FCIC INSIGHTS
An Interdisciplinary Journal

P-ISSN: 1656-6483
E-ISSN: 1984-9977

ORIGINAL ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS Volume 03 | Issue 02 | Article 02 | 2025

USE OF GOOGLE CLASSROOM FOR INSTRUCTION IN THE FCIC COLLEGE DEPARTMENT

John Melchor Q. Libres[1], Ma. Victoria A. Gonzaga[2]

[1] choyingenuity@gmail.com, Faculty, Graduate School, Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception Inc., Baybay City, Leyte, Philippines
[2] mariavictoria.gonzaga@fcic.edu.ph, Dean, Graduate School, Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception Inc., Baybay City, Leyte, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the satisfaction levels of faculty and students in the FCIC College Department regarding their use of Google Classroom, focusing on its perceived usefulness and ease of use. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed, utilizing frequency counts, percentage distributions, and statistical analyses, including the Fisher-Freeman-Halton test for faculty and Spearman correlation for students, to evaluate the relationship between socio-demographic factors and satisfaction levels. The findings revealed that faculty and students were very satisfied with Google Classroom. Faculty members reported that the platform's ability to streamline classroom management, improve communication, and support instructional efficiency was highly beneficial. Students found that the platform enhanced the quality of learning, simplified assignment submissions, and provided clear feedback on their performance. There were no significant relationships between socio-demographic variables and satisfaction levels, indicating that factors such as age, sex, and department/program affiliation did not significantly impact perceptions of Google Classroom. The study also highlighted benefits, such as increased organizational efficiency, as well as challenges, including technical issues and limited interaction. Based on these findings, an action plan was proposed to address the challenges and further improve the integration of Google Classroom into the teaching and learning processes.

Keywords: ***Google Classroom, faculty satisfaction, student satisfaction, educational technology, ease of use, usefulness, online learning, digital learning platforms***

Received: August 2025
Accepted: October 2025
Available: December 2025

Recommended Citation:
Libres, J. M., & Gonzaga, M. V. (2025). Use Of Google Classroom for Instruction in the FCIC College Department. *Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception Insights*, 03(02), 17–40. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18204712

INTRODUCTION

The ongoing integration of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in education has introduced new approaches to teaching and learning. Digital platforms such as Google Classroom support online and blended instruction by streamlining communication, organizing learning materials, and enhancing collaboration between teachers and students (Mensah et al., 2022). These tools have become increasingly essential in supporting educational continuity, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic.

However, the effective use of such platforms remains dependent on reliable internet access, availability of digital devices, and user competence. In the Philippines, these conditions are not always met, particularly in provincial areas where limitations in infrastructure and digital resources persist, posing ongoing challenges (Mangubat et al., 2023). As schools adopt digital tools to meet evolving educational demands, it becomes important to understand how these technologies are experienced by their users.

At the Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception (FCIC) in Baybay, Leyte, the College Department has employed Google Classroom to support instruction. However, despite its continued use, a significant population gap exists in the current research. There has been no formal evaluation of faculty and student satisfaction specifically within this institution.

Consequently, it remains unknown whether the platform effectively meets the needs of this distinct academic community, or how local challenges specific to FCIC influence the user experience compared to populations in other studies.

This study directly addresses this gap by providing insight into the experiences of FCIC faculty and students with Google Classroom. By examining the satisfaction of this specific population, the research supports efforts to improve digital learning practices within the institution. Furthermore, it contributes to a broader understanding of how technology is integrated and received in similar provincial educational contexts.

Research Questions

This study assessed the satisfaction level of faculty and students with the use of Google Classroom within the FCIC College Department. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the socio-demographic profile of the faculty in terms of:
   1.1 Age
   1.2 Sex
   1.3 Department?
2. What is the socio-demographic profile of the students in terms of:
   2.1 Age
   2.2 Sex
   2.3 Programs?
3. What is the satisfaction level of the faculty with the use of Google Classroom in terms of:
   3.1 Usefulness
   3.2 Ease of Use?
4. What is the satisfaction level of the students in the use of Google Classroom in terms of:
   4.1 Usefulness
   4.2 Ease of Use?

5. Is there a relationship between the satisfaction level and the socio-demographic profile of the respondents?
6. Is there a relationship between the satisfaction levels of faculty and students?
7. What benefits and challenges do the respondents experience from using Google Classroom?
8. What output can be proposed based on the results of the study?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research design, specifically a descriptive-correlational approach, to assess the satisfaction levels of faculty and students using Google Classroom for instruction in the FCIC College Department. A descriptive-correlational design is used in research studies that aim to explore relationships between different variables (McBurney & White, 2009).

This design enabled the systematic collection and analysis of data to examine the relationships between factors such as perceived usefulness, ease of use, and overall satisfaction levels. By quantifying these variables, the study employed statistical tests, including correlation analysis, to determine the strength and direction of the relationships. This approach provided a comprehensive understanding of how different factors influenced overall satisfaction with Google Classroom.

The Sample and Locale of the Study

The faculty participants in this study were from the College Department of the Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception (FCIC), which actively used Google Classroom for instruction. A total enumeration technique was employed, encompassing all 48 faculty members who utilized the platform. This approach ensured full representation of the faculty population involved in digital instruction.

A stratified random sampling technique was employed to ensure fair representation of student participants across academic programs. Out of 877 enrolled students, a sample of 526 was selected using a 60% proportional allocation. Students were grouped by program, and random samples were taken from each group. The sample included: BS in Criminology – 168, BS in Office Administration – 20, BS in Information Technology – 52, BS in Hospitality Management – 77, BS in Business Administration – 70, Bachelor of Elementary Education – 22, Bachelor of Secondary Education – 89, BS in Midwifery – 6, Diploma in Midwifery – 21, and Associate in Computer Technology – 1.

The study was conducted at FCIC, a private higher education institution in Baybay City, Leyte, Philippines. The institution is recognized for integrating digital tools, such as Google Classroom, into its instructional practices.

Research Instrument

This study used two separate questionnaires to collect data from faculty and students of the FCIC College Department. The faculty questionnaire was adapted from an existing instrument developed by Harjanto et al. (2019), while the student questionnaire was based on the tool created by Zuniga-Tonio (2021). Modifications were made to both questionnaires to suit the local context and educational setting.

The faculty questionnaire consisted of three parts. Part 1 gathered socio-demographic data, including age (categorized into six ranges), sex (male or female), and department

affiliation. Part 2 measured satisfaction with Google Classroom using 12 items on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). This section focuses on two key dimensions: the platform's usefulness for instructional tasks and the ease of use of its features. Part 3 required respondents to rank the perceived benefits and challenges related to Google Classroom, ranging from 1 (least important/difficult) to 5 (most important/complex), providing insight into the platform's practical strengths and limitations from the faculty perspective.

The student questionnaire followed the same structure. Part 1 collected demographic data, including age (in four categories), sex, and academic program. Part 2 assessed satisfaction with Google Classroom using the same five-point Likert scale, focusing on its usefulness for learning tasks and ease of use for accessing materials, navigating content, and submitting assignments. Part 3 asked students to rank perceived benefits and challenges, such as the faculty, offering a comprehensive view of their experiences with the platform.

Gathering of Data

The study on the use of Google Classroom for instruction in the FCIC College Department followed a structured procedure. Approval was obtained from the Graduate School Office and the Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception President in Baybay City, Leyte. Faculty and students were emailed about the study, and consent was secured electronically. The survey was administered using Google Forms and distributed to participants across departments and academic programs. Two weeks were given to allow participants sufficient time to respond and ensure timely data collection.

Descriptive statistics, including frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and ranks, were used to analyze socio-demographic data and satisfaction levels. Inferential statistics were employed to explore relationships between variables. The Fisher-Freeman-Halton test was used for faculty data, while Spearman correlation was used for student data. An additional Spearman correlation test was performed to examine the relationship between faculty and student satisfaction levels.

