

EXPLORING GOOGLE CLASSROOM-BASED WRITING ASSESSMENT IN EFL CLASSROOMS: A LESSON FROM SEMI-RURAL INDONESIAN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

¹*Pratiwi Indah Sulistiyowati, ¹Djarmika, ¹Ngadiso

¹Master's Program in English Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,
Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

*Correspondence Author: pratiwiindahsulistiyowati@gmail.com

Article Info	Abstract
Article History Received: June 2026 Revised: August 2026 Accepted: September 2026 Published: October 2026	<i>Writing is a complex skill that requires learners to integrate ideas, language knowledge, and genre awareness. Providing formative feedback can be challenging in digitally constrained semi-rural school contexts, particularly when students have digital literacy and technological skills. This study aimed to explore (1) the aspects of writing assessed by the teacher, (2) the process of digital writing assessment through Google Classroom, and (3) students' responses to the assessment. The study employed an exploratory qualitative case-study design in a Grade VIII classroom at a semi-rural public junior high school in Central Java. Participants were one English teacher and fifteen students, five of whom participated in interviews. Data were collected over four weeks through classroom observations, interviews, document analysis, and Google Classroom records, supported by observation guidelines and interview protocols, and analyzed using thematic analysis. The findings revealed that the teacher employed an analytic, genre-based assessment covering content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics, with particular emphasis on recount-text structure and grammatical accuracy, especially the use of the Simple Past Tense. Google Classroom supported a systematic assessment process involving assignment distribution, rubric-based assessment, digital submission, teacher feedback, revision opportunities, and grading. Students responded positively, reporting greater motivation, engagement, responsibility, and perceived improvement in their writing. Despite technological and time constraints, teachers and students adapted collaboratively. The study suggests that digital writing assessment depends on technology, pedagogical strategies, formative feedback, and students' digital readiness.</i>
Keywords Digital writing assessment; Google classroom; Recount text; Formative assessment; Semi-rural schools;	

How to cite: Sulistiyowati, P.I., Djarmika, D., & Ngadiso, N. (2026). Exploring Google Classroom-Based Writing Assessment in EFL Classrooms: A Lesson from Semi-Rural Indonesian Junior High School, *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 14(4), 1223-1239. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.33394/joltt.v14i4.20963>

Copyright© 2026, Pratiwi Indah Sulistiyowati et al.
This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](#) License.



INTRODUCTION

Writing is widely recognized as one of the essential yet complex skills in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning. It requires learners to integrate ideas, construct meaning, and communicate messages through written language while simultaneously managing several linguistic and cognitive processes, including generating and organizing ideas, selecting appropriate vocabulary, applying grammatical rules, and maintaining mechanical accuracy (Becker, 1980; Odendahl et al., 2008). For many EFL learners, writing is particularly

challenging because it involves multidimensional processes that require both linguistic knowledge and cognitive control. Writing is also a social and purposeful process in which learners need to consider the purpose, audience, and conventions of particular genres (Ouafi, 2017). Therefore, effective writing instruction requires not only appropriate teaching strategies but also assessment practices that can help learners understand their strengths, identify areas for improvement, and progressively develop their writing.

In Indonesian junior high schools, writing instruction is closely related to genre-based learning, in which students are introduced to different types of texts and their communicative purposes. One commonly taught genre is recount text, which presents past events or experiences in a chronological sequence. Learning to write recount texts can help students express personal experiences and everyday events in an organized and meaningful way (Asror et al., 2024; Kurniawati, 2022; Sartika et al., 2022). However, teaching writing through genre-based instruction also requires appropriate assessment of multiple writing components, such as content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Previous studies have demonstrated that genre-based approaches can improve students' organization and coherence in writing (Mustika et al., 2021; Phạm & Bui, 2021; Silalahi & Siregar, 2021), while formative assessment and continuous feedback can support the development of different aspects of writing (Moussaoui, 2024; Nurhayati, 2020; Phuong et al., 2023). These findings indicate that writing assessment should be viewed not merely as a means of assigning grades but as an ongoing process that supports students' writing development.

The development of educational technology has created additional possibilities for formative writing assessment. Digital platforms such as Google Classroom can facilitate assignment distribution, digital submission, feedback, revision, and monitoring of students' learning progress (Albashtawi & Bataineh, 2020; Rosyada & Sundari, 2021; Yunus & Syafi'i, 2020). However, the availability of a digital platform does not automatically ensure effective assessment. Teachers may use Google Classroom primarily to distribute and collect assignments, while the ways in which assessment criteria are applied, feedback is provided, revisions are facilitated, and students engage with the assessment process may remain unclear. The effectiveness of digital writing assessment therefore depends on how technology is integrated into pedagogical and assessment practices rather than on the technology itself. In particular, systematic assessment criteria and meaningful formative feedback are important for ensuring that digital assessment contributes to writing development rather than functioning only as an administrative tool.

The issues become particularly relevant in semi-rural school contexts, where access to technological resources and digital learning experiences may be more limited than in well-resourced urban settings. Students in this context have relatively limited opportunities to use English outside the classroom and may have varying levels of access to digital devices, internet connectivity, and digital learning resources. Previous studies have identified technological access, internet connectivity, and digital literacy as continuing challenges in technology-integrated education, particularly in less-resourced school contexts (Afzal et al., 2023; Graves et al., 2021; Mustafa et al., 2024; Trust & Whalen, 2020). Consequently, implementing digital writing assessment in such a context may require teachers to provide additional guidance and students to develop strategies for managing both writing tasks and digital technologies.

