Linguistics and English Language Teaching Journal
Vol. 14, No 1, June 2026
ISSN: 2339-2940
E-ISSN: 2614-8633

Google Classroom As A Writing Learning Medium: Its Effect on EFL Students' Writing Skills and Perceptions at UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten

Siti Maeva[a,1], Amaliah Qurrotun Aini[b,2*], Riwi Peraga Yanti[c,3], Nafan Tarihoran[d,4]

[a,b,c,d] *UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten, Sukajaya, curug district, serang city 42171, Indonesia*
[1]*sitimaeva910@gmail.com*; [2]*amaliahqurrotun@gmail.com*[*]; [3]*Riwicomel@gmail.com*; [4]*nafan.tarihoran@uinbanten.ac.id*

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received: 24/4/2026
Revised: 17/6/2026
Accepted: 19/6/2026

Keywords:
Google Classroom;
Writing abilities;
Perspectives of students;
EFL;
Quantitative study

ABSTRACT

The growing adoption of digital learning platforms in higher education has prompted questions about their actual impact on language learning outcomes and student experience. This study investigates the effect of Google Classroom on EFL students' writing skills and their perceptions of the platform within a single institutional context. Using a descriptive quantitative approach with a 20-item Likert-scale questionnaire as the primary instrument, data were collected from undergraduate students in the English Education Department (TBI) at UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten who had directly experienced writing instruction through Google Classroom. Results indicate that students generally view the platform favorably in terms of administrative functions particularly assignment submission, task management, and access to materials but reveal a notable gap between operational ease and deeper learning outcomes. While feedback effectiveness scored highest among writing-related indicators (M = 3.79), motivational and confidence-related indicators remained comparatively low, suggesting that technical accessibility alone does not translate into intrinsic writing development. These findings highlight the need to integrate Google Classroom not merely as a logistical tool but as part of a broader, pedagogically intentional writing instruction framework.

I. Introduction

The rapid expansion of digital learning technologies has fundamentally altered how language skills are taught and practiced, particularly in contexts where English functions as a foreign language. Among the competencies that EFL learners are expected to develop, writing stands out as one of the most cognitively demanding. Unlike speaking, writing requires sustained attention to structure, coherence, genre conventions, and revision skills that are difficult to cultivate without consistent practice and timely, targeted feedback. The emergence of Learning Management Systems (LMS) such as Google Classroom has offered educators a practical infrastructure for managing these processes: distributing tasks, facilitating submission workflows, providing feedback, and monitoring student progress over time.

Against this backdrop, Google Classroom has gained considerable traction in Indonesian higher education, particularly during and after the COVID-19 pandemic, when face-to-face instruction was temporarily suspended. At institutions like UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten, the platform became not just a supplement but often the primary medium through which writing instruction was delivered. What remains less understood, however, is how EFL students in this specific institutional context actually experience and benefit from that arrangement whether Google Classroom genuinely supports their growth as writers, or whether it functions more as an administrative convenience without substantive learning impact.

Existing research has produced generally optimistic findings regarding Google Classroom's role in EFL writing education. [1] [2]have documented improvements in language accuracy, organizational quality, and overall writing coherence among students who received instruction through the platform. [3]found that students taught via Google Classroom outperformed peers in traditional

ISSN: 2339-2940
E-ISSN: 2614-8633

settings on measures of grammar and general writing quality. [2] reported favorable student perceptions of the platform's usability and accessibility. More recently,linked Google Classroom's feedback and revision features to improved writing outcomes.

However, a notable gap persists in this body of literature. Most prior studies have treated writing achievement and student perceptions as separate lines of inquiry, rarely examining them simultaneously within a single study. Furthermore, few have been conducted specifically with students enrolled in English Education programs at Indonesian Islamic universities, where institutional, linguistic, and sociocultural factors may shape how digital tools are received and used. This study is designed to address that gap by investigating both dimensions effect on writing skills and student perceptions within the particular context of TBI students at UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten.

This study therefore aims to examine how Google Classroom affects EFL students' writing skills and how students perceive the platform in the context of writing instruction. Two research questions guide the investigation: (1) How do TBI students at UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten perceive the use of Google Classroom in their writing courses? and (2) To what extent does Google Classroom affect students' perceived writing skill development? By addressing these questions, the study aims to contribute nuanced, context-specific insights that can inform the pedagogical integration of educational technology in Indonesian EFL settings.

