English Language Teaching Educational Journal
Vol. 8, No. 3, December 2025, pp. 177-191
ISSN 2621-6485

# Evaluating the implementation of E-portfolio-based learning in ELT Through the CIPP model: A qualitative descriptive study in Indonesia

Raden Muhammad Ali [a, 1, *], Samsul Hadi [b, 2], Widyastuti Purbani [b, 3], Sinta Nuriyah Muso Utomo [a, 4], Muhammad Kunta Biddinika [a, 5], Dwi Hastuti [a, 6]

[a] Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Kampus 4, Jl. Ring Road Selatan, Tamanan, Banguntapan, Yogyakarta, 55191, Indonesia
[b] Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Jl. Colombo No.1, Karang Malang, Caturtunggal, Yogyakarta, 55281, Indonesia
[1] raden.ali@pbi.uad.ac.id*; [2] samsul_hd@uny.ac.id; [3] purbani@uny.ac.id; [4] sinta1900004093@webmail.uad.ac.id; [5] mkuntab@gmail.com; [6] dwi.hastuti@pgpaud.uad.ac.id

*corresponding author

ARTICLE INFO

**Article history**
Received 15 June 2025
Revised 17 July 2025
Accepted 4 August 2025

**Keywords**
CIPP
E-portfolio
Evaluation
English Language Teaching
Qualitative research

ABSTRACT

E-portfolios have increasingly been integrated into higher education to promote reflection, documentation, and learner autonomy; however, their effectiveness in English Language Teaching (ELT) in Indonesia remains insufficiently examined. This study evaluates the use of e-portfolio-based learning in an Evaluation in ELT course by employing the Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) evaluation model. Four research questions guided the investigation, focusing on the relevance of the programme context, the adequacy of inputs, the implementation processes, and the resulting learning outcomes. Using a descriptive qualitative design, data were collected through classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and documentation of students' e-portfolios. The participants consisted of one lecturer and thirty-seven seventh-semester students (ten males and twenty-seven females) enrolled in the course during the 2022/2023 academic year; additionally, three students were purposively selected for in-depth interviews. The findings indicate that (1) the context supported the adoption of e-portfolios as it aligned with course needs and learning objectives; (2) the input—including digital facilities, infrastructure, and access to online tools—was adequate for implementation; (3) the process showed active student engagement, although challenges such as connectivity issues, device limitations, and time constraints were present; and (4) the product demonstrated positive learning outcomes, including improved documentation practices, better understanding of course material, and increased digital literacy. The study underscores the potential of e-portfolios to enhance ELT learning and suggests the need for more structured feedback mechanisms and technical support to optimise future implementation.



**How to Cite:** Ali, R. M., Hadi, S., Purbani, W., Utomo, S. N. M., Biddinika, M. K., & Hastuti, D. (2025). Evaluating the implementation of E-portfolio-based learning in ELT Through the CIPP model: A qualitative descriptive study in Indonesia. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal, 8*(3), 177-191. https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v8i3.14853

## 1. Introduction

The integration of digital learning tools has become increasingly essential in higher education (Alenezi et al., 2023), particularly within English Language Teaching (ELT) (Vaishnav, 2024), where

technological advancements continue to influence instructional practices and assessment strategies. Among the various digital platforms currently used, electronic portfolios (e-portfolios) have gained prominence for their capacity to enhance learner autonomy (Kiffer et al., 2021), promote reflective engagement, and provide systematic documentation of learning progress (Bassam & Baniyounes, 2024). In digital learning environments, e-portfolios offer opportunities for students to curate multimodal evidence of their competencies (Barrot, 2025; Lam, 2022), allowing learning to be demonstrated not merely through test scores but through authentic, process-oriented artefacts (Maya & Wolf, 2024). Previous research highlights that e-portfolios support self-regulated learning (Beckers et al., 2016; Gulden et al., 2020; Romero et al., 2019), multimodal production, and authentic assessment (Tur et al., 2019; White, 2019) by enabling students to review materials (Rezadoust et al., 2025) , track their development, and engage in reflective thinking (Ciesielkiewicz, 2019; Roco & Barberà, 2022) ; (Sobko & Brown, 2019). Within ELT specifically, e-portfolios have shown potential to improve engagement and strengthen productive language skills such as speaking and writing through iterative practice and reflection (Kusuma et al., 2021; Muin et al., 2021).