Despite growing research on genre-based writing instruction, formative assessment, and digital learning platforms, an important gap remains in understanding how digital writing assessment operates as an everyday classroom process in semi-rural EFL settings. Previous studies have frequently focused on measurable writing outcomes, student motivation, or technology acceptance (Granić, 2022; Pan, 2020; Rosyada & Sundari, 2021; Wei, 2023)), often using quantitative or experimental approaches. Such studies provide valuable evidence

of outcomes but offer less insight into how teachers actually assess students' writing, which writing aspects they prioritize, how feedback and revision are managed, and how students respond to these practices in resource-constrained contexts. In particular, it remains unclear how assessment criteria, feedback, revision opportunities, and student engagement operate when digital assessment is implemented in a semi-rural school with varying levels of technological readiness. Therefore, this study addresses this gap by exploring digital writing assessment through Google Classroom. Specifically, it examines the aspects of writing assessed by the teacher, the process through which digital writing assessment is implemented, and students' responses to the assessment. By focusing on the interaction between assessment practices, digital technology, and the semi-rural classroom context, this study provides a contextualized understanding of how Google Classroom can be used not only for assignment administration but also to support formative writing assessment, feedback, revision, and student engagement.

Based on the identified problems and research gaps, this study investigates how digital writing assessment which examined five major aspects applied to recount text writing is implemented, conceptualized as a formative process, and also further explores the teacher's assessment procedures, feedback practices, revision opportunities, and pedagogical decisions, as well as students' perceptions, engagement, and challenges during the assessment process (Cahyani et al., 2025; Ghosh & Sen, 2023; Hadizadeh & Kanik, 2025; Ramadani & Melani, 2023). The novelty of this study lies in integrating these dimensions within a single classroom-based investigation. First, it examines Google Classroom as part of a formative writing-assessment cycle, encompassing assignment distribution, assessment, feedback, revision, and grading. Second, it examines this process in a semi-rural junior high school context, which remains less represented in research on digital writing assessment than urban schools and higher education settings. Third, it connects genre-based writing assessment with digital formative feedback, particularly in assessing students' recount-text writing.

The study is limited to Grade VIII students, recount-text writing, and Google Classroom as the primary digital assessment platform. Accordingly, it addresses the following research questions: 1) What aspects of writing does the teacher assess in students' recount-text writing? 2) How is digital writing assessment implemented through Google Classroom, particularly in relation to assessment procedures, feedback, revision, and grading? 3) How do students respond to the implementation of digital writing assessment through Google Classroom?.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

The exploratory qualitative case study design lets the researcher examine how writing assessment is carried out, which aspects teachers prioritize, and how students react, all within a real classroom setting. Unlike experimental or quantitative studies that emphasize outcomes, this approach focuses on processes, interactions, and the surrounding context (Almås et al., 2023; Kakar et al., 2023; Karunia, 2019). The study aims to describe, analyze, and interpret the implementation of recount text writing assessment through Google Classroom, providing rich and holistic insights into classroom practices. The research design lets the researcher examine how writing assessment is carried out, which aspects teachers prioritize, and how students react, all within a real classroom setting. Unlike experimental or quantitative studies that emphasize outcomes, this approach focuses on processes, interactions, and the surrounding context (Almås et al., 2023; Kakar et al., 2023; Karunia, 2019). The study seeks to describe, analyze, and interpret how recount-text writing assessment is implemented through Google Classroom, offering rich, holistic insights into everyday classroom practices.

Research Participants

This study was conducted at SMP Negeri 1 Jepon, Blora, Central Java, a semi-rural public junior high school using Google Classroom for English learning and writing assessment. The school and participants were purposively selected because they were relevant to the study of digital writing assessment in a semi-rural EFL context (Ahmad et al., 2024; Campbell et al., 2020). The participants were one English teacher and fifteen Grade VIII students from one intact classroom. The teacher was selected because they planned, implemented, assessed, and provided feedback on students' digital writing tasks. All fifteen students participated in classroom activities, and their writing assignments and relevant Google Classroom records were analyzed. Five of the fifteen students were purposively selected for in-depth interviews based on variation in writing achievement, Google Classroom participation, and willingness to participate. These five students represented a subset of the fifteen participants and provided varied perspectives on their experiences and challenges.

Instruments

This study used four qualitative instruments: a semi-structured interview protocol, observation checklist, document-analysis framework, and field notes, supported by Google Classroom records and audio recordings. The instruments were developed in line with the research questions and relevant writing and formative-assessment frameworks (Hadizadeh & Kanik, 2025; Taufiqullah et al., 2025). The interview protocol examined assessment practices and students' experiences, while the observation checklist focused on task implementation, teacher support, assessment, feedback, participation, and technology use. The document-analysis framework covered 15 students' recount-text submissions, rubrics, feedback, revisions, grades, and Google Classroom records. Field notes captured classroom interactions, contextual conditions, and technological issues. An English language education expert reviewed the instruments for alignment. Data were collected over four weeks through four 90-minute non-participant observations, analysis of students' writing and digital records, and interviews with the teacher and five purposively selected students. Interviews lasted 20-45 minutes and were audio-recorded with consent. These multiple data sources supported data triangulation.

Data Analysis

This study used thematic analysis proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006) as the primary analytical framework, supported by the interactive model of data analysis by Miles et al. (2018) (Miles et al., 2018; Ulbricht et al., 2024). The analysis began with verbatim transcription and repeated reading of interview transcripts, observation notes, documents, and Google Classroom records. Relevant data were then condensed according to the research questions and coded using inductive codes from the data and deductive codes based on the research questions and theoretical framework. The codes were grouped into categories and developed into broader themes concerning writing assessment, assessment procedures, feedback and revision, and students' responses. To support the thematic process, Miles et al.'s model was applied through data condensation, data display using matrices and thematic tables, and conclusion verification by comparing evidence across data sources. The emerging themes were reviewed against the original data and interpreted in relation to the research objectives and relevant literature. Triangulation and member checking were used to strengthen the credibility of the findings (Noble, H., & Heale, 2020).

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

The findings were obtained through document analysis of lesson plans (RPP), classroom observations, teacher interviews, and student interviews. The findings are

organized around the three research questions: (1) aspects of writing assessment, (2) the process of digital writing assessment, and (3) students' responses to digital writing assessment. To distinguish between intended and implemented assessment practices, lesson plans and assessment rubrics were treated as evidence of planned assessment, classroom and Google Classroom observations as evidence of implemented assessment, and teacher and student interviews as evidence of participants' perceptions and experiences. This distinction provides a clearer account of how digital writing assessment was planned, implemented, and experienced in the classroom.

