 18 (45.00%) | 1 (2.50%) |
| 2 | I feel easy to interact with teacher during online session in English class. | 2 (5.00%) | 15 (37.50%) | 11 (27.50%) | 11 (27.50%) | 1 (2.50%) |
| 3 | I feel easy to interact to other friends during online discussion in English class. | 3 (7.50%) | 11 (27.50%) | 14 (35.00%) | 10 (25.00%) | 2 (5.00%) |
| 4 | I feel easy to interact with teacher during the offline session in English class. | 1 (2.50%) | 7 (17.50%) | 12 (30.00%) | 16 (40.00%) | 4 (10.00%) |
| 5 | I feel easy to interact to other friends during offline discussion in English class. | 2 (5.00%) | 6 (15.00%) | 15 (37.50%) | 13 (32.50%) | 4 (10.00%) |

Table 13. Average answers of students' perception on students' interaction

| | Scale | Percentage |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Strongly disagree | 4.50% |
| 2 | Disagree | 21.50% |
| 3 | Neutral | 34.00% |
| 4 | Agree | 34.00% |
| 5 | Strongly agree | 6.00% |

The fifth perception is the students' perception on students' interaction in blended learning. As seen in table 12, students mostly ask questions during blended learning (45.00% agree and 2.50% strongly agree) but the interactions with the teacher and their peers are easier during offline sessions (40.00% and 32.50% agree, 10.00% and 10.00% strongly agree). The data average shows 34.00% agree and 6.00% strongly agree that students feel easier in offline interaction.

Table 14. Students' perception on student' motivation

| No | Questionnaire statement | Scale (Frequency and Percentage) | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | I feel motivated to learn English in online session. | 1 (2.50%) | 15 (37.50%) | 13 (32.50%) | 10 (25.00%) | 1 (2.50%) |
| 2 | I feel motivated to learn English in offline session. | 0 (0.00%) | 6 (15.00%) | 13 (32.50%) | 16 (40.00%) | 5 (12.50%) |
| 3 | I feel motivated to learn English outside the program. | 0 (0.00%) | 15 (37.50%) | 15 (37.50%) | 9 (22.50%) | 1 (2.50%) |
| 4 | I need motivation to be active during the English class. | 0 (0.00%) | 6 (15.00%) | 13 (32.50%) | 19 (47.50%) | 2 (5.00%) |
| 5 | I need motivation to achieve good English score. | 1 (2.50%) | 5 (12.50%) | 11 (27.50%) | 22 (55.00%) | 1 (2.50%) |

Table 15. Average answers on students' perception on students' motivation

| Scale | Percentage |
|---------------------|------------|
| 1 Strongly disagree | 1.00% |
| 2 Disagree | 23.50% |
| 3 Neutral | 32.50% |
| 4 Agree | 38.00% |
| 5 Strongly agree | 5.00% |

The sixth perception is the students' perception on students' motivation in blended learning. Based on table 14, 37.50% of students disagree that they feel motivated to learn English in online session, 40.00% of the students agree that they feel motivated to learn English in offline session, 37.50% of students disagree and another 37.50% of students neutral on feeling motivated to learn English outside the program, 47.50% of students agree that they need motivation to be active during the English class, 55.00% of students agree that they need motivation to achieve good English score. The result of the average data obtained on table 15 showed the highest frequency with a percentage of 38.00% agree with the questionnaire. They mostly agree that they need motivation. As said by Hamalik (2004) that factors like meaning, open communication, and favorable condition can encourage students' motivation.

CONCLUSION

This study is aimed to know how the blended learning is conducted by SMK

Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal, to know the extent of the blended learning implemented by SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal and to know the students' perception on the blended learning. SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal used anchor-blend type of blended learning. This type combined face-to-face learning with online learning, online material and online assignment. The percentage of the content delivered online is 50% and the rest is delivered in face-to-face learning. SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal conducted blended learning since early 2021 due to Covid-19 pandemic. In the process, SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal faced some problems. However, the school was responsive to the problems during the implementation of blended learning.