Despite these advantages, the adoption of e-portfolios in Indonesian higher education remains relatively constrained (Ali et al., 2025). Existing studies indicate that lecturers and students face persistent challenges related to digital readiness, technical literacy, and familiarity with portfolio-based pedagogies (Kusuma & Waluyo, 2023; Ni & Lam, 2025). Research on e-portfolios in Indonesia generally focuses on limited aspects, such as learner perceptions (Namaziandost et al., 2020; Wardani et al., 2022), isolated skill development, or technological barriers, without examining how e-portfolios operate as part of a broader instructional system. Moreover, studies rarely address how e-portfolio implementation relates to institutional conditions, course objectives, or teaching practices (Harun et al., 2021). This gap is reflected in the classroom data used in this study, where the lecturer reported issues such as disorganised documentation, low engagement during online sessions, and the need to cultivate students' responsibility for storing and revisiting learning materials.

As universities across Indonesia continue integrating digital tools to support blended and online instruction, there is a pressing need to understand not only whether e-portfolios are useful but how they function within the learning environment (Ali et al., 2024). Such understanding requires a systematic evaluation that takes into account the alignment between programme intentions, available resources, teaching processes, and learning outcomes. Evaluation frameworks provide structured approaches for such analyses. Among them, the Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) model offers a comprehensive and formative lens for evaluating educational programmes (Linda, 2025). It enables a holistic assessment of programme needs (context), resource readiness (input), implementation quality (process), and learning results (product). While CIPP has been widely used to evaluate curricula, teacher education programmes, and institutional innovations, its application to e-portfolio-based learning in Indonesian ELT remains limited, leaving a significant theoretical and empirical gap.

Although e-portfolio research in ELT has grown internationally, most studies focus on micro-level analyses, such as motivation, learner experience, or specific language-skill outcomes. Very few studies in Indonesia have examined e-portfolios at the programme level (Afrilyasanti et al., 2024), let alone using a comprehensive evaluation framework that simultaneously analyses context, resources, instructional dynamics, and learning outcomes. This study therefore offers novelty by shifting the focus toward a system-level evaluation that captures the interconnected components shaping e-portfolio implementation. Such an approach is crucial in the Indonesian ELT context, where digital learning adoption varies widely across institutions and where empirical guidance for designing and sustaining digital learning practices is still developing.

This study also introduces novelty through the deliberate application of the CIPP evaluation model to assess e-portfolio-based learning. While CIPP is well established in international programme evaluation scholarship, its utilisation for examining digital learning innovations—particularly e-portfolios in ELT—remains underrepresented in Indonesian research. Through the use of CIPP, this study generates a holistic account of the strengths, challenges, and pedagogical value of e-portfolio implementation, offering evidence-based recommendations that can inform future curricular design and institutional decision-making. This makes the study timely and relevant, especially as Indonesian universities seek sustainable digital learning strategies following the rapid transitions of the pandemic period.

Given the growing adoption of digital learning tools and the limited evidence regarding their pedagogical effectiveness in Indonesian ELT programmes, conducting a systematic evaluation becomes essential. Such evaluation is needed not only to assess current practices but also to inform improvements, support lecturer decision-making, and guide institutional policies for digital learning innovation. In this study, the lecturer's reflections on documentation practices, engagement issues, and the need for structured learning review further underscore the relevance of evaluating the e-portfolio programme comprehensively.

Therefore, this study aims to evaluate the use of e-portfolio-based learning in an ELT course at an Indonesian university using the CIPP evaluation model. Specifically, it addresses the following research questions:

1. How does the context of the e-portfolio-based learning programme support its implementation in the Evaluation in ELT course?
2. How do the inputs—including resources, facilities, and instructional supports—contribute to the use of e-portfolios in the course?
3. How does the learning process unfold during the implementation of e-portfolio-based learning?
4. What learning outcomes (products) result from the use of e-portfolios in the course?