II. Method

a. Research Design

This study adopts a descriptive quantitative approach. The intention from the outset was not to test a causal relationship through experimental manipulation, but to obtain a structured, numerical account of students' experiences with Google Classroom in their writing courses specifically, how they perceive the platform and the extent to which they feel it has contributed to their writing development. A survey-based design was therefore chosen as the most appropriate method for collecting this kind of self-reported data from multiple participants in a time-efficient manner. The decision to frame the study as a case study of TBI students at UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten reflects an intention to draw contextually specific conclusions rather than generalizable ones, acknowledging that students' experiences with educational technology are shaped by their particular institutional and linguistic environment.

It is important to clarify the relationship between the quantitative design and the survey method, as these are often conflated in educational research. Quantitative refers here to the analytical orientation: data are measured numerically and described using statistical summaries such as means, standard deviations, and percentages. The survey, meanwhile, refers to the data collection instrument and procedure a structured questionnaire administered to a defined group of participants. The two are complementary rather than synonymous: the survey produces the data, and the quantitative approach determines how those data are organized, analyzed, and interpreted.

b. Research Setting and Participants

The study was conducted at the English Education Department (TBI), UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten. Participants were undergraduate students who had completed at least one writing course delivered through Google Classroom. Purposive sampling was used to ensure that all participants had direct, relevant experience with the platform in a writing instruction context. Inclusion criteria required that participants be actively enrolled in the English Education program, have used Google Classroom in at least one writing-focused course, and be willing to participate voluntarily. This sampling approach, while limiting generalizability, ensures that the data reflect informed experience rather than familiarity with the platform in name only.

c. Research Instrument

The primary instrument was a 20-item structured questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The instrument was developed by reviewing existing scales on educational technology perception [1] [4]and EFL writing skill development [5], then adapting items to align with the specific research questions and institutional context of the study.

ISSN: 2339-2940
E-ISSN: 2614-8633

The questionnaire was organized into two thematic sections. The first section (ten items) addressed students' perceptions of Google Classroom across five dimensions: ease of use, difficulty of navigation, accessibility of materials, clarity of instructions, and comfort during use. The second section (ten items) focused on writing skill development as perceived by students, covering areas such as frequency of writing practice, quality of feedback received, motivation to write, confidence in writing, and ability to identify and revise errors. Each section thus directly corresponds to one of the study's research questions, ensuring that the instrument remains aligned with the research aims.

Content validity was established by mapping each questionnaire item against the relevant theoretical constructs and confirming alignment with existing validated instruments. Expert review involving two EFL lecturers familiar with writing pedagogy and educational technology was conducted to assess item clarity, relevance, and appropriateness before the questionnaire was finalized. Internal consistency was subsequently confirmed through Pearson Product-Moment Correlation analysis, with all items meeting the established validity threshold ($r > r\text{-table}$; $p < 0.05$), indicating that the instrument reliably measures the constructs it was designed to capture.

d. Data Collection Procedure

The questionnaire was distributed online via Google Forms. Prior to distribution, a brief explanation of the study's purpose and procedures was provided to all potential participants. Participation was explicitly voluntary, and respondents were informed that their answers would remain confidential and would be used solely for academic purposes. The questionnaire link was shared through communication channels commonly used within the department. Participants were given adequate time to complete the form independently, without the presence of the researcher during the process, in order to minimize social desirability bias.

It should be noted that this study did not involve an instructional treatment or intervention. Participants responded to the questionnaire based on their existing experiences with Google Classroom in previous and ongoing writing courses. As such, the study is descriptive in nature rather than experimental: it captures students' current perceptions and self-assessments rather than measuring pre-post changes resulting from a controlled intervention.

e. Data Analysis Technique

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the collected data. For each questionnaire item, mean scores and standard deviations were calculated to indicate the central tendency and variability of responses. Response distributions were additionally categorized into three groups positive (scores of 4–5), neutral (score of 3), and negative (scores of 1–2) to provide an accessible summary of response tendencies across items. Results are organized by research question: Section 4.1 presents findings related to students' perceptions of Google Classroom (RQ2), and Section 4.2 presents findings related to the platform's perceived effect on writing skills (RQ1). This structure ensures that the data presentation remains consistent with both the research aims and the instrument design.

f. Validity of the Instrument

The questionnaire was created based on accepted ideas and earlier research on EFL writing and technology integration in order to guarantee the validity of the tool. By matching each item to the research variables and aims, content validity was attained. Experts or instructors could also examine the questionnaire to make sure it is acceptable, relevant, and clear.