Aspects of Writing Assessment in Digital Writing Assessment through Google Classroom

The findings from lesson plans, observations, and interviews showed that the teacher assessed content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics through Google Classroom. However, greater emphasis was placed on generic structure and grammatical accuracy, particularly the Simple Past Tense. This reflects an analytical writing assessment approach consistent with Jacobs et al. (Tiwari, 2023).

Lesson Plan

The analysis of the lesson plans showed that the teachers assessed several aspects of students' recount text writing, including content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. These aspects were explicitly stated in the learning objectives, assessment rubrics, and scoring indicators provided in the RPP. The lesson plans (RPP) explicitly stated that students were required to: *"Write a recount text about personal experiences by paying attention to the generic structure and language features correctly."*

This statement indicates that the assessment focused not only on students' ideas but also on rhetorical organization and linguistic accuracy. The rubric presented in the lesson plans included five assessment components: 1) Content, 2) Organization, 3) Grammar, 4) Vocabulary, 5) Mechanics. Here are some evidences from the Lesson Plan shows the aspects of writing learning well planned.

Table 2
Writing Recount Text Assessment Aspects (English Translated)

Writing Aspect	Evidence from the RPP
Content	<i>"Siswa mampu mengembangkan ide yang berkaitan dengan pengalaman pribadi."</i> "Students are able to develop ideas related to personal experiences."
Organization	<i>"Siswa menyusun teks recount menggunakan orientasi, rangkaian peristiwa, dan re-orientasi."</i> "Students arrange the recount text using orientation, events, and re-orientation."
Grammar	<i>"Siswa menggunakan simple past tense dengan tepat."</i> "Students use simple past tense appropriately."
Vocabulary	<i>"Siswa menggunakan kosakata dan kata kerja tindakan yang sesuai."</i> "Students use appropriate vocabulary and action verbs."
Mechanics	<i>"Siswa menerapkan ejaan dan tanda baca yang benar."</i> "Students apply correct spelling and punctuation."

Writing assessment in the recount-text lesson involved product assessment and written tests. Students produced factual recounts based on personal experiences and received teacher feedback, guidance, and opportunities to revise their texts. Assessment focused on recount structure, language features, particularly the Simple Past Tense, and clarity of information.

Students also interviewed classmates to develop ideas before writing. In addition, an end-of-unit written test assessed students' individual understanding of recount texts.

Table 3

Writing Recount Text Assessment Rubric (English Translated)

Assessment Aspect	Score	Scoring Criteria
Content	4	Highly relevant, detailed, and focused on personal experience.
	3	Relevant, but the details are less elaborated.
	2	Less relevant, and the story lacks focus.
	1	Not relevant to the topic.
Text Structure	4	Complete structure (<i>Orientation, Events, Reorientation</i>) with a very clear chronological order.
	3	Complete structure, but the flow is less smooth.
	2	Incomplete structure (e.g., missing <i>reorientation</i>).
	1	Disorganized structure.
Grammar	4	Very accurate use of <i>Past Tense</i> (<i>was/were</i>).
	3	Minor errors in past tense usage that do not interfere with meaning.
	2	Many past tense errors that interfere with comprehension.
	1	Completely incorrect grammar usage.
Vocabulary	2	Appropriate, varied, and descriptive word choices.
	1	Fair vocabulary choice, but lacks variation.

Based on the rubric above, it can be seen that the teacher emphasized students' ability to develop story content, organize the recount text systematically, use appropriate grammar, and choose appropriate vocabulary. This indicates that writing assessment was not only focused on linguistic accuracy but also on students' ability to organize ideas and communicate personal experiences clearly and coherently.

Observation data

Observations showed that the teacher strongly emphasized the generic structure of recount text consisting of orientation, events, and reorientation. During classroom instruction, the teacher repeatedly explained chronological organization before students began writing tasks. The observations also revealed frequent focus on organization and grammar during assessment. Observation findings also strengthened this result by showing that the teacher posted the assessment rubric directly in Google Classroom before students submitted their writing assignments. This was a clear transparency in the assessment process and helped students to understand the expected writing criteria. The rubric assessed five main aspects content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics and gave detailed performance descriptors for each, so students could clearly see the standards for good writing. For example, the content criterion emphasized idea relevance and supporting details, as shown in the rubric statement.

The organization criterion focused on the completeness and logical sequence of recount text components, *Orientation, Events, and Reorientation*. The grammar criterion emphasized the correct use of the Simple Past Tense throughout the text, while vocabulary and mechanics assessed lexical appropriateness and writing conventions. These findings show that the digital writing assessment balanced both higher-order writing skills (content and organization) and lower-order language skills (grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics), giving a rounded picture of students' writing ability.

Teacher Interview

Interviews with the teacher revealed that assessment of students' recount writing focused on a few key areas: content, organization, grammar, and vocabulary. The teacher said the grading stressed the recount's generic structure and correct use of grammatical features, especially the Simple Past Tense. The interview confirmed that grammar and the recount

structure were the primary focus of assessment. The teacher stated: *“The assessment aspects that I used were the structure of the recount text and the linguistic features, particularly the use of the past tense.”* The teacher also explained that the assessment rubric focused on students’ ability to organize past experiences chronologically and use correct verb forms: *“The writing assessment rubric for recount texts was focused on students’ ability to organize personal experiences using the Simple Past Tense.”*

Weighting also enhanced in students’ grammatical and content writing. This scoring rubric stated that grammar and content become main priority in this assessment process, as stated: *“The weighting should allocate a greater proportion to content and text organization, followed by grammar and vocabulary.”* Furthermore, the data show that the rubric was specifically adjusted to the characteristics of recount text. The assessment criteria followed the generic structure of recount text, *Orientation–Events–Reorientation*, and focused on the use of *Simple Past Tense*. As stated: *“The writing recount text assessment rubric is focused on students’ ability to organize personal experiences using the Simple Past Tense.”*

The findings indicate that digital writing assessment through Google Classroom employed *genre-based assessment principles*, putting linguistic features and rhetorical organization as the primary focus of evaluation. In addition, the teacher used an analytic rubric such as *content, structure, grammar, and vocabulary* with different scoring weights. This rubric showed that grammatical accuracy and idea development were treated as the most important aspects of students’ writing.

