

Students' Perception and Experience of The Use Google form as An Online Assessment tool in The English Department at Mulawarman University

Hudzaifah Bathinu Rahmat¹, Weningtyas Parama Iswari², Ichi Ahada³

1,2)Universitas Mulawarman, Samarinda

3)Universitas Mulawarman, Samarinda

[1\)bath3012@gmail.com](mailto:1)bath3012@gmail.com), [2\)\)weningtyasparamas@fkip.unmul.ac.id](mailto:2))weningtyasparamas@fkip.unmul.ac.id), [3\)ichiahada@fkip.unmul.ac.id](mailto:3)ichiahada@fkip.unmul.ac.id)

Abstract

This study explores students' perceptions and experiences of using Google Forms as an assessment tool through a mixed-method explanatory design. Quantitative data were collected from 84 students of the 2021 cohort in the English Department at Mulawarman University using a 24-item Likert-scale questionnaire, while qualitative data were obtained from interviews with two students—one with a positive and one with a neutral perception. Findings indicate that students generally view Google Forms positively due to its simplicity, accessibility across devices, and user-friendly interface. However, concerns include its aesthetic appeal, reliance on stable internet—posing challenges for students in areas with poor connectivity—and potential academic dishonesty due to the lack of supervision. Multiple-choice questions were the most preferred, though some students valued essay questions for promoting deeper understanding. Participants emphasized the importance of receiving assessment links in advance and had mixed feelings about time limits. While the immediate feedback feature was appreciated, inconsistent implementation led to calls for more detailed responses. Overall, Google Forms is seen as a flexible and accessible assessment tool, with potential improvements in design, feedback mechanisms, and technical reliability.

Keywords: *Google Form, Student Perceptions, Experience, Online Assessment.*

1. Introduction

In the 21st century, globalization and technological advancements have transformed education, including assessment methods. Integrating technology in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction enhances students' communicative skills through interactive platforms (Agustin et al., 2023). Online tools such as Google Forms are increasingly used for assessments due to their flexibility and efficiency compared to traditional paper-based methods (Limbong, 2017).

Assessment is a crucial part of learning, providing insights into students' strengths and weaknesses while allowing teachers to adjust their instruction accordingly (Tosuncuoglu, 2018). Among various digital tools, Google Forms stands out for its accessibility, ease of use, and integration with Google services (Raju & Harinarayana, 2016). Teachers can efficiently design, distribute, and analyze assessments, while students benefit from immediate feedback (Castro, 2018). Furthermore, its diverse question formats enable structured and interactive assessments (Pratama & Fudhla, 2022).

Despite its advantages, Google Forms also presents challenges, such as internet dependency, lack of supervision leading to academic dishonesty, and limited personalized feedback (Sari et al., 2023). While previous studies have examined Google Forms in assessments (Fitriani, 2020; Alharbi et al., 2021; Pratama & Fudhla, 2022), most focused on teachers' perspectives or specific assessment types. This study aims to fill this gap by investigating university students' perceptions of Google Forms, focusing on their experiences, preferences, and its role in enhancing learning outcomes. Understanding students' perspectives is essential for optimizing digital assessment tools to ensure that technology not only facilitates teaching but also aligns with students' learning needs (Sari et al., 2023).

2. Literature Review

a) Perception

Perception is the cognitive process through which individuals make sense of their environment and the objects within it. It involves using the five senses and is influenced by personal experiences, shaping awareness, attitudes, and behaviors (Akrim & Sulasmi, 2020). Perception can be understood in both a narrow and broad sense: in a narrow sense, it refers to an individual's unique viewpoint on an object, while in a broader sense, it encompasses general understanding and interpretation, particularly in educational settings (Triyono & Febriani as cited in Yunita & Maisarah, 2020).

Hadi, as cited in Nasution and Ahmad (2020), describes perception as a process of attributing meaning to sensations and stimuli, influenced by internal and external factors such as learning approaches and outcomes. Additionally, Fitriani (2020) highlights the role of perception in guiding human interactions, ensuring that actions align with expectations and needs. Hakiki (2021) categorizes perception into positive and negative forms, where positive perception reflects optimism and satisfaction, while negative perception arises from dissatisfaction or unfavorable experiences.

b) Experience

Experience is the process of engaging with situations, events, or emotions that contribute to the development of knowledge and skills over time. Watson (1991) defines experience in several forms: as exposure to specific events, time spent in a particular role, accumulated knowledge from repeated encounters, or individual emotional experiences. These elements shape how individuals perceive and respond to their surroundings.