Satisfaction levels were interpreted using weighted mean scores derived from Likert-scale responses. The satisfaction levels were categorized into the following:

Range	Satisfaction Level	Description
4.21 – 5.00	Very Satisfied	I strongly agree and find Google Classroom to be exceptionally useful and effective.
3.41 – 4.20	Satisfied	Agree and express satisfaction with the usefulness and effectiveness of Google Classroom.
2.61 – 3.40	Neutral	Neither agree nor disagree, indicating a neutral stance on the usefulness and effectiveness of Google Classroom.
1.81 – 2.60	Dissatisfied	Those who express dissatisfaction with the usefulness and effectiveness of Google Classroom.
1.00 – 1.80	Very Dissatisfied	Strongly disagree and find Google Classroom not useful at all.

Benefits and challenges were analyzed based on ranking questions, where each item was assigned a weight corresponding to its rank. The results were categorized as follows:

Benefits

Weighted Mean	Importance	Description
4.21 – 5.00	Most Important	Identified as the most beneficial.
3.41 – 4.20	Important	Considered essential and more beneficial
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Important	Holds average beneficial.
1.81 – 2.60	Less Important	Identified as rarely beneficial.
1.00 – 1.80	Least Important	Considered not beneficial.

Challenges

Weighted Mean	Difficulty	Description
4.21 – 5.00	Most Difficult	Identified as the most challenging.
3.41 – 4.20	Difficult	Considered complex but more challenging.
2.61 – 3.40	Moderately Difficult	Poses an average level of challenge.
1.81 – 2.60	Less Difficult	Identified as rarely challenging.
1.00 – 1.80	Least Difficult	Considered not challenging.

This statistical treatment provided a comprehensive view of user experiences with Google Classroom and served as the basis for further interpretation and the formulation of an action plan.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1.1 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Demographic Profile of FCIC College Department Faculty

Attributes	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age (in years)		
22 to 24	1	2.1
25 to 34	21	43.8
35 to 44	12	25.0
45 to 54	2	4.2
55 to 64	7	14.6
65 and older	5	10.4
Total	**48**	**100**
Sex		
Male	18	37.5
Female	30	62.5
Total	**48**	**100**
Department		
College of Education	21	43.8
College of Criminal Justice Education	11	22.9
College of Business Management and Administration	9	18.8
College of Information Technology	4	8.3
College of Midwifery	3	6.3
Total	**48**	**100**

Table 1.1 indicates that the largest segment of the 48 faculty members from the FCIC College Department were aged 25 to 34, accounting for 43.8%. When combined with the 2.1% aged 22 to 24, this reflects a predominantly young teaching workforce. This demographic skew suggests a high baseline of institutional adaptability, as these younger cohorts are generally

more agile with digital tools like Google Classroom (Al-Maroof et al., 2023; Hussein et al., 2020). However, the data also highlights a potential area of friction regarding the digital divide. Faculty aged 55 to 64 accounted for 14.6% and those 65 and older comprised 10.4%. While these groups offer deep pedagogical experience, they are statistically more likely to require targeted, non-standardized training to remain engaged with digital instruction compared to their younger counterparts (Keržič et al., 2023; Krumsvik et al., 2023). The middle cohorts—aged 35 to 44 at 25.0% and 45 to 54 at 4.2%—occupy a transitional space, often balancing leadership roles with the need for structured support in integrating new technologies (Staddon, 2020; Batanero-Ochaíta et al., 2021).

In terms of sex, 62.5% of the faculty were female and 37.5% male, indicating a female-majority workforce. This distribution aligns with global trends indicating an increase in female participation in higher education teaching roles (Casad et al., 2021). Importantly for this study, this balance ensures that the findings regarding the acceptance of digital tools are representative of the general academic workforce, rather than being skewed by the male-dominated demographics often found in strictly technical institutions.

Table 1.1 also shows that the College of Education had the highest faculty representation at 43.8%. This dominance is critical for interpreting the aggregate results: unlike the College of Information Technology at 8.3%, faculty in the College of Education are likely evaluating Google Classroom through a pedagogical lens rather than a purely technical one. Because they are responsible for teaching general education subjects, their high usage rates likely reflect a professional commitment to modeling effective instructional strategies. This was followed by the College of Criminal Justice Education at 22.9% and the College of Business Management and Administration at 18.8%. The College of Midwifery had the smallest faculty numbers at 6.3%, consistent with their lower program enrollment.

Table 1.2 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Demographic Profile of FCIC College Department Students

Attributes	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age (in years)		
18 to 24	449	85.4
25 to 34	72	13.7
35 to 44	5	1.0
Total	**526**	**100**
Sex		
Male	255	48.5
Female	271	51.5
Total	**526**	**100**
Program		
Bachelor of Science in Criminology	168	31.9
Bachelor of Secondary Education	89	16.9
Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management	77	14.6
Bachelor of Science in Business Administration	70	13.3
Bachelor of Science in Information Technology	52	9.9
Bachelor of Science in Office Administration	20	3.8
Diploma in Midwifery	21	4.0
Bachelor of Elementary Education	22	4.2
Bachelor of Science in Midwifery	6	1.1
Associate in Computer Technology	1	.2
Total	**526**	**100**

Table 1.2 indicates that among the 526 students from the FCIC College Department, 85.4% were aged 18 to 24. This overwhelming majority situates the study within a "digital native" context, suggesting that the general student body possesses a baseline familiarity with digital platforms like Google Classroom (Dario et al., 2024). However, the aggregate data masks a critical minority: students aged 25 to 34 made up 13.7%, representing non-traditional learners who often balance academics with work or family obligations (Zack, 2020). Furthermore, 1.0% were aged 35 to 44. While statistically small, this group is analytically significant because they are most likely to face barriers in adapting to digital tools without tailored assistance (Staddon, 2020). Therefore, any dissatisfaction recorded in the study may stem from these specific cohorts who lack the intuitive digital reflexes of the younger majority.

Sex distribution was nearly balanced, with 51.5% female and 48.5% male. This parity is methodologically significant because it ensures that the findings regarding technology acceptance are not skewed by gender-specific preferences. This pattern is consistent with broader trends in higher education, where female students slightly outnumber their male counterparts (Aristovnik et al., 2020; Chang, 2020).

Program enrollment data indicate that the Bachelor of Science in Criminology had the highest number of students at 31.9%. This creates a unique context for the study, as Criminology is often associated with physical and tactical training rather than purely online instruction (Patayon et al., 2022). This was followed by the Bachelor of Secondary Education at 16.9%, highlighting a segment of students who are likely evaluating the platform not just as users, but as future educators (Yi et al., 2021). Hospitality Management at 14.6%, Business Administration at 13.3%, and Information Technology at 9.9% were also among the top choices. This diversity implies that the study tests Google Classroom's versatility across a spectrum of disciplines, ranging from the technical demands of IT to the skill-based requirements of Hospitality (Sublett et al., 2021).

Smaller programs such as Office Administration at 3.8%, Elementary Education at 4.2%, Midwifery at 5.1% combined, and Associate in Computer Technology at 0.2% served students with more specialized vocational goals. The inclusion of these groups ensures that the assessment of the platform covers specialized vocational contexts, particularly in areas like healthcare, early education, and technical support.

Table 2.1 Satisfaction Level of Faculty Regarding the Usefulness of Google Classroom

No.	Indicator	Weighted Mean	Level of Satisfaction
1.	It saves me time when managing classroom tasks.	4.52	Very Satisfied
2.	It provides a helpful way to organize and distribute assignments.	4.50	Very Satisfied
3.	It improves my communication with students.	4.33	Very Satisfied
4.	It helps me become a more effective teacher.	4.21	Very Satisfied
5.	It makes me more productive in lesson planning and grading.	3.85	Satisfied
Overall		**4.28**	**Very Satisfied**

Legend:

4.21 – 5.00	*Very Satisfied*	*1.81 – 2.60*	*Dissatisfied*
3.41 – 4.20	*Satisfied*	*1.00 – 1.80*	*Very Dissatisfied*
2.61 – 3.40	*Neutral*		

As shown in Table 2.1, the overall usefulness of Google Classroom received a weighted mean of 4.28, indicating that the faculty have successfully integrated the platform into their

daily workflow and view it as a stable component of their instructional delivery. However, a critical breakdown of the items reveals a hierarchy in how faculty derive value from the system.