By addressing these questions, this study contributes to the expanding body of literature on digital learning in ELT by providing programme-level evidence on the effectiveness of e-portfolios. The findings offer practical insights for lecturers, curriculum designers, and policymakers seeking to optimise digital learning integration in Indonesian higher education. Ultimately, this research seeks to inform sustainable approaches to technology-enhanced learning that support engagement, autonomy, and long-term learning development in ELT courses.

## 2. Method

As part of the effort to comprehensively evaluate the implementation of e-portfolio-based learning within the ELT context, this study required a methodological approach capable of capturing the full dynamics of the programme. The methodology needed to trace the relationships between instructional goals, resource readiness, classroom processes, and the learning outcomes achieved by students. In addition, the research method had to accommodate the exploration of the lecturer's and students' subjective experiences, enabling a richer and more accurate portrayal of how the programme operated in practice. With these considerations in mind, a qualitative approach was selected to provide both flexibility and analytical depth.

### 2.1. Research Design

This study employed a descriptive qualitative design to evaluate the implementation of e-portfolio-based learning in an English Language Teaching (ELT) course. The evaluation was guided by the Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) model, which provides a comprehensive framework for examining the alignment between programme objectives, available resources, instructional processes, and learning outcomes. Using this approach allowed the researchers to explore how e-portfolio practices functioned within the natural classroom setting and to understand the experiences of both lecturer and students.

### 2.2. Setting and Participants

The research was conducted in the Evaluation in ELT course during the 2022/2023 academic year at the English Education Study Programme of Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia. The participants consisted of one lecturer and thirty-seven seventh-semester students, comprising ten males and twenty-seven females. To obtain more detailed insights into student experiences, three students were purposively selected for follow-up interviews based on their consistency in completing e-portfolio tasks and their active classroom participation. The class used a blended-learning format, which provided opportunities to observe both face-to-face and online components of the course.

### 2.3. Instruments

Data were collected using three primary instruments: an observation guide, a semi-structured interview protocol, and a documentation checklist. The observation guide helped record the flow of classroom activities, the lecturer's instructions, and students' engagement with e-portfolio tasks. The interview protocol was developed to explore participants' experiences, challenges, and perceptions related to e-portfolio use. It was reviewed informally by ELT and e-learning experts to ensure content clarity. The documentation checklist was used to examine students' e-portfolio artefacts, including the organisation of Google Sites pages, completeness of uploaded materials, and the presence of reflective elements.

### 2.4. Data Collection Procedures

Data collection took place over the duration of the course. Classroom observations were conducted during scheduled meetings to examine how the lecturer introduced e-portfolios, demonstrated the use of Google Sites, and facilitated discussions around students' work. Semi-structured interviews were carried out with the lecturer and the three selected students. All interviews were audio-recorded with consent and subsequently transcribed for analysis. In addition, documentation of students' e-portfolios was gathered through screenshots, artefact listings, and access to students' Google Sites pages, allowing the researchers to analyse learning products and patterns of participation.

### 2.5. Data Analysis

Data analysis followed Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña's (2014) interactive model, comprising data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing. During data condensation, the researchers selected and organised relevant excerpts from interview transcripts, observation notes, and documentation records. These condensed data were then displayed in thematic matrices and narrative summaries aligned with the four CIPP components. Analysis continued with iterative coding, beginning with inductive identification of emerging themes and followed by deductive categorisation based on CIPP dimensions. The final stage involved drawing conclusions by comparing patterns across data sources and verifying interpretations through collaborative discussion among the researchers.

### 2.6. Trustworthiness

Several strategies were implemented to ensure the trustworthiness of the findings. Method triangulation was achieved by combining observations, interviews, and documentation. Data source triangulation was applied by obtaining perspectives from both lecturer and students. Peer debriefing with colleagues in ELT helped refine interpretations, while member checking was conducted by sharing interview summaries with participants to confirm the accuracy of their statements. These procedures strengthened the credibility and dependability of the study.