III. Results and Discussion

a. Students' Perceptions of Google Classroom

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for the ten perception-related items, organized around five dimensions: ease of use, accessibility of materials, instruction clarity, task management, and overall user comfort.

Table 1. Students Perceptions of Google Classroom

Indicators	Average (mean)	Standar Deviation	Percentage of Positive	Percentage of Neutral	Percentage of Negative

ISSN: 2339-2940
E-ISSN: 2614-8633

			Respond	Respond	Respond
Ease of use	3,79	0,87	71%	20%	9%
Difficulty of use	2,84	1,02	27%	26%	47%
Ease of accessing materials	3,69	0,79	63%	30%	7%
Level of user confusion	2,89	0,96	27%	34%	39%
Clarity of instructions	3,64	0,82	64%	30%	13%
Ease of submitting assignments	4,06	0,72	80%	19%	1%
Complexity of use	2,79	1,03	54%	24%	3%
Task management	3,76	0,77	64%	31%	4%
User comfort	2,73	3,70	26%	26%	49%
Feature support for learning	3,70	0,73	60%	37%	3%

The most striking finding from Table 1 is the disproportionate strength of administrative indicators relative to experiential or psychological ones. The ease of submitting assignments recorded the highest mean score in the entire perception section (M = 4.06, SD = 0.72), with 80% of respondents providing a positive rating a figure that stands well above every other item. Task management (M = 3.76) and ease of accessing materials (M = 3.69) were similarly strong, indicating that students have largely internalized Google Classroom's workflow for organizing and submitting academic work. Together, these three indicators paint a coherent picture: the platform succeeds in removing the procedural friction that often interferes with academic participation.

What complicates this picture, however, is the sharp contrast between these functional ratings and the responses associated with comfort and intuitive usability. User comfort returned the lowest mean score in the entire section (M = 2.73, SD = 3.70), with nearly half of respondents (49%) expressing dissatisfaction a striking contrast to the confidence students show when navigating submissions. Difficulty of use (M = 2.84) and level of user confusion (M = 2.89) also returned below-midpoint scores, suggesting that students distinguish clearly between knowing how to complete a specific task on the platform and feeling at ease within it as a learning environment.

This finding echoes a well-documented tension in educational technology research: functional proficiency does not necessarily imply a sense of belonging or psychological comfort within a digital learning space [1]. Students may have learned to operate Google Classroom efficiently precisely because their academic requirements demanded it without developing the deeper familiarity that would make the platform feel like a natural extension of their learning. This distinction matters pedagogically. When students interact with a platform out of procedural necessity rather than genuine engagement, the risk is that their participation remains surface-level, focused on task completion rather than on learning. The implication for instructors is that functional orientation to a platform is not sufficient; students also need deliberate scaffolding that helps them feel competent and comfortable in a digital learning environment, not merely capable of meeting its technical demands.

b. The Perceived Effect of Google Classroom on Writing Skills

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for the ten writing-related items, covering perceived skill improvement, feedback effectiveness, motivation, confidence, and revision behavior.

Table 2. Perceived Effect of Google Classroom on Writing Skills

Indicators	Avarage (mean)	Standar Deviation	Percentage of Positive Respond	Percentage of Neutral Respond	Percentage of Negative Respond

ISSN: 2339-2940
E-ISSN: 2614-8633

Improvement in writing skills	3,53	0,85	30%	44%	9%
No improvement in writing skills	3,01	0,96	47%	36%	34%
Frequency of writing practice	3,46	0,85	23%	43%	10%
Motivation to write	2,79	0,96	57%	30%	47%
Writing practice through assignments	3,59	0,75	61%	36%	7%
Effectiveness of feedback	3,79	0,83	57%	34%	4%
Identification and correction of errors	3,61	0,79	27%	36%	7%
Difficulty revising writing	2,93	1,03	40%	39%	34%
Confidence in writing	3,47	0,79	27%	54%	27%
Attention to feedback	3,14	0,97	40%	44%	23%

Among writing-related indicators, feedback effectiveness emerged as the strongest single variable (M = 3.79, SD = 0.83), closely followed by identification and correction of errors (M = 3.61) and writing practice through assignments (M = 3.59). These three items cluster together logically: the platform provides writing tasks, enables feedback delivery, and creates opportunities for error correction forming a rudimentary feedback-revision cycle that students appear to value. This aligns with established findings in second language writing research, which consistently identify timely, actionable feedback as one of the most influential factors in writing development [2], [3], [6].