The results indicate that the platform's primary value lies in logistical efficiency. The most highly rated feature was its ability to save time in managing classroom tasks, with a weighted mean of 4.52. This was closely followed by the ability to organize and distribute assignments, which also received a high mean of 4.50. The dominance of these two indicators suggests that faculty prioritize the platform's capacity to automate routine administrative work. As noted by Piaralal et al. (2023) and Debbyanti et al. (2022), when features like automated grading, assignment tracking, and timestamping successfully reduce workload, the platform is perceived as essential for managing classroom content effectively.

In the middle tier of acceptance, faculty acknowledged the platform's role in interaction and delivery. A weighted mean of 4.33 was recorded for improving communication with students. Features such as comment threads, private messages, and real-time feedback were cited as key drivers for consistent interaction (Suhroh et al., 2021). Teaching effectiveness was also enhanced, with a score of 4.21. While positive, this slightly lower score compared to the administrative indicators suggests that while lesson organization is improved, the platform is viewed more as a delivery mechanism than a complete pedagogical solution (Piaralal et al., 2023).

The lowest-rated feature was related to productivity in lesson planning and grading, with a weighted mean of 3.85. This statistical dip highlights a specific technical threshold. While faculty find it easy to distribute work, they find it comparatively harder to utilize the platform for the deeper work of assessment logic. This aligns with Prestoza (2024), who notes that advanced features like rubrics and grading customization often have a steeper learning curve than simple file uploads.

Overall, Table 2.1 reflects that faculty view Google Classroom as a valuable instructional tool that enhances efficiency, communication, and classroom organization. However, the disparity between the high administrative scores and the lower planning scores implies that while satisfaction is high, the institution requires targeted training. Future support should move beyond basic navigation and focus on maximizing potential in areas such as lesson planning and assessment to bridge the gap between logistical ease and pedagogical depth (Debbyanti et al., 2022; Suhroh et al., 2021; Prestoza, 2024).

Table 2.2 Satisfaction Level of Students Regarding the Usefulness of Google Classroom

No.	Indicator	Weighted Mean	Level of Satisfaction
1.	Enhances the quality of my learning activities.	4.50	Very Satisfied
2.	It clarifies the subject's objectives, assessments, and content, making them more transparent and easier to understand.	4.40	Very Satisfied
3.	It simplifies assignment submission and helps me stay on track with deadlines.	4.37	Very Satisfied
4.	Its grading system helps me understand my performance and progress.	4.36	Very Satisfied
5.	It promotes excellent interaction between me, my classmates, and my instructors.	4.35	Very Satisfied
6.	It provides easy access to class notes, slides, references, and review materials.	4.34	Very Satisfied
7.	It facilitates helpful and constructive feedback from my professor.	4.31	Very Satisfied
Overall		**4.38**	**Very Satisfied**

Legend:

4.21 – 5.00	*Very Satisfied*	*1.81 – 2.60*	*Dissatisfied*
3.41 – 4.20	*Satisfied*	*1.00 – 1.80*	*Very Dissatisfied*
2.61 – 3.40	*Neutral*		

Table 2.2 reveals that students were very satisfied with the overall usefulness of Google Classroom, with a weighted mean of 4.38. This high aggregate score suggests that for the student body, the platform has evolved beyond a mere repository of files into a central hub for their academic ecosystem. A closer examination of the hierarchy of responses indicates that students place the highest value on features that drive direct engagement rather than passive administration.

The highest-rated feature was the enhancement of learning activities, with a weighted mean of 4.50. This peak in the data is significant because it suggests that students value the platform's ability to transform static content into interactive experiences. Unlike faculty, who prioritized administrative timesaving, students prioritized the interactive tools—such as discussion boards and multimedia resources—that foster participation (Romero et al., 2020). This was supported by the clarity of course objectives, assessments, and content, which was rated highly at 4.40. This indicates that the platform's structured modules and clear instructions successfully reduce academic anxiety by making expectations transparent (Zuñiga-Tonio, 2021; Jaca, 2022).

In the functional tier of the results, the data shows consistent satisfaction with the platform's organizational tools. Simplified assignment submission and deadline management received a mean of 4.37, while the grading system followed closely at 4.36. These scores suggest that the automated reminders and transparent feedback loops are essential for helping students self-regulate their learning pace (Canuto-Penrad et al., 2023; Salam, 2020). Similarly, collaboration and communication features received a mean score of 4.35, and access to lecture materials and references was rated 4.34. These clustered results confirm that the "Classwork" and "Stream" sections are effectively functioning as a digitized classroom environment that facilitates both peer interaction and independent study (Xhaferi et al., 2020; Syafi'i, 2020; Rahmawati, 2020).

The lowest relative score in this high-performing dataset was assigned to feedback from instructors, which earned a 4.31. While still a positive rating, its position at the bottom of the hierarchy implies a limitation of the digital medium. It suggests that while students appreciate the mechanism of receiving comments, the digital format may not fully replicate the depth or nuance of face-to-face consultation, leaving a slight gap in the perceived personalization of instruction (Romero et al., 2020).

Overall, student responses in Table 2.2 confirm that Google Classroom is perceived as highly useful, but specifically because it supports active learning strategies. The results demonstrate that for students, the platform's value is defined not just by the efficient delivery of content, but by its ability to create a structured, interactive, and transparent learning environment that promotes student success (Romero et al., 2020; Canuto-Penrad et al., 2023).

Table 2.3 Satisfaction Level of Faculty Regarding the Ease of Use of Google Classroom

No.	Indicator	Weighted Mean	Level of Satisfaction
1.	It is simple to set up and use.	4.69	Very Satisfied
2.	It is user-friendly for teachers.	4.69	Very Satisfied
3.	I easily remember how to use it, even after breaks.	4.67	Very Satisfied
4.	I learned how to use it quickly.	4.63	Very Satisfied
5.	It is easy to correct mistakes or make changes.	4.60	Very Satisfied
6.	It has an easy-to-navigate interface.	4.56	Very Satisfied
7.	I can use it without needing frequent instructions.	4.54	Very Satisfied
Overall		**4.63**	**Very Satisfied**

Legend:

4.21 – 5.00	*Very Satisfied*	*1.81 – 2.60*	*Dissatisfied*
3.41 – 4.20	*Satisfied*	*1.00 – 1.80*	*Very Dissatisfied*
2.61 – 3.40	*Neutral*		

Table 2.3 reveals that faculty were very satisfied with the ease of use of Google Classroom, recording an overall weighted mean of 4.63. This exceptionally high score is analytically significant because it suggests that the platform has achieved a level of "technological transparency," where the interface is so intuitive that it ceases to be a barrier and instead functions as an invisible support for instruction.

The data indicates that the primary strength of the platform lies in its removal of entry barriers. The highest-rated indicators were the platform's simplicity in setup and its user-friendly design, both of which received a rating of 4.69. These near-perfect scores imply that the platform successfully minimizes the "cognitive load" required to begin using it. As noted by Suhroh et al. (2021) and Debbyanti et al. (2022), this streamlined design is vital for mixed-age faculties (as seen in Table 1.1) because it allows even those with lower digital literacy to navigate the system without the intimidation often associated with complex Learning Management Systems.

The platform's design also supports long-term retention. A weighted mean of 4.67 was given for the platform's ability to be remembered after breaks in usage. This finding is particularly relevant to the academic calendar, which includes semester breaks. It suggests that the consistent design logic allows faculty to return to the platform after long pauses without needing re-training, thereby ensuring sustainable long-term usability (Piaralal et al., 2023).