Students’ Interview

The student interview data also supported previous teacher interviews findings. Most students generally understood the assessment criteria. Most of them stated that criteria used are: 1) *generic structure*, 2) *verb 2 usage*, 3) *past tense*, and 4) *the use of was/were*. Student D explained: *“The aspects assessed by the teacher in writing were, first, the paragraph organization in the recount text or its generic structure. Second, the use of verbs in the past form. Third, the use of the to be forms ‘was’ and ‘were.’”*

The interview findings also revealed that students generally understood the assessment criteria because the teacher explained them before assigning writing tasks. Student L stated: *“I understood the assessment criteria because the teacher explained them before giving the assignment.”*

However, despite understanding the criteria, students still experienced difficulties related to grammar. The most common problems involved: 1) distinguishing verbal and nominal sentences, 2) applying Simple Past Tense, 3) using verb 2 correctly, and 4) using negative sentence patterns. Student L explained: *“In using negative sentences with ‘didn’t + verb 1,’ I sometimes wrote ‘didn’t + verb 2.’”* Overall, the findings indicate that digital writing assessment through Google Classroom emphasized genre-based writing competence by focusing on rhetorical organization and linguistic accuracy. Grammar, particularly the use of Simple Past Tense, became the dominant aspect assessed by the teacher.

The Process of Digital Writing Assessment through Google Classroom

The findings showed that digital writing assessment was conducted systematically through Google Classroom. The platform was used for 1) *distributing tasks*, 2) *providing instructions*, 3) *collecting assignments*, 4) *monitoring submissions*, 5) *scoring students’ writing*, and 6) *providing feedback*.

Lesson Plan

Based on the Lesson plan analysis, it revealed that teachers conducted the writing assessment systematically using Google Classroom as the primary assessment platform. The assessment procedures were clearly described in the teaching steps and assessment sections of the Lesson Plan (RPP). It can be seen from the table below:

Table 4
Analysis of Lesson Plan

Indicator Analysis	Findings	Evidences	Interpretation
Assessment procedures	The teacher provides writing instructions, uploads materials, sets deadlines, and asks students to submit assignments through Google Classroom.	“The teacher uploads materials about recount text and provides writing instructions through Google Classroom.”	Google Classroom functions as a learning management system facilitating writing assessment administration.
Feedback technique	The RPP indicates that teachers provide comments and corrections directly on students’ submitted assignments.	“The teacher provides feedback and corrections on students’ writing through the assignment comment section.”	Feedback is conducted digitally, enabling more flexible and documented assessment practices.
Types of assessment	The assessment includes individual writing tasks, formative assessment, and assignment-based evaluation.	“Students compose an individual recount text based on their personal experiences and submit it through Google Classroom.” “The teacher provides feedback and corrections on students’ writing through the assignment comment section.”	The teacher applies process-oriented assessment rather than focusing only on final products.
Assessment instruments	The RPP includes scoring rubrics and writing criteria used to evaluate students’ recount texts.	“Assessment criteria: content (30%), organization (20%), grammar (25%), vocabulary (15%), mechanics (10%).”	Rubrics help maintain consistency and transparency in scoring students’ writing.
Use of Google Classroom features	Teachers utilize assignment, grading, comment, and deadline features available in Google Classroom.	“Google Classroom is used to distribute assignments, monitor submissions, and provide scores and feedback.”	The platform supports efficient classroom management and online writing assessment.

The lesson plans showed that the teachers first uploaded learning materials and instructions through Google Classroom. One excerpt stated: *“The teacher uploads materials about recount text and provides writing instructions through Google Classroom.”* After explaining the materials, students were assigned to write recount texts individually. The RPP mentioned: *“Students compose an individual recount text based on their personal experiences and submit it through Google Classroom.”* The analyses is also found that teachers used formative assessment practices during the writing process. Feedback was provided digitally using the comment feature in Google Classroom. The RPP stated: *“The teacher provides feedback and corrections on students’ writing through the assignment comment section.”*

Furthermore, scoring rubrics were used as assessment instruments. The rubric criteria found in the lesson plan included organization, grammar, vocabulary, content, and mechanics. An example from the rubric section was: *“Assessment criteria: content (30%), organization (20%), grammar (25%), vocabulary (15%), mechanics (10%).”* The teachers also utilized several Google Classroom features such as assignment submission, grading, deadlines, and online comments. The RPP explained: *“Google Classroom is used to distribute assignments, monitor submissions, and provide scores and feedback.”* These findings indicate that Google Classroom supported both administrative and pedagogical aspects of writing assessment.

Observation data

The observation of Google Classroom activities showed a systematic implementation of digital writing assessment. The teacher used Google Classroom to distribute assignments, collect students' submissions, apply rubrics, and manage grading processes.

Table 5
Observation Findings for Digital Writing Assessment Process

Indicator	Findings	Evidence from Observation	Interpretation
Assignment Distribution	Writing tasks were distributed digitally through Google Classroom.	Multiple assignments posted by the teacher.	Google Classroom served as the primary assessment platform.
Writing Task Variety	Students completed several recount-related tasks.	"Write a real past experience recount text"; "Write your real experiences of Gas Deso"; "Make 10 multiple choice items of recount text."	Students practiced writing through various task types.
Rubric Integration	Rubrics were embedded within assignments.	"Rubrik: 1 kriteria • 1 poin."	Assessment criteria were communicated clearly before submission.
Digital Submission	Students uploaded assignments through Google Classroom.	Numerous student submissions and attachments were recorded.	Students submitted work electronically.
Monitoring and Grading	Teacher tracked submission status and grading progress.	Categories such as "Dinilai", "Diserahkan", and "Belum Diserahkan".	The platform facilitated assessment management and monitoring.
Deadline Management	Assignments included submission deadlines.	"Tenggat: 12 Mei"; "Tenggat: 13 Mei".	Google Classroom helped regulate assessment schedules.