In an educational context, student experience plays a crucial role in shaping learning outcomes and satisfaction. Amado Mateus et al. (2023) define student experience in higher education as interactions with services and systems that influence perceptions of educational quality. Factors such as student-centered services, reliance on educators, and holistic development impact students' academic journeys. Emotional responses, as guided by core affect, significantly shape students' engagement and overall success.

c) Assessment and Online Assessment

Assessment is a critical component of education, serving to evaluate student learning and measure teaching effectiveness (Pratama & Fudhla, 2022). Brown (2004) identifies

two primary types of assessment: formative and summative. Formative assessment occurs throughout the learning process, providing continuous feedback, whereas summative assessment takes place at the end of a learning period to evaluate overall achievement.

Online assessment, also known as technology-based assessment, provides an efficient method of evaluating student performance in digital environments. Yoestara et al. (2020) define online assessment as a tool for measuring academic achievement via digital platforms. Weleschuk et al. (2019) emphasize that online assessments not only evaluate student performance but also provide instant feedback, enhancing the learning experience. However, despite these advantages, challenges such as internet connectivity issues remain a concern (Nursani et al., 2024).

d) Google Forms in Assessment

Google Forms is a widely used online assessment tool that enables educators to create quizzes, collect data, and evaluate student performance in a flexible and accessible manner. According to Castro (2018), Google Forms allows teachers to design, share, and personalize formative assessments efficiently. It provides instant feedback and measurable performance data, making it a valuable tool in education.

The advantages of Google Forms, as highlighted by Sivakumar (2019) and Mahmudi (2018), include its ease of use, accessibility, and cost-effectiveness. It supports various question formats such as multiple-choice, short-answer, and paragraph responses, allowing for diverse assessment methods (Adelia et al., 2021). Additionally, Alsadoon (2017) notes that e-assessments like Google Forms motivate students, reduce grading time, and facilitate large-scale feedback distribution. However, challenges such as internet dependency and technical limitations must be considered to ensure effective implementation. As stated by Alsadoon (2017), e-assessments using platforms like Google Forms provide teachers with less control over the exam environment, which, as noted by Rowe (2004), makes it easier for students to cheat.

e) Relevant Research/Previous Research

Several studies have investigated the use of Google Forms in assessments. Fitriani (2020) conducted a study titled *Student Perceptions of Reading Tests Using Google Forms*, which aimed to explore the perceptions of accounting students at STEKOM University Semarang regarding reading tests administered via Google Forms. Using a quantitative descriptive method, the study revealed that only a small proportion of students had a positive perception of reading tests using Google Forms. The majority of students viewed the platform as ineffective, inefficient, and challenging, primarily because it did not contribute to improving their scores.

Similarly, Pratama and Fudhla (2022) examined the use of Google Forms as an assessment tool in English subjects at SMAN 2 Solok. This descriptive-analytical study, employing a qualitative approach, sought to understand teachers' and students' perceptions of Google Forms in assessments. The findings indicated positive responses from teachers, particularly in terms of validity, reliability, efficiency, economy, and engagement. However, some teachers were concerned that students' preference for Google Forms might reduce their interest in traditional paper-based tests. Students, on the other hand, expressed

overwhelmingly positive perceptions, with an average approval rating of 94.66%, supporting the tool's validity and effectiveness in assessments.

Jazil et al. (2020) explored students' attitudes toward Google Forms as an online grammar assessment tool at MTs Masyhadiyah Gresik. Using a qualitative research method, they found that students exhibited both positive and negative attitudes toward Google Forms. While a minority (23-25%) had positive opinions, the majority found online assessments using Google Forms to be more challenging and effective. The instant feedback feature made students feel both nervous and motivated, while the convenience of clicking answers instead of marking them manually saved time.

Alharbi et al. (2021) conducted a mixed-methods study titled Student and Teacher Perceptions of Google Forms as a Formative Digital Assessment Tool in Saudi High Schools. The research, involving students and teachers from secondary schools in Medina and Jeddah, found that Google Forms had a positive impact as a formative assessment tool in English classes. Teachers considered Google Forms an efficient medium for assessing students quickly, allowing them to focus more on instructional strategies and remedial programs. The automatic feedback feature enabled teachers to track student performance in detail, facilitating targeted interventions. However, challenges remained, including the need to verify test content before administration to ensure multimedia elements functioned correctly. While students appreciated the tool for its effectiveness in language assessment, they also acknowledged the potential for cheating during online exams.