Furthermore, the process of learning how to use the platform was rated very positively with a mean of 4.63, while the ease of making corrections or changes received a weighted mean of 4.60. These scores highlight the platform's "forgiving" nature. The high rating for making corrections suggests that the interface supports instructional agility, allowing teachers to edit assignments or grades efficiently without navigating cumbersome menus. This contributes to a sense of confidence and flexibility in instruction (Suhroh et al., 2021; Kassim, 2024).

Finally, Google Classroom's navigation was rated 4.56, and independent use was rated highly with a mean of 4.54. While these are the lowest scores in the set, they remain extremely high, indicating that the vast majority of faculty feel capable of managing the platform without external technical support. This high degree of self-efficacy validates the view that self-sufficient platforms improve user experience by allowing teachers to focus their energy on pedagogical content rather than technical troubleshooting (Huang et al., 2021; Kumar et al., 2019).

Overall, Table 2.3 demonstrates that Google Classroom's ease of use received consistently high means across all indicators. The uniformity of these high scores confirms that

the platform effectively bridges the gap between novice and expert users, serving as a reliable tool that supports the faculty's diverse technological profiles (Suhroh et al., 2021; Debbyanti et al., 2022; Kassim, 2024).

Table 2.4 Satisfaction Level of Students Regarding the Ease of Use of Google Classroom

No.	Indicator	Weighted Mean	Level of Satisfaction
1.	It offers easy and convenient signing in.	4.44	Very Satisfied
2.	It makes accessing quizzes and learning activities simple.	4.41	Very Satisfied
3.	It provides easy access to important information, announcements, and updates about the subject.	4.39	Very Satisfied
4.	Its navigation is intuitive and easy to use.	4.36	Very Satisfied
5.	It makes accessing course materials simple.	4.35	Very Satisfied
6.	It provides a user-friendly method for submitting and uploading assignments.	4.34	Very Satisfied
Overall		**4.38**	**Very Satisfied**

Legend:

4.21 – 5.00	*Very Satisfied*	*1.81 – 2.60*	*Dissatisfied*
3.41 – 4.20	*Satisfied*	*1.00 – 1.80*	*Very Dissatisfied*
2.61 – 3.40	*Neutral*		

The results in Table 2.4 indicate that students were very satisfied with the ease of use of Google Classroom, with an overall weighted mean of 4.38. This high satisfaction score suggests that for the student body, the platform serves as a "transparent technology"—a tool where the interface is so unobtrusive that it allows learners to focus almost entirely on the content rather than the mechanics of the software.

The data reveals that the most significant driver of this satisfaction is the removal of entry barriers. The most highly rated feature was the ease and convenience of signing in, with a weighted mean of 4.44. This peak score is analytically important because it represents the "first mile" of user experience. By ensuring a seamless login process—likely integrated with their existing accounts—the platform eliminates the password fatigue and access delays that often discourage students from engaging with coursework (Kumar et al., 2019).

Once inside the platform, the data suggests that the interface successfully prioritizes "actionable" content. The second highest rating of 4.41 was for accessing quizzes and learning activities. This indicates that the design minimizes the number of clicks required to get to high-stakes tasks, allowing students to navigate directly to key academic content without "digital wandering" (Huang et al., 2021). Similarly, Access to important information such as announcements and updates received a high rating of 4.39. This confirms that the platform's "Stream" feature effectively functions as a central bulletin board, helping students stay informed and organized by pushing critical updates to the forefront of the user experience (Syafi'i, 2020; Rahmawati, 2020).

The functional mechanics of the platform also received strong validation. Navigation was rated 4.36, highlighting that the platform's intuitive interface caters to varying levels of digital literacy. Even students with limited technical experience found it easy to locate content, suggesting a low learning curve (Kassim, 2024). This is further supported by the way students could access course materials, which received a weighted mean of 4.35. The platform's linear organization allows for the quick retrieval of lecture notes, essentially functioning as an organized digital binder that supports independent review (Romero et al., 2020).

Finally, the assignment submission feature earned a rating of 4.34. While this is the lowest score in this high-performing set, it remains exceptionally positive. It implies that the critical "hand-in" moment—often a source of technical anxiety—is viewed as simple and reliable. This ease of use contributes to timely submissions and reduces the excuse of technical barriers for missing deadlines (Huang et al., 2021).

Overall, the data in Table 2.4 confirm that students find Google Classroom exceptionally easy to use. The results argue that the platform's value lies in its reduction of "technical friction." By streamlining access to content, activities, and communication tools, the design allows students to direct their cognitive energy toward learning rather than troubleshooting, a factor known to significantly improve student satisfaction and engagement (Kumar et al., 2019; Kassim, 2024).

Table 3.1 Relationship between socio-demographic profile and faculty satisfaction level of Google Classroom

Socio-demographic Profile	Satisfaction Level	Fisher-Freeman-Halton Test Value	p- value	Significance
Age	Usefulness	13.892	.842	Not Significant
	Ease of Use	19.649	.414	Not Significant
Sex	Usefulness	5.433	.091	Not Significant
	Ease of Use	4.744	.107	Not Significant
Department	Usefulness	14.708	.198	Not Significant
	Ease of Use	12.141	.627	Not Significant

The data in Table 3.1 reveal that all p-values are above the 0.05 threshold, a finding that establishes a critical pattern of "demographic neutrality." This lack of statistical significance indicates that there is no relationship between faculty members' socio-demographic profiles and their satisfaction with Google Classroom. Analytically, this suggests that the platform's interface is sufficiently intuitive to bridge the gaps that typically exist between different user groups, resulting in uniformly high satisfaction regardless of age, sex, or departmental affiliation.

For age, the Fisher-Freeman-Halton test results show p-values of 0.842 for usefulness and 0.414 for ease of use. These statistically non-significant results effectively refute the common assumption of a "digital divide" within this specific faculty cohort. While faculty aged 25 to 34 reported the highest satisfaction, those in older age brackets, such as 55 to 64 and 65 and older, also expressed strong satisfaction. This convergence suggests that the intuitive design of the platform lowers the technical barrier to entry, allowing senior faculty to leverage their pedagogical experience without being hindered by software complexity. These findings align with Keržič et al. (2023) and Krumsvik et al. (2016), who emphasize that once a platform achieves a certain level of usability, biological age ceases to be a predictor of technological acceptance.

Sex-related results also show no significant difference, yielding p-values of 0.091 for usefulness and 0.107 for ease of use. Both male and female faculty members reported being "very satisfied" across indicators. This parity is methodologically important as it indicates that the tool does not favor a specific gendered approach to technology. This supports the view of Yu (2021), who notes that while initial attitudes toward technology adoption may differ by sex, satisfaction levels tend to equalize as users become familiar with the platform's workflow.

Departmental affiliation similarly showed no significant relationship, with p-values of 0.198 for usefulness and 0.627 for ease of use. This uniformity is a strong indicator of the

platform's "trans-disciplinary" design. Faculty across departments, from the technical focus of Information Technology to the pedagogical focus of Education, expressed high levels of satisfaction. This implies that Google Classroom is not limited to specific types of content but is a flexible container for diverse instructional strategies. These results support the conclusion of Castro-Guzmán (2021), who argue that platforms like Google Classroom are adaptable enough to meet diverse instructional needs across various academic disciplines without friction.

In summary, Table 3.1 confirms that faculty satisfaction with Google Classroom is consistent across age groups, sexes, and departments. These findings suggest that the platform offers a universally accessible user experience. The data implies that satisfaction in this context is driven by the intrinsic quality of the tool's design rather than the personal characteristics of the user (Keržič et al., 2023; Piaralal et al., 2023).