The observation revealed that the digital writing assessment had several stages. First, the teacher posted writing assignments through Google Classroom. The assignments included tasks such as *"Write a real past experience recount text"* and *"Write your real experiences of Gas Deso (traditional village festival) to be Recount text."* Second, the assessment rubrics were attached directly to the assignments so students could review the criteria before submitting their work. The rubric was visible in the assignment interface, making the teacher's expectations clear and transparent.

Third, students submitted their work digitally through Google Classroom. The observation showed various submission statuses such as *"Diserahkan"* (submitted), *"Dinilai"* (graded), and *"Belum Diserahkan"* (not submitted). This feature allowed the teacher to monitor students' participation and completion rates efficiently. Finally, the teacher evaluated and assessed students' work within the same platform. The existence of grading labels and rubric-based scoring indicates that Google Classroom supported both assessment administration and record management. Overall, the digital assessment process was conducted systematically from assignment distribution to grading and monitoring.

Teacher Interview

The teacher interview revealed that writing assessment activities were conducted during classroom hours. The teacher stated: *"I gave the assignment through Google Classroom during class hours."* Another important finding concerned the use of formative feedback. The teacher evaluated students' writing individually and gave corrections related to grammar, vocabulary, and text structure. The teacher explained: *"Evaluating each student's work individually, both in terms of the recount text structure and its linguistic features."*

Students' Interview

Students also confirmed that the teacher instructed them to bring smartphones and access Google Classroom during the lesson. Student G explained: *"I was asked to bring my smartphone during class, open Google Classroom, and complete the assigned task."* The

findings also showed that the teacher provided clear instructions before students completed the assignments. Students mentioned that the teacher allowed them to ask questions if they did not understand the tasks. Hasna stated: *"I understood the teacher's instructions quite clearly because the teacher gave us the opportunity to ask questions if there was anything we did not understand."* Students confirmed that the teacher highlighted incorrect parts of their writing and explained how to improve them. Student I stated: *"The teacher pointed out the incorrect parts of my writing and explained how they should be written correctly."*

The findings also revealed that students were given opportunities to revise their writing after receiving feedback. The teacher stated: *"Yes, I gave the students the opportunity to revise their writing based on my evaluation and explanation."* Despite these positive findings, both teacher and students reported several challenges, such as: 1) limited digital literacy, 2) technical difficulties, and 3) limited classroom time. The teacher explained: *"Each student had different levels of ability in using digital technology."* The findings indicate that digital writing assessment through Google Classroom was implemented systematically and interactively. However, technical and pedagogical constraints still affected the effectiveness of the assessment process.

Students' Responses toward Digital Writing Assessment through Google Classroom

The findings revealed that students generally responded positively toward digital writing assessment conducted through Google Classroom. Students demonstrated *behavioral, cognitive, and affective* engagement during the assessment process.

Observation data

Observation findings showed that most students actively accessed Google Classroom, followed submission procedures, and uploaded their assignments successfully. Students also paid attention to the teacher's explanation and took participation during classroom activities. It also confirmed that students read the teacher's feedback and revised their writing, and doing some self-regulated learning because students independently improved their writing after receiving feedback. Although observation data do not directly capture students' opinions or feelings, students' participation patterns, submission behavior, and engagement with Google Classroom provide evidence of their responses toward the digital writing assessment.

Table 6
Observation Findings for Students' Responses to Digital Writing Assessment

Indicator	Findings	Evidence from Observation	Interpretation
Student Participation	Many students submitted assignments.	Majority of students marked as "Diserahkan" or "Dinilai".	Students generally engaged with the digital assessment.
Student Compliance	Students followed digital submission procedures.	Uploaded documents and image attachments observed.	Students adapted to online submission requirements.
Assignment Completion	Most students completed writing tasks.	Numerous graded submissions recorded.	Students actively participated in assessment activities.
Non-Submission Cases	Some students failed to submit assignments.	Several students marked "Belum Diserahkan".	Technical, motivational, or digital literacy issues may have affected participation.
Continuous Engagement	Students completed multiple writing assignments across	Several assignments submitted from April to May.	Students demonstrated sustained engagement with the platform.

Indicator	Findings	Evidence from Observation	Interpretation
	different dates.		

The observations showed that students generally responded positively to digital writing assessment through active participation in multiple assignments. Most students submitted their work and received grades through Google Classroom, as reflected in records marked “*Diserahkan*” and “*Dinilai*.” Students were also able to upload files, documents, and images. However, some submissions remained “*Belum Diserahkan*,” indicating unequal participation and possible challenges with internet access, digital literacy, time management, or motivation.

Teacher Interview

The teacher interview revealed that students became more enthusiastic and responsible when completing writing assignments digitally. The teacher stated: “*The students responded with greater enthusiasm and showed more responsibility in completing their assignments.*” The teacher also observed differences among students’ writing abilities. These differences became visible through the number of revisions and writing errors produced by students. The teacher explained: “*Each student’s revision results varied, both in the number of errors and in the assessed aspects.*”

Students’ Interview

Student interviews also showed positive emotional responses toward digital assessment. Student D explained: “*The writing assessment through Google Classroom made me more enthusiastic and better prepared.*” Similarly, Student H stated: “*This type of assessment motivated me to better understand and comprehend the material.*” The findings further showed that students believed digital assessment improved their writing ability, especially in writing recount texts. Student G explained: “*I think this method improved my writing skills, especially in writing recount texts.*”

Students also stated that teacher feedback helped them understand their mistakes and improve their writing. Student L explained: “*I felt that I understood how to write recount texts better after receiving feedback from the teacher.*” Although most students responded positively, some difficulties and challenges still emerged during digital assessment implementation such as: 1) limited digital skills, 2) confusion using Google Classroom, 3) delayed submissions, and 4) limited time to complete assignments. Student I explained: “The difficulties I faced were my insufficient digital skills and the limited time available.” The findings indicate that digital writing assessment through Google Classroom positively influenced students’ motivation, engagement, responsibility, and writing development. However, technological limitations and differences in digital literacy still became important challenges during implementation.