### 2.7. Evaluation Framework: CIPP Model

The CIPP model served as the analytical framework for evaluating the programme. The Context component examined the background and objectives of e-portfolio adoption. The Input component assessed the availability of resources, infrastructure, and instructional planning. The Process component focused on how e-portfolio-based learning was implemented in practice, including lecturer strategies, student participation, and encountered challenges. The Product component evaluated the outcomes of the learning programme, including students' understandings, skills, and reflections. By structuring the analysis around these four dimensions, the study offered a holistic evaluation of e-portfolio-based learning in the ELT classroom.

## 3. Finding and Discussion

This section presents the integrated findings and discussions derived from the evaluation of an e-portfolio-based learning programme using the CIPP model. In qualitative educational research, it is both logical and methodologically appropriate to combine findings and discussions into a single, interpretive narrative in order to preserve the coherence between empirical data, thematic interpretation, and theoretical linkage. Accordingly, this section is organised into four subsections—Context, Input, Process, and Product—each representing one research question and containing eight analytical paragraphs. These paragraphs draw from interviews, classroom observations, and

documentation of student e-portfolios, and are supported by relevant scholarship to produce a comprehensive and evidence-driven evaluation of the learning programme.

### 3.1. Context Evaluation

The context evaluation revealed that the adoption of e-portfolio-based learning arose from a confluence of pedagogical, technological, and motivational challenges experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic. The lecturer described the unprecedented shift to online education as a period marked by dramatic declines in student engagement: "*Students were not active in Zoom class, mostly off cam, and learning became boring and monotonous.*" This experience parallels findings in the global literature noting widespread passivity, emotional detachment, and cognitive overload among online learners (Amin & Paiman, 2022). The need to redesign instructional strategies was therefore urgent, prompting the lecturer to consider alternative approaches that could maintain interaction and accountability.

Students' testimonies further reinforced the contextual need for transforming the learning framework. One student recounted a common but critical issue: "*My notes were lost somewhere when I was going to Final Exam*." This statement reveals the vulnerability of paper-based documentation, especially during periods of remote or hybrid learning. The literature consistently reports that students often struggle to maintain organised, accessible, and long-term records of learning materials without digital support (Scully et al., 2018). The adoption of e-portfolios thus addressed a concrete organisational problem that had implications for academic performance and learner confidence.

Another contextual dimension was the need to facilitate reflective learning and deep processing of instructional materials. A student explained: "*This e-portfolio makes me review the material… and that is what makes us remember what the lecturer explained*." This form of cyclical review is foundational to self-regulated learning theory (Zimmerman, 1990), which emphasises learner responsibility in reviewing, evaluating, and reconstructing knowledge. In ELT contexts, reflective review supports metalinguistic awareness, vocabulary retention, and comprehension skills (Kusuma et al., 2021), suggesting that the e-portfolio aligned strongly with both pedagogical and domain-specific needs.

The lecturer also emphasised the programme's alignment with broader digital transformation trends in higher education. He noted that e-portfolios allowed students to access materials "anywhere and anytime," reflecting core principles of flexible and ubiquitous learning (Haggerty & Thompson, 2017). This demonstrates that the contextual rationale for adopting e-portfolios extended beyond pandemic responses, tapping into global educational demands for digital literacy, multimodal engagement, and self-directed learning competencies.

A further contextual factor involved empowering students to develop sustained habits of academic responsibility. The lecturer expressed an intention to encourage students to document learning systematically, a skill relevant for teachers-in-training in ELT programmes. Research affirms that e-portfolios can cultivate long-term learning strategies—and not merely serve short-term assessment purposes—when integrated consistently into coursework (Rhodes, 2010). The programme thus sought to cultivate habits aligned with professional expectations in educational fields.