Table 3.2 Relationship between socio-demographic profile and student satisfaction level of Google Classroom

Socio-demographic Profile	Satisfaction Level	Spearman Correlation Value	p- value	Significance
Age	Usefulness	-.009	.831	Not Significant
	Ease of Use	-.022	.614	Not Significant
Sex	Usefulness	-.030	.499	Not Significant
	Ease of Use	-.026	.557	Not Significant
Academic Program	Usefulness	.039	.373	Not Significant
	Ease of Use	.051	.245	Not Significant

Table 3.2 presents data showing that all p-values for the tested socio-demographic variables are above 0.05. This consistent lack of statistical significance establishes a clear pattern of "demographic neutrality." It indicates that the student experience with Google Classroom is uniform, suggesting that the platform's interface is sufficiently robust to accommodate diverse learner profiles without alienating specific groups based on age, sex, or academic discipline.

For age, the Spearman correlation values were –0.009 for usefulness with a p-value of 0.831, and –0.022 for ease of use with a p-value of 0.614. These near-zero correlations are analytically significant because they challenge the assumption of a "digital divide" within the student body. Students across age groups consistently reported high satisfaction. Among the "digital native" cohort aged 18 to 24, 293 out of 449 were "very satisfied" with usefulness. However, similar satisfaction was observed in older age groups, including students aged 25 to 34 and 35 to 44. This convergence implies that the platform's intuitive features successfully lower the barrier to entry for non-traditional learners, allowing them to engage with the same level of confidence as their younger counterparts (Al-Maroof et al., 2023).

For sex, the correlation values were –0.030 for usefulness with a p-value of 0.499, and –0.026 for ease of use with a p-value of 0.557, indicating no significant relationship. Appendix data confirm that both male and female students expressed high satisfaction. Specifically, 169 out of 255 male students and 174 out of 271 female students reported being "very satisfied" with the usefulness. This parity confirms that the platform functions as a gender-neutral learning environment. Unlike some technical tools that may implicitly favor specific user behaviors, Google Classroom appears to align equally well with the learning preferences of both sexes once familiarity is established (Yu, 2021).

Regarding the academic program, the Spearman correlation values were 0.039 for usefulness with a p-value of 0.373, and 0.051 for ease of use with a p-value of 0.245. This lack of variance is a strong indicator that the platform is "discipline-agnostic." Students from programs with vastly different pedagogical requirements—ranging from the tactical focus of Criminology to the technical focus of Information Technology—consistently reported high satisfaction. For instance, 105 out of 168 criminology students and 61 out of 89 secondary education students were "very satisfied" with the platform's usefulness. This suggests that the platform is flexible enough to bridge the gap between "high-touch" vocational instruction and theoretical academic work, validating the argument by Barrot et al. (2021) that flexible digital designs can meet diverse disciplinary needs equally well.

Overall, the findings from Table 3.2 confirm that age, sex, and academic program do not significantly influence student satisfaction with Google Classroom. The data argues that satisfaction in this context is driven by the intrinsic quality of the design and user accessibility, rather than the demographic traits of the user. This supports the conclusion that a well-designed LMS can effectively democratize access to education, providing a stable learning environment for the entire student population regardless of their background (Al-Maroof et al., 2023; Barrot et al., 2021).

Table 4. Relationship between faculty and student satisfaction level of Google Classroom

Satisfaction Level	Faculty	Student	**Total**
Very Dissatisfied	0	2	2
Dissatisfied	1	6	7
Neutral	2	41	43
Satisfied	7	114	121
Very Satisfied	38	363	401
Total	48	526	574

Spearman Correlation Value = -.060^{ns}, p-value = .152, Significance = ^{ns} Not Significant

Table 4 presents the Spearman Correlation analysis between faculty and student satisfaction levels with Google Classroom. The analysis yielded a correlation value of –0.060 with a p-value of 0.152. Since this p-value is above the 0.05 significance threshold, the result indicates that there is no statistically significant relationship between the satisfaction levels of the two groups. Analytically, this non-significant result points to a phenomenon of "parallel satisfaction" rather than "causal satisfaction." It implies that the student experience is not directly derivative of the faculty experience; a student can have a highly positive experience with the platform even if their instructor finds the backend interface cumbersome.

The distribution of responses shows that despite the lack of statistical linkage, there is a shared consensus of high approval. Among faculty, 38 out of 48 respondents were "very satisfied" and seven were "satisfied." This mirrors the student cohort, where 363 out of 526 reported being "very satisfied," while another 114 students were "satisfied." Only a small minority expressed dissatisfaction, including one "dissatisfied" faculty member and eight students who reported being either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied." This data creates a "high-high" performance quadrant, confirming that the platform is meeting the distinct needs of both user bases effectively.

These findings suggest that satisfaction levels are shaped by divergent utility functions unique to each group. The lack of correlation implies that the "pain points" for faculty do not necessarily translate into "pain points" for students. As indicated in the previous tables, faculty satisfaction is likely driven by production metrics, such as the efficiency of assignment management and grading tools. In contrast, student satisfaction is likely driven by consumption

metrics, such as the ease of navigation and immediate access to course materials. This distinction aligns with findings from Romero et al. (2020) and Canuto-Penrad et al. (2023), who emphasize that while both groups benefit from the ecosystem, they are essentially interacting with two different sides of the same interface.

Therefore, although the correlation between faculty and student satisfaction is not statistically significant, the overall high ratings from both groups highlight the platform's dual effectiveness. To maintain this, FCIC may consider a bifurcated strategy for improvements. Enhancing administrative features and providing ongoing support would specifically target the faculty's need for efficiency, while continued investment in user accessibility and engagement tools would sustain the positive experience for students. By treating these as separate optimization tracks, the institution can ensure that the platform remains valuable to both the producers and consumers of the educational content.

Table 5.1 Benefits of Using Google Classroom among Faculty

No.	Benefits	Weighted Mean	Importance
1.	Streamlines Learning and Organization.	4.04	Important
2.	Prepares for the Digital Learning Landscape	3.38	Moderately Important
3.	Encourages Time Management and Self-Motivation.	3.06	Moderately Important
4.	Simplifies Communication and Provides Personalized Feedback.	2.90	Moderately Important
5.	Promotes Efficiency and Sustainability.	1.63	Least Important

Legend:

4.21 – 5.00	*Most Important*	*1.81 – 2.60*	*Less Important*
3.41 – 4.20	*Important*	*1.00 – 1.80*	*Least Important*
2.61 – 3.40	*Moderately Important*		

Table 5.1 presents data showing a clear hierarchy in what faculty value within the platform. The results indicate that faculty prioritize functional utility over soft skills or environmental impact. This is evidenced by the fact that "Streamlines Learning and Organization" was identified as the most important benefit, achieving a weighted mean of 4.04. This top ranking suggests that for instructors, the platform's primary mandate is to function as a "digital filing cabinet" that reduces chaos. Faculty value the "Classwork" and "Stream" sections not just as features, but as essential tools for tracking progress and distributing materials in a centralized way (Prihaswati et al., 2020; Akhigbe et al., 2023).

In the middle tier of the hierarchy, faculty acknowledged the platform's role in skill-building. The benefit "Prepares for the Digital Learning Landscape" was rated as Moderately Important with a weighted mean of 3.38. This indicates that faculty view the platform as a training ground for digital literacy, where the integration of Google Workspace tools (Docs, Slides, Sheets) helps users adapt to the technological demands of modern education (Husain et al., 2023). Similarly, "Encourages Time Management and Self-Motivation" received a weighted mean of 3.06. This moderate rating implies that while faculty recognize the value of automated reminders and calendars, they view these as supplementary aids to student independence rather than core instructional features (Husain et al., 2023).

The benefit "Simplifies Communication and Provides Personalized Feedback" was rated at 2.90. This relatively lower score is analytically interesting because it contrasts with the high scores seen in earlier tables regarding communication. It suggests that while communication tools are useful, faculty view them as less critical than the organizational tools.

They likely perceive the platform primarily as a management system first, and a communication channel second (Prihaswati et al., 2020).