Discussion

Aspects of Writing Assessment

The findings show that the teacher used an analytic approach to assess students’ writing based on five aspects: content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. However, the assessment placed greater emphasis on grammatical accuracy and the generic structure of recount texts, particularly the Simple Past Tense and the organization of Orientation, Events, and Reorientation. This suggests that the assessment reflected the teacher’s view of the key features of successful recount writing. Amalina and Yulianto (2024), Mochizuki (2025), and Nguyen and Truong (2021) similarly emphasize that genre-based writing pedagogy connects text organization and appropriate language features with the communicative purpose of a particular genre.

The stronger focus on grammar and structure also shows a balance that needs consideration. Although several writing aspects were assessed, greater attention to accuracy and genre conventions may lead students to focus more on correct language use than on developing ideas, considering readers, and communicating meaning (Hyland & Hyland, 2019; Tayyebi et al., 2022). However, this does not necessarily indicate a weakness in the assessment. Rather, the rubric provided clear guidance about the features considered important in recount writing. Students' responses also showed that they understood these assessment expectations. They identified generic structure, past-tense forms, verb choices, and *was/were* as common assessment points. This clarity reflects the importance of transparent criteria in helping students understand learning expectations (Yan & Carless, 2022). However, transparent criteria should be balanced so that accuracy and structure receive appropriate attention alongside content, organization, and communicative purpose.

The Process of Digital Writing Assessment

The findings indicate that digital writing assessment functioned primarily as a formative process rather than merely as a mechanism for evaluating students' completed writing products. Through Google Classroom, the teacher was able to organize and connect several stages of assessment, including task distribution, student submission, evaluation, feedback provision, revision, and final grading. This suggests that the platform served not only as a repository for students' assignments but also as an instructional space in which assessment information could be used to support subsequent learning. Students' initial submissions were therefore meaningful beyond their function as objects of evaluation because they provided the teacher with evidence of students' current writing performance, including strengths, recurring difficulties, and areas that required further instructional attention. On the basis of this evidence, feedback could be directed toward specific weaknesses, while students were provided with opportunities to respond to the feedback through revision. In this respect, the assessment process became cyclical rather than terminal, as students moved from initial production to feedback and then to improved versions of their texts. Carless and Winstone (2023) explain that effective formative assessment depends not simply on the provision of feedback but also on the extent to which learners are able to understand, interpret, and use that feedback to improve subsequent performance. Their concept of feedback literacy is particularly relevant to the present findings because Google Classroom enabled students to revisit teacher comments and use them as guidance for improving their recount texts. Similarly, Panadero et al. (2025) emphasize that digitally supported assessment environments can strengthen formative assessment when assessment criteria, feedback, and opportunities for learner engagement are integrated within the same process.

Revision emerged as a particularly important component of this formative process because writing development is inherently iterative and generally involves drafting, receiving feedback, reconsidering linguistic and organizational choices, and rewriting. In the present study, students were able to review the teacher's comments after submitting their writing and subsequently revise their texts through Google Classroom. The persistent availability of digital feedback was pedagogically significant because students did not have to rely solely on one-time oral explanations or handwritten comments that might be difficult to access later. Instead, teacher feedback remained available for repeated consultation, enabling students to return to specific suggestions while revising grammar, vocabulary, organization, and other aspects of their writing. Carless and Winstone (2023) argue that feedback becomes educationally meaningful when students are supported in translating comments into concrete actions, suggesting that accessibility alone is insufficient unless learners know how to respond productively. The findings of the present study support this view because the effectiveness of digital assessment depended heavily on the teacher's guidance and the

opportunities provided for revision. At the same time, several contextual constraints influenced the implementation of this process, particularly differences in students' digital literacy, technological competence, access to devices or connectivity, and the limited time available for completing and revising assignments.

Students' Responses toward Digital Writing Assessment

The findings show that students generally viewed digital writing assessment positively, particularly regarding motivation, responsibility, engagement, and understanding of writing expectations. These findings represent students' reported experiences and observed participation rather than objective evidence of improved writing proficiency. Students considered teacher feedback and revision opportunities useful for identifying errors and improving their texts. Thus, assessment was viewed not only as a way to receive grades but also as guidance for subsequent writing.

This finding supports formative assessment, which emphasizes students' active use of feedback. In this study, students reviewed teacher comments and revised their writing, showing that feedback was followed by further action. However, some students experienced difficulties with digital literacy, technical procedures, and limited time. These challenges required them to manage both writing demands and digital tasks. Therefore, teacher support remained important. Overall, students' engagement was shaped by assessment design, feedback, revision opportunities, and teacher guidance rather than by Google Classroom alone (Panadero et al., 2025; Yan & Carless, 2022).

Digital Writing Assessment in a Semi-Rural Context

The semi-rural context provides an important basis for understanding the implementation of digital writing assessment. Although students differed in digital literacy and technological readiness, the assessment continued through adaptation by both the teacher and students. The teacher provided clear instructions, monitored platform use, and offered consultation, while students gradually learned the required digital procedures. Teacher support therefore helped maintain participation despite differences in students' digital readiness.

This support also functioned as scaffolding by addressing both writing development and participation in digital assessment. Students received guidance in producing recount texts as well as submitting assignments, accessing feedback, and revising their work. This reflects sociocultural perspectives that emphasize learning through interaction, guidance, and increasing learner independence (Moorhouse & Kohnke, 2021; Vygotsky & Cole, 1978). The findings further show that participation was influenced by digital competence, technological readiness, instructional time, and available support. Nevertheless, students gradually developed digital routines while completing and revising assignments. Thus, teacher guidance helped students participate in digital assessment despite existing technological constraints (Rasmitadila et al., 2020; Trust & Whalen, 2020).