These research studies illustrate diversity in research methodologies, ranging from quantitative and qualitative to mixed methods. They also encompass distinct participant groups, including students majoring in accounting, English subjects, and secondary school students and teachers. Unlike previous studies, this research employs a mixed-method approach, combining questionnaire-based quantitative analysis and qualitative thematic analysis to gain a deeper understanding of students' perceptions and experiences with Google Forms in assessment. This approach can yield valuable insights that bridge the gaps left by previous research, particularly in terms of applicability to higher education and a more comprehensive understanding of the student experience.

3. Methods

This study employs a mixed-methods approach with a sequential explanatory design. Creswell and Clark (2018) describe this design as a two-stage process, where the quantitative phase is conducted first, followed by the qualitative phase to provide deeper insights into the numerical findings. The quantitative component consists of a questionnaire with 24 Likert-scale questions categorized based on the frameworks of Alsadoon (2017), Karim & Shukur (2016), and Sari et al. (2020), covering aspects such as the advantages of Google Forms, design, answer model preferences, time limitations, and feedback mechanisms. Descriptive statistical analysis is applied to measure mean scores and response distributions, offering a comprehensive overview of students' perceptions. The population of this study includes 92 students from the Class of 2021 in the English Department at Mulawarman University, while the sample consists of 84 students selected

through purposive sampling, focusing on those with experience using Google Forms in both online and offline assessments.

For the qualitative phase, a smaller sample was selected purposively to ensure diverse perspectives from students with neutral and positive perceptions, as no respondents fell into the negative category based on questionnaire results. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with these participants to explore their experiences in greater depth, covering aspects such as the design and usability of Google Forms, accessibility, efficiency, time limitations, feedback mechanisms, and potential disadvantages, including the lack of supervision and the possibility of cheating. Additionally, participants compared Google Forms with traditional paper-based assessments and discussed its role as an alternative assessment tool. Thematic analysis was employed to identify key patterns and insights related to usability, fairness, and assessment preferences. By integrating the qualitative findings with the quantitative results, this study provides a more nuanced understanding of students' perception and experiences with Google Forms as an assessment tool.

To enhance the study's validity, methodological triangulation is applied, comparing questionnaire results with interview data to identify consistencies and discrepancies. This approach strengthens the interpretation of findings by integrating statistical trends with firsthand student perspectives. By adopting a sequential mixed-methods approach, this study ensures that the quantitative results guide the qualitative phase, allowing for a structured yet flexible exploration of student perceptions regarding Google Forms as an assessment tool.

4. Result

1. Students' Perceptions Findings

The overall findings from the questionnaire data indicate that most students have a positive perception of using Google Forms as an assessment tool. A total of 59 students (70.2%) expressed a positive perception, while 4 students (4.8%) had a strongly positive view. The average score of 3.5933 suggests a tendency toward positive perceptions. No students reported negative or strongly negative perceptions, suggesting that Google Forms is generally well-received as an assessment tool.

Table 1. Overall Student Perceptions of Google Forms

Interval	Perception	Frequency	Percentage
	Category		
1.00-1.80	Strongly Negative		0.0%
1.81-2.60	Negative		0.0%
2.61-3.40	Neutral	21	25.0%
3.41-4.20	Positive	59	70.2%
4.21-5.00	Strongly Positive	4	4.8%
Total		84	100.0%
Maximum Score			4.42
Minimum Score			2.71
Average			3.5933

To gain a deeper understanding, responses were analyzed across five main categories based on the theories of Alsadoon (2017), Karim & Shukur (2016), and Sari et al. (2020). These findings are complemented by qualitative data from interviews to provide deeper insights into students' perceptions.