Moreover, the context suggested that the e-portfolio programme filled a pedagogical gap by enabling more transparent and continuous monitoring of student progress. The lecturer explained that digital archiving helped him trace students' understanding throughout the semester, something difficult to achieve through traditional assignments. This benefits instructors by making student learning more visible and trackable, aligning with the principle of assessment for learning (Black & Wiliam, 1998).

Additionally, e-portfolios addressed the need for authentic assessment during hybrid learning. Authentic assessment theory emphasises the importance of real-world tasks, process documentation, and reflective demonstration of learning. The programme met these needs by requiring students to reconstruct knowledge, organise content, and articulate understanding in their own words.

Overall, the context evaluation indicates that the adoption of e-portfolios was highly justified, grounded in real challenges, and responsive to learners' needs. It aligns with Stufflebeam's (Stufflebeam, 2003) requirement that context evaluation must identify needs, goals, and opportunities before programme implementation. Collectively, student testimonies, lecturer reflections, and

theoretical alignment show that the contextual foundation for the e-portfolio programme was strong, timely, and pedagogically sound.

### 3.2. Input Evaluation

The input evaluation examined how resources, technological tools, institutional support, and instructional preparation contributed to the implementation of the e-portfolio programme. The lecturer deliberately selected Google Sites due to its cost-free nature, accessibility, and ease of use. He explained: *"I choose to use Google Sites because it's easy and free."* Accessibility is a critical input element in digital environments where socioeconomic disparities affect learner participation. Prior studies affirm that user-friendly and free platforms facilitate smoother adoption in resource-variable contexts (Salas-Pilco et al., 2022).

Students' access to devices and internet connectivity varied, revealing an important input challenge. Although most students had laptops and institutional Google accounts, several reported connectivity problems. One student stated: *"Because the class is hybrid… sometimes the signal was bad and making it took a lot of energy and time."* Research shows that inconsistent connectivity can significantly limit learners' participation in digitally mediated tasks (Michikyan et al., 2025) . Despite these obstacles, students adapted by working offline and uploading assignments when network conditions improved, demonstrating resilience and digital problem-solving behaviours.

Instructional preparation was a significant input strength. The lecturer provided a thoroughly prepared syllabi (RPS), learning modules, examples of portfolio structures, and clear instructions for each weekly task. This scaffolding allowed students to understand expectations, pacing, and task requirements. Literature emphasises that clear instructional design is crucial for portfolio success (Tosun, 2011), especially for learners unfamiliar with multimodal documentation (Scully et al., 2018)

Another important input was students' willingness to engage in independent learning strategies. One student described: *"My first strategy is to find out what an e-portfolio is… I looked at references on the internet."* This aligns with research demonstrating that digital portfolio tasks naturally encourage self-directed learning and independent exploration (Chittum, 2018). These strategies represent an essential input in the CIPP framework, which emphasises learner readiness as a prerequisite for effective programme outcomes.

Institutional support further strengthened the programme's inputs. The availability of classroom projectors, speakers, air conditioning, and electrical infrastructure created a conducive environment for hybrid learning. University-provided Google accounts streamlined student access to digital tools, while integrated platforms such as Google Docs and YouTube enriched the portfolio creation process. Institutional technological readiness is a known predictor of successful digital learning implementations (Okuonghae et al., 2021).

The lecturer's preparation also included designing activities that emphasised multimodal representation, reflection, and documentation—principles central to portfolio assessment. This aligns with constructivist approaches, which view learning as the active construction of knowledge rather than passive consumption. The e-portfolio created opportunities for student content creation, which is a key marker of constructivist and experiential learning approaches (Sitthimongkolchai et al., 2022).

Despite robust inputs, challenges remained—most notably students' inconsistent familiarity with digital tools. Some students required additional support and modelling from the lecturer. Digital readiness varies widely among Indonesian undergraduates (Kusuma & Waluyo, 2023). However, the programme's inputs—platform choice, institutional infrastructure, instructional scaffolds, and learner strategies—collectively provided a strong foundation that aligned with the input dimension of the CIPP model.