The least valued benefit was "Promotes Efficiency and Sustainability," which received a weighted mean of 1.63. This low score reveals a pragmatic mindset among the faculty. While the reduction of paper use and digital resource sharing are positive environmental outcomes, they are viewed as peripheral to the actual work of teaching. Faculty prioritize features that solve immediate instructional problems over broader, abstract goals like sustainability (Miscevic et al., 2023).

Overall, the findings suggest that faculty value Google Classroom primarily for its immediate logistical impact. The data confirms that for instructors, the "benefit" of the platform is defined by its ability to streamline classroom management and support digital readiness, while environmental impacts or soft-skill development are seen as secondary bonuses.

Table 5.2 Challenges of Using Google Classroom among Faculty

No.	Challenges	Weighted Mean	Difficulty
1.	Technical Glitches and Reliance on Technology.	3.83	Difficult
2.	Limited Face-to-Face Interaction.	3.40	Difficult
3.	Adapting Traditional Teaching Methods.	2.77	Moderately Difficult
4.	Potential for Distraction and Overwhelm.	2.77	Moderately Difficult
5.	Digital Divide and Accessibility.	2.23	Less Difficult

Legend:

4.21 – 5.00	*Most Difficult*	*1.81 – 2.60*	*Less Difficult*
3.41 – 4.20	*Difficult*	*1.00 – 1.80*	*Least Difficult*
2.61 – 3.40	*Moderately Difficult*		

Table 5.2 presents the challenges faculty encountered while using Google Classroom. The data reveals a significant insight: the primary obstacles to implementation are external infrastructural issues rather than internal software design flaws.

The highest-rated challenge was "Technical Glitches and Reliance on Technology," with a weighted mean of 3.83. Categorized as Difficult, this high score exposes the vulnerability of digital instruction to physical infrastructure. Despite the high usability scores reported in Table 2.3, the efficacy of the platform is ultimately bottlenecked by inconsistent internet connections and device limitations. This indicates that for faculty, the stress of digital teaching stems less from navigating the interface and more from the instability of the network, highlighting an urgent need for robust technical support (Miscevic et al., 2023; Selvia et al., 2022).

The second significant barrier points to a pedagogical gap. "Limited Face-to-Face Interaction" was rated 3.40, also falling under the Difficult category. This finding complements the data from Table 2.1, where faculty rated "Teaching Effectiveness" lower than "Administrative Efficiency." It suggests that while Google Classroom is excellent for logistics, faculty feel it cannot fully replicate the depth of in-person communication. This "relational deficit" is considered a critical loss for building rapport and facilitating the deeper understanding that comes from physical presence (Ningsih et al., 2021).

In the middle tier of challenges, two indicators were rated Moderately Difficult, both receiving a weighted mean of 2.77: "Adapting Traditional Teaching Methods" and "Potential for Distraction and Overwhelm." The identical scores suggest a linked "transitional friction." Faculty acknowledge that migrating to a digital platform requires a fundamental shift in instructional habits, moving away from lecture-heavy styles toward more modular digital

formats (Piaralal et al., 2023). Simultaneously, the concern regarding distraction highlights the "attention economy" of digital learning; the same device used for learning is also a source of entertainment, making it harder for instructors to maintain student focus compared to a controlled physical classroom (Ningsih et al., 2021).

The lowest-rated challenge was "Digital Divide and Accessibility," which received a weighted mean of 2.23. Placing it in the Less Difficult category, this score is analytically surprising given the broader context of the digital divide. It suggests that from the faculty's operational perspective, student access issues—while present—are not viewed as a daily blocker to their own teaching workflow, or perhaps the institution has successfully mitigated extreme access gaps. However, acknowledging this gap remains vital to ensuring equitable participation (Xhaferi et al., 2020).

In summary, the most pressing challenges identified by faculty involve technological reliability and the limitations of remote interaction. The data suggests a clear dichotomy: the platform works well when the internet works, but it struggles to replace the human element of teaching. Therefore, improving the experience requires a dual approach: stabilizing the technical infrastructure while simultaneously training faculty on how to bridge the psychological distance of online learning.

Table 5.3 Benefits of Using Google Classroom among Students

No.	Benefits	Weighted Mean	Importance
1.	Prepares for the Digital Learning Landscape	3.72	Important
2.	Streamlines Learning and Organization.	3.55	Important
3.	Encourages Time Management and Self-Motivation.	3.05	Moderately Important
4.	Simplifies Communication and Provides Personalized Feedback.	2.51	Less Important
5.	Promotes Efficiency and Sustainability.	2.17	Less Important

Legend:

4.21 – 5.00	*Most Important*	*1.81 – 2.60*	*Less Important*
3.41 – 4.20	*Important*	*1.00 – 1.80*	*Least Important*
2.61 – 3.40	*Moderately Important*		

Table 5.3 outlines the benefits students associate with Google Classroom, revealing a distinct prioritization of skill acquisition over mere convenience. The highest-rated benefit, "Prepares for the Digital Learning Landscape," received a weighted mean of 3.72, categorized as Important. This peak score is analytically significant because it suggests that students view the platform as more than just a submission portal; they perceive it as a training ground for professional digital competencies. By integrating tools such as Google Docs, Sheets, and Slides, the platform forces a "digital upskilling" that helps students adapt to modern academic environments that increasingly rely on blended and online workflows (Syafi'i, 2020; Rahmawati, 2020).

The second tier of benefits reinforces this focus on operational efficiency. The benefit "Streamlines Learning and Organization" was also rated Important, with a weighted mean of 3.55. This high rating indicates that students value the platform primarily as a centralized dashboard that reduces academic friction. By simplifying assignment management and organizing content through the "Classwork" and "Stream" sections, the system provides a structural clarity that is essential for academic satisfaction (Zuñiga-Tonio, 2021; Canuto-Penrad et al., 2023).

In the middle of the hierarchy, "Encourages Time Management and Self-Motivation" was rated Moderately Important with a mean of 3.05. This moderate score suggests that while features like deadlines and reminders are helpful, students view them as supplementary aids rather than transformative solutions for self-discipline. This aligns with Husain et al. (2023), who note that while digital platforms can support accountability, the core drive for time management remains an internal student variable.

The lower end of the data provides a critical insight into how students define the purpose of an LMS. "Simplifies Communication and Provides Personalized Feedback" received a rating of Less Important at 2.51. This is a sharp contrast to the high scores for organization. It implies that students treat Google Classroom as a transactional space—a place to get work done—rather than a social space. As noted by Huang et al. (2021) and Kassim (2024), students in digital environments often prioritize efficiency and task completion over interaction, viewing communication features as secondary to the functional mechanics of submitting grades and receiving scores.

Lastly, "Promotes Efficiency and Sustainability" was also rated Less Important, with a weighted mean of 2.17. Mirroring the faculty results in Table 5.1, this low score confirms that environmental impact is not a primary driver of user satisfaction. Students are pragmatic users who value immediate academic survival—completing tasks and passing courses—over broader considerations like paper reduction (Miscevic et al., 2023).

Overall, the results indicate that students prioritize features that enhance digital readiness and streamline academic responsibilities. The data paints a picture of a student body that is highly focused on utility: they value the platform because it helps them navigate the digital landscape and stay organized, while viewing communication and sustainability as peripheral bonuses.

Table 5.4 Challenges of Using Google Classroom among Students

No.	Challenges	Weighted Mean	Difficulty
1.	Digital Divide and Accessibility.	3.37	Moderately Difficult
2.	Potential for Distraction and Overwhelm.	3.16	Moderately Difficult
3.	Limited Face-to-Face Interaction.	3.03	Moderately Difficult
4.	Adapting Traditional Teaching Methods.	2.74	Moderately Difficult
5.	Technical Glitches and Reliance on Technology.	2.70	Moderately Difficult

Legend:

4.21 – 5.00	*Most Difficult*	*1.81 – 2.60*	*Less Difficult*
3.41 – 4.20	*Difficult*	*1.00 – 1.80*	*Least Difficult*
2.61 – 3.40	*Moderately Difficult*		

Table 5.4 summarizes the challenges students encountered while using Google Classroom. The data reveals a consistent pattern where all challenges were rated as Moderately Difficult, with weighted means ranging from 2.70 to 3.37. Analytically, this tight clustering suggests that while the platform is functional, the student experience is characterized by a constant, low-level friction caused by a mix of infrastructural and psychological barriers.