In this study, 40 students participated to share their perception on blended learning in SMK Muhammadiyah 1 Kota Tegal by answering questionnaire. Students gave positive tendency on learning flexibility, offline session, students' interaction and students' motivation. However, students gave negative tendency on online session and learning management.

While this study focuses on the students' perceptions on blended learning, further study to investigate the correlation between blended learning model and students' motivation is worth conducted.

REFERENCES

- Adam, S., & Nel, D. (2009). Blended and online learning: student perceptions and performance. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 6(3), 140–155. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17415650911005366>
- Allen, I. E. (2007). *Blending In: The Extent and Promise of Blended Education in the United States*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234579919>
- Blumberg, P. (2000). *Evaluating the evidence that problem-based learners are self-directed learners: A review of the literature*. In D. H. Evensen & C. E. Hmelo (Eds.), *Problem-based learning: A research perspective on learning interactions* (pp. 199–226). Lawrence Erlbaum Asso.
- Brown, G. (2004). *How Students Learn A supplement to the RoutledgeFalmer Key Guides for Effective Teaching in Higher Education series*.
- Deur, P. Van, & Murray-Harvey, R. (2005). The inquiry nature of primary schools and students' self-directed learning knowledge. *International Education Journal, ERC2004 Special Issue*, 5(5), 166–177. <http://iej.cjb.net>
- Firdaus, F., Muntaqo, R., & Trisnowati, E. (2020). Analysis of Student Readiness for Blended Learning Model Implementation in Industrial Era 4.0. *Indonesian Journal of Science and Education*, 4(1), 48. <https://doi.org/10.31002/ijose.v4i1.2309>

- Novyansyah Ilyas Izzulhaq, Noeris Meiristiani: *The Students' Perception on Blended*
- Hall, S., & Villareal, D. (2015). The Hybrid Advantage: Graduate Student Perspectives of Hybrid Education Courses. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 27(1), 69–80. <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/>
- Hamalik, O. (2004). *Psikologi belajar dan mengajar*. Sinar Baru Algensindo.
- Hege, B. A. R. (2011). *The Online Theology Classroom: Strategies for Engaging a Community of Distance Learners in a Hybrid Model of Online Education*.
- Isti'anah, A. (2017). The Effect of Blended Learning to the Students' Achievement in Grammar Class. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 4(1), 16–30. <https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v4i1.5697>
- King, F. B. (2002). *A virtual student Not an ordinary Joe*.
- Macdonald, J. (2008). *Blended learning and online tutoring: Planning learner support and activity design*. Gower Publishing.
- Rossett, A., & Frazee, R. (2006). *Blended Learning Opportunities Flexible Learning Environments eXchange View project*. www.amanet.org
- Schank, R. C. (2001). *Educational Technology: The Promise and The Myth*.
- Smyth, S., Houghton, C., Cooney, A., & Casey, D. (2012). Students' experiences of blended learning across a range of postgraduate programmes. *Nurse Education Today*, 32(4), 464–468. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2011.05.014>
- Sukardjo, M., Ibrahim, N., Ningsih, H. P., & Nugroho, A. W. (2020). Implementation-blended learning in Indonesian Open Junior High Schools. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 10(12), 638–654.
- Tsai, C. W. (2010). Designing appropriate blended courses: A students' perspective. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 13(5). <https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2009.0335>
- Uğur, N. G., & Koç, T. (2019). Leading and Teaching with Technology: School Principals' Perspective. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 7(1), 42. <https://doi.org/10.17583/ijelm.2019.3758>
- Utami, I. S. (2018). The effect of blended learning model on senior high school students' achievement. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 42, 00027. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20184200027>
- Yapici, I. U., & Akbayin, H. (2012). High school students' views on blended learning. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 13(4), 125–139. <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.74332>