What is more difficult to explain and arguably more important is the collapse in motivation-related indicators. Motivation to write returned a mean of just 2.79, with 47% of respondents registering a negative response. This is the lowest and most concerning figure in the writing section, because motivation is not a peripheral variable in writing development; it is a foundational one. If students are practicing writing and receiving feedback through Google Classroom, yet not feeling motivated to write, the platform is functioning as a compliance mechanism rather than a developmental one. Students are responding to the rhythm of assignment submission and correction without internalizing a greater drive to improve as writers.

Confidence in writing (M = 3.47) reflects a similar stagnation: 54% of respondents remained neutral, suggesting that even students who acknowledge some improvement in their writing skills have not translated that into increased self-assurance. This pattern is consistent with describe as a disconnect between behavioral engagement and affective engagement in EFL writing contexts students may participate actively in writing tasks while remaining internally detached from the goal of becoming better writers[7]. The implication here is not that Google Classroom is ineffective, but that its effectiveness is bounded. It performs well as a mechanism for delivering practice opportunities and facilitating feedback exchange; it does not, on its own, generate the motivational conditions under which writers develop a genuine sense of authorship and confidence.

Taken together, the two sets of findings reveal a platform that occupies a comfortable functional niche without fully addressing the psychological dimensions of writing development. Google Classroom works well as an organizer of writing activity; it works less well as a catalyst for writing identity. This has direct implications for how instructors design their courses around the platform. Simply using Google Classroom to distribute prompts and receive submissions a pattern that may characterize much current practice is unlikely to produce the affective outcomes that underpin sustainable writing improvement. What appears to be needed is a more intentional pedagogical layer: practices that use the platform's

ISSN: 2339-2940
E-ISSN: 2614-8633

feedback infrastructure as a starting point for richer instructor-student dialogue, peer collaboration, and metacognitive reflection on the writing process.

Subsequently, previous research has shown that Google Classroom can increase learning efficiency through functional yet simple features, such as material engagement, gathering task, and straightforward feedback [1], [4]. In addition, the flexibility of access provided by this platform allows students to learn whenever and wherever they choose, increasing their participation in the learning process[8]. Not all indicators show results that are consistently positive. A few factors, such as ease of use, degree of user perplexity, and user comfort, continue to indicate a high negative response rate. This indicates that many srudents still struggle with using Google Classroom, either because they don't fully understand the features available or because they aren't familiar with the technology-based learning system.

In addition, research indicates that the lack of digital literacy and the difficulty of using technology are two major factors that reduce the effectiveness of courageous education[8], [7]. According to [9], the complexity of features on digital platforms can also increase user satisfaction, especially for those who are still in the process of adjusting. Because of this, learning strategies and mentoring must be more flexible in order for students to use Google Classroom as effectively as possible.

According to the results of the study, Google Classroom has a very positive impact on the writing learning process. This is evident from indicators such as writing practice through assignments, the effectiveness of feedback, and the discovery and correction of faults that indicate a positive response. This indicates that students have more opportunities to write in a routine manner and obtain feedback that can help them improve the quality of their writing. Subsequently, research indicates that the use of digital technology in language learning can improve students' writing quality through the use of quicker, more efficient, and more thorough feedback [3], [10]. According to Laili and Muflihah [1] and Sukmawati and Nensia [2], using Google Classroom can also help students improve their language skills, such as language proficiency, concept organization, and writing coherence. Nevertheless, not all indicators produce optimal results. Some aspects, such as enhanced writing abilities, writing motivation, and writing confidence, are nonetheless dominated by negative and neutral responses. This indicates that even while students are actively engaged in writing activities, they do not always exhibit significant increases in their writing abilities or strong motivation.

Subsequently, research indicates that the increase in writing skills is not only affected by educational media but also by internal factors such as motivation, motivation, and learning strategies used by students [11]. According to Carless and Boud [12] and Winstone et al. [13], feedback effectiveness also plays a significant role in helping students comprehend and apply the advice provided during the writing revision process.

Overall, the study's findings indicate that Google Classroom offers very important features for improving the learning process, particularly in terms of technical and managerial aspects. This platform is very effective in facilitating material distribution, collection task, and feedback distribution. However, Google Classroom is not yet able to increase the effectiveness of students, such as motivation and self-belief in writing. Because of this, the use of educational technology must be accompanied with appropriate pedagogical strategies in order to produce more ideal results. Technology just serves as a teaching tool that must be effectively integrated into the learning process [14].