A. Perceptions towards the Advantages of Google Form

Table 2. Students' Perceptions towards The Advantages of Google form

Perception		Frequency	Percentage
Interval	Category		
1.00-1.80	Strongly Negative		
1.81-2.60	Negative		
2.61-3.40	Neutral	57	67.9%
3.41-4.20	Positive	27	32.1%
4.21-5.00	Strongly Positive		
Total		84	100.0%
Maximum Score			4.00
Minimum Score			2.63
Average			3.3095

Students' perceptions regarding the advantages of Google Forms showed that 67.9% had a neutral stance, while 32.1% viewed it positively. Strengths identified included time efficiency, as seen in statements such as "Google Form saves time" (M = 4.15) and "Google Form assessments are faster than paper assessments" (M = 4.32). Accessibility was another positive factor, with students appreciating that it does not consume much internet data (M = 3.98). However, challenges were also identified, particularly regarding internet dependency and academic integrity. The lowest-rated item, "A good internet connection is required" (M = 1.83), highlighted concerns over connectivity, while statements about supervision (M = 2.21) and potential for cheating (M = 2.21) indicated issues with uncontrolled assessments. Interview findings supported these observations, with students emphasizing that while Google Forms is efficient and flexible, improvements in supervision and internet stability could enhance its effectiveness.

B. Perceptions towards the Design of Google form

Table 3. Students' Perceptions towards the Design of Google form

Perception		Frequency	Percentage
Interval	Category		
1.00-1.80	Strongly Negative		
1.81-2.60	Negative	2	2.4%
2.61-3.40	Neutral	14	16.7%
3.41-4.20	Positive	37	44.0%
4.21-5.00	Strongly Positive	31	36.9%
Total		84	100.0%
Maximum Score			5.00

Minimum Score	2.50
Average	3.9643

Regarding the design of Google Forms, students generally had a positive perception, with an average score of 3.9643. Strengths included accessibility ("It is easy to join assessments on Google Forms" (M = 4.20)), ease of use ("The assessment feature is easy to operate" (M = 4.10)), and clarity of instructions ("The instructions for taking the assessment are easy to understand" (M = 3.90)). However, a challenge identified through interviews was the lack of aesthetic appeal, as customization depends on the effort of the form creator. Despite this, students found Google Forms user-friendly with a structured and functional layout.

C. Perceptions towards the Answer Model

Table 4. 4 Students' Perceptions towards the Answer Model

Perception		Frequency	Percentage
Interval	Category		
1.00-1.80	Strongly Negative		
1.81-2.60	Negative	3	3.6%
2.61-3.40	Neutral	20	23.8%
3.41-4.20	Positive	44	52.4%
4.21-5.00	Strongly Positive	17	20.2%
Total		84	100.0%
Maximum Score		5.00	
Minimum Score		2.33	
Average		3.7778	

Students' perceptions of the answer model used in Google Forms showed a generally positive response, with an average score of 3.7778. The findings indicated a strong preference for multiple-choice questions due to their ease and speed in answering, while essay or short-answer questions were seen as more challenging. Some students preferred essay questions, but overall, the multiple-choice format was favored for its efficiency and reduced likelihood of errors.

D. Perceptions towards the Time Limitation

Table 5. Students' Perceptions towards Time Limitation

Perception		Frequency	Percentage
Interval	Category		
1.00-1.80	Strongly Negative	1	1.2%
1.81-2.60	Negative	8	9.5%
2.61-3.40	Neutral	53	63.1%
3.41-4.20	Positive	18	21.4%
4.21-5.00	Strongly Positive	4	4.8%
Total		84	100.0%
Maximum Score		4.67	
Minimum Score		1.67	

Average	3.2500
---------	--------

Regarding time limitations, students had mixed perceptions, with an average score of 3.5635. Some students found timed assessments stressful, as reflected in the statement "I feel nervous when I take a time-limited assessment" ($M = 3.21$), while others saw them as a motivating challenge ("I feel challenged and excited when I answer time-limited questions" ($M = 3.74$)). The interview findings supported these results, revealing that some students felt pressured by time constraints, while others appreciated the structure and discipline they provided.

E. Perceptions towards the Feedback of Google form

Table 6. Students' Perceptions towards the Feedback of Google Form

Perception		Frequency	Percentage
Interval	Category		
1.00-1.80	Strongly Negative	1	1.2%
1.81-2.60	Negative		0.0%
2.61-3.40	Neutral	24	28.6%
3.41-4.20	Positive	35	41.7%
4.21-5.00	Strongly Positive	24	28.6%
Total		84	100.0%
Maximum Score		5.00	
Minimum Score		1.67	
Average		3.8294	

Students' perceptions of feedback from Google Forms were generally positive, with an average score of 3.8542. The speed of result display was a significant advantage, as seen in "I like that Google Forms immediately provides my score" ($M = 4.10$). However, some students expressed concerns about fairness, particularly regarding automated grading for essay questions ("I feel that Google Forms' grading is fair" ($M = 3.65$)). Interviews further highlighted that while students valued the quick feedback, they wished for more detailed explanations for incorrect answers.