The data identifies the primary bottleneck as external rather than internal. The most prominent challenge was "Digital Divide and Accessibility," rated with a weighted mean of 3.37. This top ranking is significant because it indicates that the biggest hurdle for students is not understanding the software, but simply accessing it. The report that inconsistent internet access and limited device availability hindered engagement highlights a structural inequity. It suggests that the effectiveness of the LMS is capped by the quality of the student's physical

infrastructure, validating the concern that digital learning can inadvertently amplify existing socioeconomic gaps (Syafi'i, 2020; Rahmawati, 2020; Xhaferi et al., 2020).

The second tier of challenges shifts from infrastructure to cognitive management. "Potential for Distraction and Overwhelm" was rated at 3.16. This score points to the "attention economy" cost of digital learning. Students reported that the volume of notifications and digital tasks negatively affected their focus, supporting the findings of Rahmawati (2020) regarding cognitive overload. It implies that without the physical containment of a classroom, students struggle to self-regulate against the noise of a digital environment.

Similarly, "Limited Face-to-Face Interaction" received a weighted mean of 3.03. This confirms that while the platform is efficient for logistics, it creates a "relational deficit." Students expressed that digital communication lacked the immediacy of in-person discussions, which reduced their engagement. This observation aligns with Xhaferi et al. (2020), suggesting that the platform cannot fully replicate the pedagogical nuance of human connection.

Interestingly, the functional aspects of the transition were rated as less severe. "Adapting Traditional Teaching Methods" presented a mean of 2.74, indicating that while adjusting to new formats requires effort, students are generally adaptable to the shift in instructional style. Lastly, "Technical Glitches and Reliance on Technology" was rated 2.70. Being the lowest-ranked challenge, this offers a critical contrast to the high score for Accessibility (3.37). It implies that the Google Classroom software itself is stable and reliable; the problem lies in the student's connection to it, not the platform's performance (Xhaferi et al., 2020).

In summary, while students generally adapted to Google Classroom, they encountered moderate difficulties that were primarily structural and psychological rather than technical. The findings suggest that the software works well, but the ecosystem around it—specifically internet access and the mental load of self-directed study—requires institutional intervention. Future efforts should focus less on platform training and more on infrastructure support and strategies to reduce cognitive overwhelm.

CONCLUSION

Summary of Findings

The study explored the use of Google Classroom among faculty and students in the FCIC College Department. Most faculty members were between the ages of 25 and 34, with females comprising 62.5% of the respondents. The majority were affiliated with the College of Education, representing 43.8% of the faculty. On the other hand, most students were aged 18 to 24, accounting for 85.4% of the student population, with an almost equal distribution of male and female students. The Bachelor of Science in Criminology program had the highest enrollment, representing 31.9% of all students.

Faculty reported high satisfaction with Google Classroom, particularly with its usefulness in saving time, managing classroom tasks, and improving communication. Ease of use was also highly rated, with faculty noting the platform's intuitive setup and navigation. However, slightly lower satisfaction was observed in areas related to lesson planning and grading. Students likewise expressed high satisfaction with the platform's usefulness and ease of use. They appreciated its role in enhancing learning activities, simplifying assignment submission, and providing clear feedback. The platform's accessible interface and organized structure were also recognized as key strengths.

No statistically significant relationship was found between satisfaction levels and socio-demographic factors such as age, sex, or department/program, for both faculty and students.

This indicates that satisfaction with Google Classroom was consistent across different demographic groups. Similarly, no significant relationship was found between the satisfaction levels of faculty and students, suggesting that the experiences and perceptions of each group were independent.

Regarding benefits, faculty emphasized improved task organization, communication, and time-saving features. Students highlighted the development of digital literacy and better academic organization as key advantages. Nonetheless, both groups identified several challenges. Faculty members reported technical glitches and difficulty adapting traditional teaching methods, while students highlighted the digital divide, distractions in online learning, and limited face-to-face interaction. In response to these findings, an action plan was proposed as an output to address the challenges and sustain high levels of satisfaction.

Conclusion

Based on the findings, Google Classroom has proven to be an effective and valuable tool for both faculty and students in the FCIC College Department. It facilitates task organization, supports communication, and streamlines academic processes. Faculty benefit from its time-saving features and administrative convenience, while students appreciate the clarity it brings to course objectives and the simplicity of assignment submission. High satisfaction levels from both groups underscore the platform's positive impact on digital learning.

However, the study also revealed areas for improvement. Technical support and accessibility remain concerns that need to be addressed to ensure all users can fully benefit from the platform. Despite these challenges, Google Classroom continues to play a significant role in enhancing the educational experience, and with targeted support, its effectiveness can be further strengthened.

Recommendations

In light of the conclusions, several recommendations are proposed. First, continuous and comprehensive training should be provided to both faculty and students to help them maximize the platform's features, ensuring usability across different socio-demographic profiles. Second, the institution is encouraged to invest in strengthening its digital infrastructure and support systems to address the identified issues of technical glitches and the digital divide. Equal access to devices and connectivity is crucial for promoting equitable learning opportunities.

Third, the proposed action plan to sustain satisfaction with Google Classroom should be implemented. This plan outlines strategies to reinforce the platform's strengths while addressing the specific challenges experienced by users. Lastly, further research is recommended to explore other variables that may influence satisfaction, including long-term usage patterns and the role of advanced platform features. This will provide a more comprehensive understanding of Google Classroom's impact on teaching and learning.

REFERENCES

Akhigbe, Josephine Omoron & Ihionkhan, Comfort & Adiqat, Igiekhume. (2023). International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON USING GOOGLE CLASSROOM FOR TEACHING OF BUSINESS EDUCATION COURSES IN UNIVERSITIES IN EDO STATE. International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies. 05. https://doi.org/10.38193/IJRCMS.2023.5102

Al-Maroof, R. S., Salloum, S. A., Hassanien, A. E., & Shaalan, K. (2023). Fear of COVID-19 and technology adoption: The impact of Google Meet during the coronavirus pandemic. Interactive Learning Environments, 31(3), 1293–1308. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1830121

Aristovnik, A., Keržič, D., Ravšelj, D., Tomaževič, N., & Umek, L. (2020). Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the lives of higher education students: A global perspective. Sustainability, 12(20), 8438. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12208438

Barrot, J. S., Llenares, I. I., & Del Rosario, L. S. (2021). Students' online learning challenges during the pandemic and how they cope with them: The case of the Philippines. Education and information technologies, 26(6), 7321-7338. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10589-x

Batanero-Ochaíta, C., De-Marcos, L., Rivera, L. F., Holvikivi, J., Hilera, J. R., & Tortosa, S. O. (2021). Improving Accessibility in Online Education: Comparative Analysis of Attitudes of Blind and Deaf Students Toward an Adapted Learning Platform. IEEE Access, 9, 99968–99982. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3095041

Canuto-Penrad, J., & Bayog, R. (2023). Features of Google Classroom: Perceived Usefulness by Intermediate Teachers and Learners. Available at SSRN 4491095. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4491095

Casad, Bettina & Franks, Jillian & Garasky, Christina & Kittleman, Melinda & Roesler, Alanna & Hall, Deidre & Petzel, Zachary. (2020). Gender inequality in academia: Problems and solutions for women faculty in STEM. Journal of Neuroscience Research. 99. 10.1002/jnr.24631. https://doi.org/10.1002/jnr.24631

Castro-Guzmán, W. (2021). Challenges of Professional Development for Technology Integration in Higher Education. Cuadernos de Investigación Educativa, 12(2), 82–99. https://doi.org/10.18861/cied.2021.12.2.3090