The findings suggest that the value of digital writing assessment depends not simply on technology but on how it is integrated into the assessment process. Google Classroom supported task distribution, writing submission, feedback, and revision, while the teacher's use of these features gave the process its formative function. The rubric identified assessment criteria, feedback highlighted areas for improvement, and revision enabled students to respond to assessment information. The study also shows that comprehensive criteria do not necessarily receive equal emphasis. Although the rubric covered content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics, greater attention to generic structure and grammatical accuracy influenced students' understanding of important features in recount writing. Therefore, clear criteria should be supported by feedback and teaching practices that also address content development, audience awareness, and communicative effectiveness. In the

semi-rural context, formative digital assessment depended on assessment design, teacher scaffolding, students' digital readiness, and opportunities for revision. The study therefore highlights the importance of integrating technology with appropriate pedagogy rather than viewing the digital platform itself as the main factor in writing assessment.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the use of Google Classroom for digital writing assessment in teaching recount texts, focusing on the assessed writing aspects, assessment process, and students' responses. The teacher assessed content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics, with greater emphasis on recount-text structure and grammatical accuracy, particularly the Simple Past Tense. The assessment process included task distribution, submission, evaluation, feedback, revision, and grading, while revision records indicated opportunities for students to respond to feedback and learn through revising their writing. Students generally reported positive experiences, including greater motivation, responsibility, engagement, and perceived improvement in writing. The study contributes to understanding digital writing assessment in a semi-rural school where differences in digital skills, technological readiness, and learning time presented challenges. The findings suggest that its value depended not only on Google Classroom but also on teacher guidance, feedback, revision opportunities, and students' digital readiness. However, the single-school qualitative design and reliance on participants' perceptions limit conclusions about objectively improved writing proficiency.

FUNDING STATEMENT

This research received no external funding from any governmental, commercial, or non-profit organization. The study was conducted independently by the researchers as part of their academic and professional responsibilities. All activities, including research design, data collection, classroom observation, interviews, document analysis, data interpretation, and manuscript preparation, were carried out using the researchers' own resources and institutional support available for educational research.

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Informed consent was obtained from all participants involved in this study. Prior to data collection, the participants, including the English teacher and students, were informed about the objectives, procedures, potential benefits, and ethical considerations of the research. Participation was voluntary, and participants were assured that their personal information and identities would remain confidential. Pseudonyms or anonymized codes were used in reporting the findings to protect participants' privacy. Participants were also informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any stage without any negative consequences.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are not publicly available due to ethical considerations and the need to protect the privacy and confidentiality of the participants. The dataset consists of interview transcripts, classroom observation records, lesson plan documents, assessment rubrics, and students' writing assessment records collected through Google Classroom. However, anonymized data may be made available by the corresponding author upon reasonable request for academic purposes, subject to institutional approval and compliance with ethical research guidelines.

REFERENCES

- Afzal, A., Khan, S., Daud, S., Ahmad, Z., & Butt, A. (2023). Addressing the digital divide: Access and use of technology in education. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 3(2), 326–336. <https://doi.org/10.54183/jssr.v3i2.326>

- Ahmad, M., Wilkins, S., & Neil. (2024). Purposive sampling in qualitative research: A framework for the entire journey. *Quality & Quantity*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-024-02022-5>
- Albashtawi, A., & Al Bataineh, K. B. (2020). The effectiveness of Google Classroom among EFL students in Jordan: An innovative teaching and learning online platform. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 15(11), 78–88. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i11.12865>
- Almås, H., Pinkow, F., & Giæver, F. (2023). Reimagining how to understand learning game experiences: A qualitative and exploratory case study. *Smart Learning Environments*, 10, Article 14, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00234-0>
- Amalina, I., & Yulianto, H. J. (2024). Analysing tenth-grade students' difficulty and their perceptions in writing recount text. *English Education Journal*, 14(3), 450–457. <https://doi.org/10.15294/6c15jt72>
- Asror, K., Fadhillawati, D., & Aini, M. R. (2024). Lifting eighth-grade students' recount text writing skills through mind mapping. *Academy of Education Journal*, 15(1), 430–437. <https://doi.org/10.47200/aoej.v15i1.2221>
- Becker, A. (1980). A review of writing model research based on cognitive processes. In *Revision: History, theory, and practice* (pp. 25–49). Parlor Press.
- Cahyani, F., Yuliana, B. D., & Putri, K. (2025). Peran media digital dalam meningkatkan motivasi menulis kreatif di kalangan mahasiswa. *Jurnal Bima: Pusat Publikasi Ilmu Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 3(3), 190–201. <https://doi.org/10.61132/bima.v3i3.2181>
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 25(8), 652–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>
- Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2023). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 28(1), 150–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- Ghosh, A., & Sen, S. (2023). Relationship between different components of English writing skill. *International Journal of Research and Review*, 10(10), 463–471. <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20231058>
- Granić, A. (2022). Educational technology adoption: A systematic review. *Education and Information Technologies*, 27, 9725–9744. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-10951-7>
- Graves, J., Abshire, D., Amiri, S., & Mackelprang, J. (2021). Disparities in technology and broadband internet access across rurality: Implications for health and education. *Family & Community Health*, 44(4), 257–265. <https://doi.org/10.1097/FCH.0000000000000306>
- Hadizadeh, A., & Kanik, M. (2025). Undergraduate students' conceptions of academic writing at the intersection of English medium instruction and the digital age. *European Journal of Education*, 60(3), Article e70162. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70162>
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2019). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547>
- Kakar, Z., Rasheed, R., Rashid, A., & Akhter, S. (2023). Criteria for assessing and ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research. *International Journal of Business Reflections*. <https://doi.org/10.56249/ijbr.03.01.44>
- Karunia, N. (2019). Qualitative research design. In *SAGE Research Methods Foundations*. SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315213033-51>