2. Students' Experiences Findings

Two students were chosen to be interviewed. They had positive and neutral perspectives towards the use of Google Forms as an assessment tool. Below are their perspectives:

A. Experience in Using Google Forms

The students' experiences with Google Forms varied depending on when they first encountered the tool. Some were introduced to it during junior high or high school, particularly around 9th or 10th grade. One student recalled:

"I first time use Google Form during my junior high school, or my high school. It's between 9th grade or 10th grade. So, for the question of if I used it often, it's not really that often because only a couple of teachers used it, and it is for obviously learning activities." (UE,S1,L2)

Another student shared that their usage increased significantly during the COVID-19 pandemic when online assessments became more common:

"My first time using the Google Form was back when I was still a high school student. At the time, I took midterm tests for the class. The Google Form assessment has started being used quite often during the COVID-19 era." (UE,S2,L2&L4)

B. Appearance and Design

In terms of appearance and design, the students generally described Google Forms as simple and easy to use. While it lacks aesthetic appeal, its well-structured layout and clear design allow students to navigate and complete forms effortlessly.

"For the first time I used Google Form, I think I'm pretty sure I really know how to use it, because the interface, or the system or the basically, Google Form itself is quite simple and it is easy to use." (DES-GF,S1,L8)

"It's not really aesthetic, but it's normal, I guess, and Google Form was really well structured and very well written, making it easy to fill." (AP-GF,DES-GF,S2,L10&L40)

However, the students also pointed out that the appearance largely depends on the creator of the form, as Google Forms actually provides options for customizing the look and background.

"It depends on the creators of the Google Forms. Google actually provides the feature for us to make a background, but I think most lecturers probably do not have time to do that and focus on the questions instead." (SKL-GF,S2,L40)

C. Accessibility

According to the students, Google Forms is easy to access as the link can be shared through various platforms, such as social media and messaging apps.

"I get it from my lecturer. It is usually from social media platforms such as Line or WhatsApp, and that's all." (PLT-GF,S1,L4)

"Mostly teachers or lecturers send it via WhatsApp and sometimes via Google Classroom." (PLT-GF,S2,L6)

Additionally, they noted that Google Form links could be accessed anytime, though they suggested that sharing the link a few days before the test would help students prepare and report any access issues.

"Usually, I get this Google Form link a couple of days before the test itself." (ANT-GF,S1,L10)

"Usually, the lecturers share the link on the day of the exam. However, some lecturers provide the link in advance on Google Classroom. When we try to access the link before the exam day, it often cannot be accessed. On the exam day, the lecturers open the form, and then we can access it." (ANT-GF,S2,L12)

D. Versatility

Google Forms supports various question types, such as multiple choice, short answers, essays, and checkboxes, making it adaptable for different assessment formats.

"I think it's the multiple-choice question, and short answer or essay question." (VRS-QT,S1,L16)

"Multiple choice, checkbox, essay, and also short answers." (VRS-QT,S2,L18)

Students also shared their preferences, with multiple-choice questions being the most favored due to their simplicity and efficiency.

"Okay, I prefer the multiple question, because the answer is usually, is usually not having any error. Since if it's a essay or short answer, if I just put one wrong alphabet, it will mark my answer as wrong answers. So I prefer, multiple question." (PREF-QT ,S1,L18)

"To be honest? I prefer the multiple choice and also essay. Can you tell me the reason why? For multiple choice, it's obviously, I mean for the paper-based test. I think most students would also choose multiple choice one, because it's easy, and then the Google Form also makes us easy to fill multiple choice." (PREF-QT,S2,L20&L22)

E. Efficiency

Students appreciate Google Forms for being cost-effective and requiring minimal internet data.

"I think the only times it uses internet data is when I click the link and when I submit the answers. So personally, I think it doesn't require a lot of data." (EF-CS,S1,L30)

"I could easily use my mobile data instead of Wi-Fi." (EF-CS,2,L38)

Typing responses is also considered faster than handwriting.