In relation to the instrument testing, the findings of this study indicate that all questionnaire items are considered valid based on the validity test using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation technique. This validity test aims to determine whether the research instrument is capable of collecting data in accordance with the variables under investigation. According to this method, an item is considered valid if the correlation coefficient between the item score and the total score is higher than the r-table value or if the significance level (p-value) is less than 0.05. In addition, the Product Moment method is also used in quantitative research since it has a high degree of accuracy in evaluating the consistency of items in research instruments [15].

ISSN: 2339-2940
E-ISSN: 2614-8633

As a consequence, all of the questionnaire's items meet the validity standards according to the analysis's findings, making this research tool suitable and practical for data collecting. This shows that every statement item is in line with the research goals and can measure the desired constructs effectively. A valid instrument is one that can accurately and consistently capture the study variables by demonstrating that the correlation between each item and the overall score has satisfied the necessary standards. As a result, the questionnaire employed in this study has proven to have strong construct validity and is appropriate for assisting with the research process.

Additionally, the fact that the validity requirements were met suggests that the study's data are reliable and trustworthy for further analysis and interpretation. A valid instrument minimizes potential measurement errors and ensures that the results accurately reflect respondents' perspectives or experiences [15]. Furthermore, validity plays a crucial role in determining whether a research instrument measures what it is intended to measure, thereby improving the accuracy of the conclusions drawn. Therefore, the validated questionnaire used in this study provides a strong foundation for generating reliable and meaningful research findings.

Ultimately, this study provides a compelling snapshot of how technology functions within an EFL classroom, specifically of TBI students at UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten. If one were to draw a single common thread, it is that Google Classroom has successfully fulfilled its role as an exceptionally effective "administrative assistant". Students no longer face significant hurdles in the technicalities of submitting assignment or accesing course materials, which operationally creates a much better sense of academic order than conventional methods. This seamlessness serves as strong foundation, considering that technical efficiency is often the primary barrier to the adoption of educational technology.

However, these findings also prompt an important reflection: sophisticated features do not automatically transform the psychological state of students in the learning to write process. There appears to be a thin wall between "the ability to use a tool" and "comfort within the learning process." The low scores in users comfort, alongside writing motivation that has not been significantly boosted, suggest that the presence of Google Classroom has only touched the mechanical surface. Students may be adept at revising their work based on effective digital feedback, but they do not necessarily feel more confident or more passionate about the act of writing itself. This proves that while rapid feedback and practical features do improve the quality of a manuscript, they do not inherently improve the mentality of the writer.

Google Classroom remains an invaluable instrument in modern English education due to its ability to facilitate systematics and routine writing practice. Neverthelees, moving forward, the integration of such technology cannot stand alone. Instructors need to complement the platform's technical convenience with more humanistic pedagogical strategies approaches that move beyond a simple "upload-correct-download" cycle to focus on building students' self-assurance and internal drive. Technology is merely a vessel; the soul of writing instruction still lies in meaningful interaction and motivational support that transcends digital comment boxes.

VI. Conclusion

This study set out to examine the effect of Google Classroom on EFL students' writing skills and their perceptions of the platform, situated in the specific context of the English Education Department at UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten. The findings converge on a single, nuanced conclusion: Google Classroom is a functionally effective tool that has not yet realized its potential as a writing development environment.

In response to the first research question, students perceived the most tangible effect of Google Classroom in areas directly connected to feedback and structured practice indicators of effectiveness of feedback (M = 3.79), assignment-based practice (M = 3.59), and error identification and correction (M = 3.61) all returned relatively strong scores. However, deeper indicators of writing growth motivation (M = 2.79) and confidence (M = 3.47, with 54% neutral) remained comparatively low, suggesting that the platform supports the mechanics of writing practice without necessarily cultivating

ISSN: 2339-2940
E-ISSN: 2614-8633

the internal orientations that drive long-term development. In response to the second research question, students' perceptions were sharply split between appreciation for the platform's administrative efficiency (task submission: M = 4.06) and discomfort with its broader use as a learning environment (user comfort: M = 2.73, with 49% negative).

These findings contribute to the literature in two specific ways. First, they add to the growing body of evidence suggesting that functional adoption of an LMS does not automatically produce affective learning gains a distinction that has implications for institutions planning or evaluating technology-mediated instruction. Second, they provide context-specific data from an Indonesian Islamic university, a setting that has been underrepresented in EFL technology research despite its significant student population.