- Kurniawati, K. (2022). The students' perception towards peer feedback as social-affective strategy in writing recount text skill. *Journal of English Educational Study*, 5(1), 67–76. <https://doi.org/10.31932/jees.v5i1.1609>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2018). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. SAGE Publications.
- Mochizuki, N. (2025). EFL undergraduate students' thinking and awareness in genre-based writing: Conceptualizing rhetorical moves and experimenting with linguistic knowledge. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 70, Article 101243. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101243>
- Moorhouse, B. L., & Kohnke, L. (2021). Thriving or surviving emergency remote teaching necessitated by COVID-19: University teachers' perspectives. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 30(3), 279–287. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00567-9>
- Moussaoui, S. (2024). Enhancing writing quality and self-efficacy beliefs through process-oriented task-based instruction and multiple feedback forms. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, 18(1), 96–116. <https://doi.org/10.53543/jeps.vol18iss1pp96-116>
- Mustafa, F., Nguyen, H., & Gao, X. (2024). The challenges and solutions of technology integration in rural schools: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102380>
- Mustika, R., Nurdin, N. E., & Sakina, R. (2021). Theme and thematic progression in students' recount texts: A systemic functional linguistic perspective. In *Proceedings* (pp. 196–203). <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210312.030>
- Nguyen, T., & Truong, A. (2021). EFL teachers' perceptions of classroom writing assessment at high schools in Central Vietnam. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 11(10), 1187–1196. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1110.06>
- Noble, H., & Heale, R. (2020). Triangulation and member checking. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, 17(6), 407. <https://doi.org/10.1111/wvn.12383>
- Nurhayati, A. (2020). The implementation of formative assessment in EFL writing: A case study at a secondary school in Indonesia. *Pedagogy: Journal of English Language Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.32332/pedagogy.v8i2.2263>
- Odendahl, N., Fowles, M., Bivens-Tatum, J., Deane, P., Quinlan, T., & Welsh, C. (2008). *Cognitive models of writing: Writing proficiency as a complex integrated skill*.
- Ouafi, A. (2017). Students' use of information from their readings to write an argumentative essay. *American Scientific Research Journal for Engineering, Technology, and Sciences*, 35(1), 25–41.
- Pan, X. (2020). Technology acceptance, technological self-efficacy, and attitude toward technology-based self-directed learning: Learning motivation as a mediator. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 564294. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.564294>
- Panadero, E., Fernández-Ortute, A., Krebs, R., & Roelle, J. (2025). Analysis of online rubric platforms: Advancing toward e-rubrics. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 50(1), 31–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2345657>
- Phạm, V., & Bui, T. (2021). Genre-based approach to writing in EFL contexts. *World Journal of English Language*, 11(2), 95. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v11n2p95>
- Phuong, H., Phan, Q.-T., & Le, T.-T. (2023). The effects of using analytical rubrics in peer and self-assessment on EFL students' writing proficiency: A Vietnamese contextual study. *Language Testing in Asia*, 13, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-023-00256-y>
- Ramadani, N., & Melani, M. (2023). An analysis of teacher's assessment task in teaching writing at MAS TI Paninggahan. *Journal of Educational Management and Strategy*, 2(2), 130–145. <https://doi.org/10.57255/jemast.v2i2.241>

- Rao, P. (2017). The characteristics of effective writing skills in English language teaching. 2, 75–86.
- Rasmitadila, R., Aliyyah, R. R., Rachmadtullah, R., Samsudin, A., Syaodih, E., Nurtanto, M., & Tambunan, A. R. S. (2020). The perceptions of primary school teachers of online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic period: A case study in Indonesia. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 7(2), 90–109. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/388>
- Rosyada, A., & Sundari, H. (2021). Learning from home environment: Academic writing course for EFL undergraduates through Google Classroom application. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 8, 710–725. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i2.18374>
- Sartika, D., Khairinisaak, K., & Asmara, R. (2022). The analysis of students' difficulties in writing recount text. *Journal of English Education Program*, 3(1), 59–66. <https://doi.org/10.26418/jeep.v3i1.50496>
- Silalahi, N. S., & Siregar, M. (2021). The implementation of genre-based approach in teaching writing text for tenth grade at SMA Yayasan Pendidikan Mulia. *REGISTER: Journal of English Language Teaching of FBS-Unimed*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.24114/reg.v10i1.24670>
- Taufiqullah, T., Fahdly, F. Z., Rosdiana, I., Ferrer, C. N., & Ratsamemonthon, C. (2025). Comprehensive review of writing assessments in EFL contexts: A meta-synthetic study. *International Journal of Language Testing*, 15(1), 193–213.
- Tayyebi, M., Abbasabady, M. M., & Abbassian, G.-R. (2022). Examining classroom writing assessment literacy: A focus on in-service EFL teachers in Iran. *Language Testing in Asia*, 12(1), Article 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00161-w>
- Tiwari, H. P. (2023). Use of Jacobs ESL Composition Profile to evaluate university students' writing. *ELT Worldwide: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(2), 288–299. <https://doi.org/10.26858/eltww.v10i2.51632>
- Trust, T., & Whalen, J. (2020). Should teachers be trained in emergency remote teaching? Lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.70725/307718pkpjuu>
- Ulbricht, J., Schachner, M. K., Civitillo, S., & Juang, L. (2024). Fostering culturally responsive teaching through the Identity Project intervention: A qualitative quasi-experiment with pre-service teachers. *Identity*, 24(4), 307–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2024.2361890>
- Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wei, L. (2023). Artificial intelligence in language instruction: Impact on English learning achievement, L2 motivation, and self-regulated learning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1261955. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1261955>
- Yan, Z., & Carless, D. (2022). Self-assessment is about more than self: The enabling role of feedback literacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(7), 1116–1128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.2001431>
- Yunus, A. A., & Syafi'i, A. (2020). Google Classroom as learning platform in teaching writing. *British: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris*, 9(1), 48–64. <https://doi.org/10.31314/british.9.1.48-64.2020>