"Taking assessments using Google Form is actually easier, because if we compare it to writing, typing is much faster." (EF-TM,S2,L26)

F. Time Limit

Google Forms allows time limits, though students mentioned it lacks a countdown display, making them reliant on lecturer announcements.

"Obviously, there is a time limit, and it depends on the lecturer. Sometimes it's one hour, two hours, or even 30 minutes. It varies depending on the teacher." (TML-AS,S1,L22)

"There is a time limit, but we can't really see it on Google Form. Usually, the lecturer announces the time for the test, like 30 minutes or 45 minutes." (TML-AS,S2,L24)

G. Feedback

While Google Forms provides instant feedback, it is often limited to showing scores without explanations or corrections.

"In terms of feedback, I rarely get any because what's usually given is just the score. I don't get feedback on which answers were wrong or need improvement." (FB-LI,S1,L38)

"Not all lecturers activate this feature, so sometimes only the score is shown." (FB-LI,S2,L48)

H. Disadvantages

Students highlighted that Google Forms requires a stable internet connection, and technical issues may result in lost responses.

"Sometimes, if my internet connection is unstable, my answers aren't saved, and I have to redo it all." (IC-IS,S2,L66)

They also noted that cheating is a significant issue due to the ease of accessing answers online or sharing them with peers.

"I have cheated by opening a new tab and finding answers online, especially when no one is supervising the test." (CH-S,CH-T,S2,L54)

I. Comparison with Traditional Assessments

Students generally prefer Google Forms for its convenience but acknowledge that traditional assessments are better at preventing cheating.

"Obviously, I prefer Google Form because I can do it anywhere, but traditional methods are also good because it's harder to cheat." (PREF-GF,S1,L40)

J. Google Forms as an Alternative Assessment Tool

While students see Google Forms as a useful tool, they recognize its limitations.

"I think Google Form is a very good tool, but it cannot replace all assessments, like speaking assessments, which require face-to-face interaction." (ALT-AS,S1,L40)

5. Discussion

a) Students' Perceptions

Students generally had positive perceptions of Google Forms, particularly in terms of its design and accessibility. The quantitative data reflected this, with a mean score of 3.96 for design-related aspects. Many students found the interface simple and user-friendly, aligning with Radhaswati and Santosa (2022), who highlighted Google Forms as an easy-to-use platform. However, some students noted that its aesthetic appeal was lacking, suggesting that improvements in visual engagement could enhance user motivation (Sivakumar, 2019).

In terms of accessibility, Google Forms was perceived as convenient, allowing students to take assessments anytime and anywhere (Nursani et al., 2024). However, reliance on a stable internet connection posed a challenge, as reflected in a low mean score of 1.83 for internet dependency. Furthermore, students preferred receiving the assessment link in advance to allow for preparation, as noted in their qualitative responses.

Regarding question format, students appreciated the versatility of Google Forms in supporting multiple-choice, short-answer, and checkbox questions. Multiple-choice questions were the most preferred, receiving a mean score of 4.29, as they were easier and quicker to complete. This aligns with Adelia et al. (2021), who noted that Google Forms provides flexibility in question formats.

Efficiency was another key factor influencing students' perceptions. Google Forms was seen as a time-saving and cost-effective tool, with strong agreement in questionnaire results ($M = 4.15$ for time-saving and $M = 4.32$ for faster assessments). This supports findings by Sari et al. (2020) and Mahmudi (2018), who emphasized the platform's efficiency in reducing grading time and costs.

Concerning time constraints, most students felt that the allocated time was sufficient, with a mean score of 3.83. Additionally, some believed that time limits helped minimize cheating (Evans & Culp, 2015). However, some students reported experiencing nervousness under time-limited conditions ($M = 2.26$), highlighting a potential drawback of timed assessments.

Students also viewed the feedback mechanism positively, as it provided immediate results, with a mean score of 3.83. Alsadoon (2017) emphasized that instant feedback in e-assessments enhances student engagement and learning progress. However, concerns regarding security and cheating were evident, as students felt that Google Forms lacked adequate supervision, allowing for dishonest behavior (Rowe, 2004; Alharbi et al., 2021).