This study is not without limitations. The reliance on self-reported perception data means that the findings reflect how students believe Google Classroom has affected their writing, not necessarily documented writing improvement measured against external criteria. The purposive sample, while appropriate for the study's descriptive aims, limits generalizability. Future research would benefit from incorporating pre- and post-test writing assessments alongside perception surveys, enabling a more rigorous examination of the relationship between platform use and measurable writing outcomes. Longitudinal designs and qualitative follow-up interviews would further illuminate why motivational and confidence-related indicators remain low even when students engage consistently with the platform's feedback features.

In practical terms, the study suggests that instructors should not rely on Google Classroom's structural affordances alone to drive writing development. The platform's feedback and submission infrastructure provides a useful scaffold, but meaningful writing growth particularly in terms of motivation and confidence requires pedagogical strategies that go beyond logistical convenience: strategies that foster dialogue, reward revision as a process rather than a product, and create space for students to develop a sense of themselves as writers.

References

[1] E. N. Laili and T. Muflihah, “the Effectiveness of Google Classroom in Teaching Writing of Recount Text for Senior High Schools,” *J. Lang. Lang. Teach.*, vol. 8, no. 4, p. 348, 2020, doi: 10.33394/jollt.v8i4.2929.

[2] S. Sukmawati and N. Nensia, “The Role of Google Classroom in ELT,” *Int. J. Educ. Vocat. Stud.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 142–145, 2019, doi: 10.29103/ijevs.v1i2.1526.

[3] A. M. Idris, M. Z. Ul Haq, and M. A. Setiadi, “the Effect of Writing Features of Google Classroom Usage on Students Writing Ability for Narrative Text Materials,” *J. Comput. Interact. Educ.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 70–81, 2023, doi: 10.56983/jcie.v6i2.533.

[4] Marzuki, U. Widiati, D. Rusdin, Darwin, and I. Indrawati, “The impact of AI writing tools on the content and organization of students’ writing: EFL teachers’ perspective,” *Cogent Educ.*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2023, doi: 10.1080/2331186X.2023.2236469.

[5] V. Zhang and K. Hyland, “Fostering student engagement with feedback: An integrated approach,” *Assess. Writ.*, vol. 51, p. 100586, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2021.100586.

[6] K. Ansong-Gyimah, “Students’ perceptions and continuous intention to use elearning systems: The case of google classroom,” *Int. J. Emerg. Technol. Learn.*, vol. 15, no. 11, pp. 236–244, 2020, doi: 10.3991/IJET.V15I11.12683.

[7] M. Fareed, A. Ashraf, and M. Bilal, “ESL Learners’ Writing Skills: Problems, Factors and Suggestions,” *J. Educ. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 83–94, 2016, doi: 10.20547/jess0421604201.

[8] H. Taherdoost, “Validity and Reliability of the Research Instrument; How to Test the Validation of a Questionnaire/Survey in a Research,” *SSRN Electron. J.*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 28–36, 2018, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3205040.

[9] Mike Okmawati, “the Use of Google Classroom During Pandemic,” *J. English Lang. Teach.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 438–443, 2020.

[10] S. Getenet, R. Cantle, P. Redmond, and P. Albion, “Students’ digital technology attitude, literacy and self-efficacy and their effect on online learning engagement,” *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.*, vol. 21, no. 1, 2024, doi: 10.1186/s41239-023-00437-y.

[11] R. Jawabreh, İ. Danju, and S. Salha, “Quality of pre-school learning environment in

ISSN: 2339-2940
E-ISSN: 2614-8633

palestine," *Univers. J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 8, no. 10, pp. 4769–4775, 2020, doi: 10.13189/ujer.2020.081048.

[12] D. Carless and D. Boud, "The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback," *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.*, vol. 43, no. 8, pp. 1315–1325, 2018, doi: 10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354.

[13] N. Winstone, R. Nash, M. Parker, and J. Rowntree, "Supporting Learners' Agentic Engagement With Feedback: A Systematic Review and a Taxonomy of Recipience Processes," *Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 52, pp. 1–21, 2017, doi: 10.1080/00461520.2016.1207538.

[14] A. H. Albashtawi and K. B. Al Bataineh, "The effectiveness of google classroom among EFL students in Jordan: An innovative teaching and learning online platform," *Int. J. Emerg. Technol. Learn.*, vol. 15, no. 11, pp. 78–88, 2020, doi: 10.3991/IJET.V15I11.12865.

[15] A. E. P. Atmojo and A. Nugroho, "EFL Classes Must Go Online! Teaching Activities and Challenges during COVID-19 Pandemic in Indonesia," *Regist. J.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 49–76, 2020, doi: 10.18326/rgt.v13i1.49-76.