Chang, D. F., & ChangTzeng, H. C. (2020). Patterns of gender parity in the humanities and STEM programs: The trajectory under the expanded higher education system. Studies in Higher Education, 45(6), 1108-1120. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1550479

Dario, N., Mollo, M., Savarese, G., & Carpinelli, L. (2024, January). Through teachers' eyes: adaptability and transformations in their practices and relationship with students during

COVID-19 pandemic. In Frontiers in Education (Vol. 8, p. 1322103). Frontiers Media SA. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1322103

Debbyanti, L., & Subekti, A. (2022). Google Classroom in Indonesian EFL Classes: Voices from High School Teachers and Students. International Journal of Humanity Studies (IJHS), 6, 95–108. https://doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.v6i1.5052

Eka Selvia, Devi & Suri, Indah. (2022). Teacher Problems in Implementing Google Classroom. Al-Tadzkiyyah: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam. 13. 77-86. 10.24042/atjpi.v13i1.10295. https://doi.org/10.24042/atjpi.v13i1.10295

Harjanto, A. S., & Sumarni, S. (2019). Teachers' Experiences on the Use of Google Classroom. English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings, 3, 172–178. https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/ELLIC/article/view/4704

Huang, T. H., Liu, F., Chen, L. C., & Tsai, C. C. (2021). The acceptance and impact of Google Classroom integrating into a clinical pathology course for nursing students: A technology acceptance model approach. PloS one, 16(3), e0247819. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0247819

Husain, N. M., Musa, N. F. H., & Adnan, M. H. M. (2021, November). Teachers' Acceptance and Readiness in Using Google Classroom in Secondary Schools in Malaysia. In International Conference on Business and Technology (pp. 967-978). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08090-6_62

Jaca, C. A. L. (2022). Students' Online Class Experiences Using Google Classroom Amidst the Covid-19 Pandemic. Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science Journal, 3(1), 58-68. https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v3i1.409

Kassim, W. Z. W. (2024). Google Classroom: Malaysian University Students' attitudes towards its use as learning management system. Brazilian Journal of Development, 10(1), 207-223. https://doi.org/10.34117/bjdv10n1-015

Keržič, D., Danko, M., Zorko, V., & Dečman, M. (2021). The effect of age on higher education teachers' ICT use. Knowledge Management & E-Learning, 13(2), 182. https://doi.org/10.34105/j.kmel.2021.13.010

Krumsvik, R. J., Jones, L. Ø., Øfstegaard, M., & Eikeland, O. J. (2016). Upper Secondary School Teachers' Digital Competence: Analysed by Demographic, Personal and Professional Characteristics. Nordic Journal of Digital Literacy, 11(3), 143–164. https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.1891-943x-2016-03-02

Kumar, J. A., & Bervell, B. (2019). Google Classroom for mobile learning in higher education: Modelling the initial perceptions of students. Education and Information Technologies, 24(2), 1793-1817. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-018-09858-z

Gelisan, L. A., Mangubat, L. J., & Medina, A. K. O. (2024). Webinars as an Alternative to Traditional Face-to-Face Teaching in High School: Benefits, Challenges, and Issues.

ASEAN Journal of Open and Distance Learning (AJODL), 15(2), 10–23. https://ajodl.oum.edu.my/document/Current/02. Webinars as an Alternative.pdf

McBurney, D. H., & White, T. L. (2009). Research methods (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Mensah, I. K., Zeng, G., Luo, C., Lu, M., & Xiao, Z. W. (2022). Exploring the e-learning adoption intentions of college students amidst the COVID-19 epidemic outbreak in China. SAGE Open, 12(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221086629

Mensah, I. K., Zeng, G., Luo, C., Lu, M., & Xiao, Z. W. (2022). Exploring the E-learning adoption intentions of college students amidst the COVID-19 epidemic outbreak in China. Sage Open, 12(2), 21582440221086629. https://doi.org/10.1177/215824402210866

Miscevic, Gordana & Bujišić, Ljiljana. (2023). Искуства учитеља о предностима и недостацима коришћења Гугл учионице TEACHERS' EXPERIENCES REGARDING THE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF GOOGLE CLASSROOM. https://plus-legacy.cobiss.net/cobiss/sr/en/bib/138733577

Ningsih, Dian. (2021). Teacher Constraints in Preparing Lesson Plan through Google Classroom at SMA Negeri 1 Kediri: A Qualitative Study. Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies. 4. 10.23887/jlls.v4i1.34663. https://doi.org/10.23887/jlls.v4i1.34663

Patayon, U. B., & Crisostomo, R. V. (2022, October). Time Series Analysis on Enrolment Data: A case in a State University in Zamboanga del Norte, Philippines. In 2022 International Conference on Advanced Computer Science and Information Systems (ICACSIS) (pp. 13-18). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICACSIS56558.2022.9923436

Piaralal, S., Mohd Tahir, M. H., Adnan, A., Mohamad Shah, D., & Ya Shak, M. (2023). The Use of Google Classroom Among Secondary School Teachers. JONUS, 8, 310–332. https://doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol8iss1pp310-332

Prestoza, M. J. (2024). Assessing remote learning's feasibility: A comprehensive analysis of Philippine public-school teachers' use of learning management systems and blended learning. Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers and Teacher Education, 13(2), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.37134/jrpptte.vol14.1.3.2024

Prihaswati, M., Mawarsari, V. D., & Winaryati, E. (2020). Applying google classroom based on prospective teacher. In Journal of Physics: Conference Series (Vol. 1446, No. 1, p. 012050). IOP Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1446/1/012050.

Rahmawati, B. F. (2020, May). Learning by Google Classroom in students' perception. In Journal of Physics: Conference Series (Vol. 1539, No. 1, p. 012048). IOP Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1539/1/012048?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate.net%26utm_medium%3Darticle

Romero, Cristóbal & Ventura, Sebastian. (2020). Educational Data Mining and Learning Analytics: An Updated Survey. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery. 10.1002/widm.1355. https://doi.org/10.1002/widm.1355

Salam, U. (2020). The students' use of Google Classroom in learning English. JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia), 9(4), 628-6. https://doi.org/10.23887/jpi-undiksha.v9i4.27163

Staddon, R. V. (2020). Bringing technology to the mature classroom: age differences in use and attitudes. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 17(1), 11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00184-4

Sublett, C., & Tovar, J. (2021). Community College Career and Technical Education and Labor Market Projections: A National Study of Alignment. Community College Review, 49(2), 177-201. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552120982008

Suhroh, F., & Cahyono, B. (2021). The Perspective of Indonesian Teachers on the Google Classroom Usage in Blended Teaching. Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, dan Pengembangan, 5, 1495. https://doi.org/10.17977/jptpp.v5i10.14139

Syafi'i, A. (2020). Google Classroom as learning platform in teaching writing. British (Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra Inggris), 9(1), 48–64. https://dx.doi.org/10.31314/british.9.1.48-64.2020

Xhaferi, B., & Xhaferi, G. (2020). Online learning benefits and challenges during the COVID 19-pandemic-students' perspective from SEEU. Seeu Review, 15(1), 86–103. https://doi.org/10.2478/seeur-2020-0006?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate.net%26utm_medium%3Darticle

Yi, S., & Duval-Couetil, N. (2021). Interdisciplinary entrepreneurship education: Exploring 10-year trends in student enrollment, interest and motivation. Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy, 4(2), 100-118. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127420979195

Yu, Z. (2021). The effects of gender, educational level, and personality on online learning outcomes during the COVID-19 pandemic. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 18(1), 14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00252-3

Zack, L. (2020). Non-traditional students at public regional universities: A case study. Teacher-Scholar: The Journal of the State Comprehensive University, 9(1), 1. http://doi.org/10.58809/FXDX3287

Zuñiga-Tonio, J. (2021). Google Classroom as a tool of support for flexible learning in the new normal. Journal of Education, Management and Development Studies, 1(2), 25–39. https://doi.org/10.52631/jemds.v1i2.20