When comparing Google Forms to traditional assessments, students generally preferred digital assessments for their convenience and eco-friendliness. However, they acknowledged its limitations, particularly in subjects requiring direct interaction. This aligns with Aburumman (2021), who noted the environmental benefits of online assessments.

b) Students' Experiences

Students' experiences with Google Forms varied, with many encountering the platform for the first time during junior or senior high school. However, its use significantly increased during the COVID-19 pandemic. The platform was perceived as easy to navigate, confirming Mahmudi's (2018) findings that Google Forms is designed with a user-friendly interface.

Access to Google Forms depended on how lecturers shared the links, with students receiving them through WhatsApp, Google Classroom, or other platforms (Lim et al., 2023). Some students encountered access restrictions when links were locked until the exam day.

Regarding time-limited assessments, students noted that time constraints varied by lecturer, but most found the allocated time sufficient. Some, however, experienced challenges when forced to submit hurried responses. Evans and Culp (2015) suggest that time limits in online assessments primarily aim to minimize cheating and manage stress rather than impact learning outcomes.

In terms of assessment formats, students encountered multiple-choice, short-answer, and essay questions, with a strong preference for multiple-choice due to its lower risk of errors. This preference aligns with prior research (Adelia et al., 2021). Despite these advantages, students expressed concerns about potential cheating due to the lack of supervision, reinforcing findings from Alharbi et al. (2021).

Overall, students' perceptions and experiences highlight Google Forms as an efficient and flexible assessment tool. However, issues related to internet dependency, security, and engagement should be addressed to enhance its effectiveness in online assessments.

6. Conclusion

Overall, students perceive Google Forms as an efficient and accessible assessment tool, appreciating its ease of use, multi-device compatibility, and time-saving features. Its convenience is particularly valued, although the platform's reliance on a stable internet connection remains a notable limitation. Additionally, students suggest enhancing its aesthetic appeal to improve engagement. Concerns regarding academic integrity persist, as the lack of supervision provides opportunities for dishonest practices. In terms of assessment formats and time management, students prefer multiple-choice questions due to their simplicity and lower risk of errors. They also emphasize the importance of receiving assessment links in advance for better preparation. While time limits are recognized as a measure to maintain integrity, they are also a source of stress for some students. Moreover, the ability to browse for answers during unsupervised assessments highlights the necessity for stricter monitoring mechanisms.

Students' experiences with Google Forms align with these perceptions. Many adapted quickly to the platform, particularly during the pandemic, due to its user-friendly nature. However, while the immediate feedback feature is valued, its inconsistent activation by lecturers reduces its effectiveness. Additionally, students openly acknowledge engaging in dishonest practices when assessments lack supervision, reinforcing the challenge of ensuring academic integrity in online evaluations. These findings suggest that while Google Forms serves as a practical assessment tool, improvements in supervision and security measures are necessary to enhance its effectiveness.

References

- Aburumman, M. F. (2021). E-Assessment of Students' Activities During Covid-19 Pandemic: Challenges, Advantages, and Disadvantages. *International Journal of Contemporary Management and Information Technology (IJCMIT)*, 2(1), 1–7. www.ijcmit.com
- Adelia, Miftahurrahmah, Nurpathonah, Zaindanu, Y., & Taufik Ihsan, M. (2021). The Role of Google Form as An Assessment Tool in ELT: Critical Review of The Literature. *Indonesian ETDC : Journal of Research and Educational Review*, 1(1), 58–66. <https://doi.org/10.51574/ijrer.v1i1.49>
- Agustin, K., Aridah, A., & Iswari, W. P. (2023). The Relationship among Attitudes toward ICT, Collegial Support and TPACK of EFL Teachers. *Journal of English as A Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 3(1), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.31098/jefltr.v3i1.1221>
- Akrim, A., & Sulasmi, E. (2020). Talent Development & Excellence Student Perception of Cyberbullying in Social Media. 12(1), 322–333. <http://www.iratde.com>
- Alharbi, A. S., Abdullah Alhebshi, A. A., & Meccawy, Z. (2021). EFL Students' and Teachers' Perceptions of Google Forms as a Digital Formative Assessment Tool in Saudi Secondary Schools. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(1), 140–154. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/call7.10>

- Alsadoon, H. (2017). Students' Perceptions of E-Assessment at Saudi Electronic University. *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 16(1), 147–153.
- Amado Mateus, M., Guzmán Rincón, A., & Cuero Acosta, Y. A. (2023). Student experience scale: Factor analysis in higher education institutions. *Frontiers in Education*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.1057651>
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. Longman.
- Castro, S. (2018). Google Forms Quizzes and Substitution, Augmentation, Modification, and Redefinition (SAMR) Model Integration. *Issues and Trends in Educational Technology*, 6(2), 4–14. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2458/azu_itet_v6i2_castro
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2018). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (H. Salmon, C. Neve, & J. Scappini, Eds.; 3rd ed.). SAGE Publication, Inc.
- Fitriani, N. (2020). The Students' Perception of Reading Examination Using Google Form. *E-Journal of Linguistics*, 15(1), 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.24843/e-jl.2021.v15.i01.p06>
- Hakiki, G. N. R. (2021). Perception of EFL Students on the Use Grammarly Application in Writing Class. *EDUVELOP*, 4(2), 99–106. <https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v4i2.891>
- Karim, N. A., & Shukur, Z. (2016). Using Preferences as User Identification in the Online Examination. *International Journal on Advanced Science, Engineering and Information Technology*, 6(6). <http://www.remotep>
- Lim, G. F. C., Jalil, N. A., Hidup, D. S. A., Omar, M., Kamaruzaman, F. M., & Abd Majid, M. Z. (2023). The Use of Google Forms in Teaching and Learning based on Teachers' Perspective. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(12). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v13-i12/20221>
- Limbong, E. (2017). Globalization And Pedagogy: How Should English Teachers Teach English In The 21 st Century? The 1st International Conference on Education, Science, Art and Technology (the 1st ICESAT), 22–23.
- Nursani, Zaiturrahmi, & Diana, N. (2024). Students' Perspective toward The Implementation of Goggle Form as A Digital Learning Assessment Tool. *English Education and Applied Linguistics (EEAL) Journal*, 7(2).
- Pratama, J., & Fudhla, N. (2022). A Study of Google Form as an Assessment Tool in English Subject at SMAN 2 Solok. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 11(1), 87–94. <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jelt/article/view/116235>
- Radhaswati, I. D. A. A., & Santosa, M. H. (2022). Teachers' Perceptions: the Use of Google Form as a Media to Assess Primary School Students. *EDUTECH : Journal of Education And Technology*, 5(4). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.29062/edu.v5i4.308>
- Raju, V., & Harinarayana, N. S. (2016, January). Online survey tools: A case study of Google Forms. Paper Presented at the National Conference on "Scientific, Computational & Information Research Trends in Engineering. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326831738>
- Rowe, N. C. (2004). Cheating in Online Student Assessment: Beyond Plagiarism. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 7(2).
- Sari, L., Limbong, E., & Utami Asih, Y. (2023). Aligning Pedagogical Beliefs and Technology Integration in English Language Teaching: A Multiple-Case Study of Islamic Senior High School EFL Teachers. *Borneo Educational Journal (Borju)*, 5(2), 260–272. <https://doi.org/10.24903/bej.v5i2.1356>

- Sari, S., Bayu, A., Sari, P., & Rejeki, S. (2020). Google Forms as An EFL Assessment tool: Positive features and Limitations. *Premise : Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 231–250. <https://fkip.ummetro.ac.id/journal/index.php/english>
- Tosuncuoglu, I. (2018). Importance of Assessment in ELT. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6(9), 163–167. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i9.3443>
- Watson, S. J. (1991). An analysis of the concept of experience. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 16, 1117–1111. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.1991.tb03373.x>
- Weleschuk, A., Dyjur, P., & Kelly, P. (2019). *Online Assessment in Higher Education*. Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning at the University of Calgary Guide Series. <http://www.ucalgary.ca/taylorinstitute/>
- Yakkop, M., Basri, M., & Mahmud, M. (2021). Teachers' Perception in Google Forms-Based English Assessment in An Indonesian Vocational High School. *ELT WORLDWIDE Journal of English Language Teaching*, 8(2), 278–292. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26858/eltww.v8i2.22145>
- Yoestara, M., Putri, Z., Keumala, M., & Idami, Z. (2020). Pre-Service English Teachers' Perception towards Online Assessment Method. *International Journal of Education, Language, and Religion*, 2(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.35308/ijelr.v2i1.1933>
- Yunita, W., & Maisarah, I. (2020). Students' Perception on Learning Language at the Graduate Program of English Education Amids the COVID 19 Pandemic. *Linguists : Journal Of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 6(2), 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.29300/ling.v6i2.3718>