### 3.3. Process Evaluation

The process evaluation examined how the e-portfolio programme unfolded in practice, including instructional procedures, student engagement, learning behaviours, and challenges (Keshmiri & Mehrparvar, 2023). The lecturer explained that the course used a blended approach: "*This e-portfolio is mostly done as homework… we discuss difficulties during several meetings*." This aligns with blended learning models, which combine synchronous instruction with asynchronous reflective tasks, improving motivation and self-regulation (Ho & Tai, 2020). The design of the programme encouraged

learners to balance structured instruction with independent online activities, allowing them to gradually develop autonomy in managing digital tasks and course responsibilities.

Students' weekly routines involved documenting learning materials, uploading summaries, embedding external resources, and writing reflective notes. One student described: *"On the Google Site… I fill it with material at each meeting… whatever the lecturer explains in class.*" This represents continuous, iterative documentation, which is essential to portfolio pedagogy (Scully et al., 2018). Students were thus engaged in ongoing meaning-making rather than episodic task completion, and this iterative engagement enabled them to revisit, consolidate, and refine their understanding of course concepts over time.

Creativity emerged as a strong dimension of the process. Students enjoyed designing their portfolios aesthetically and functionally. As one expressed: "*Using e-portfolio is fun… I can hone my skills in editing or creating Google Sites.*" Creativity is a documented outcome of portfolio-based learning because students have autonomy over design and representation (Douglas et al., 2019). The lecturer reinforced this observation by noting that students took pride in their work: "*They are proud because they can make works like that*," signalling the motivational benefits of creative ownership in digital learning spaces.

Nevertheless, the process revealed challenges. Students often described e-portfolio creation as time-consuming: "*Making it takes a lot of energy and time… not only filling materials but also designing it."* This aligns with literature acknowledging the heavy workload associated with portfolio construction (Mihret et al., 2017). Technical issues such as embedding multimedia, template limitations, and unstable connectivity occasionally disrupted workflow, indicating areas where additional institutional support or training could be beneficial.

The peer-feedback mechanism also faced difficulties. Students used Google Docs to comment on peers' work, but participation varied. Some comments were repetitive or superficial, and in one case, all entries were lost due to technical failure. Research warns that unstructured feedback processes can limit portfolio effectiveness (Scully et al., 2018). This suggests a need for more explicit instructions, rubrics, and clearer expectations to strengthen the quality of peer review and ensure more meaningful engagement.

Throughout the process, student agency and independence remained prominent. The lecturer observed growing student confidence in managing digital content, and students began exploring additional features of Google Sites independently. This reflects transformative learning processes where learners move from dependency to autonomy. The development of such autonomy is particularly valuable in ELT, where self-directed learning plays an important role in language acquisition and professional preparation (Amini & Kruger, 2022).

In addition to these findings, the process evaluation highlighted the role of digital collaboration in shaping students' learning experiences. Although Google Docs served as the primary platform for peer feedback, students' participation demonstrated varying levels of engagement. Some students interacted actively, offering specific suggestions on organisation, accuracy of content, or page design, while others contributed only brief or repetitive comments. This inconsistency mirrors existing literature indicating that peer feedback in e-portfolio environments requires structured guidance to be effective (Zhang & Tur, 2022). Without explicit rubrics or targeted prompts, students may struggle to provide meaningful critique, resulting in superficial interaction.

Another important aspect observed in the process is the gradual development of students' digital competencies. While many students initially expressed uncertainty regarding the technical features of Google Sites, their confidence increased over time as they explored templates, embedded multimedia, and experimented with layout design (Halim & Halim, 2024). One student noted that they "*became more skilled in editing and arranging pages"* after repeated practice, indicating that the e-portfolio process functioned not only as a documentation platform but also as a medium for digital skill building. This aligns with Modise and Mudau (Modise & Mudau, 2023), who argue that e-portfolios create opportunities for learners to grow technological fluency (Aghazadeh, 2020) by engaging with authentic digital tasks (Walland & Shaw, 2022).

Finally, process evaluation revealed that the e-portfolio served as a mechanism for continual content review and reinforcement (Yang & Wong, 2024). Because students updated their portfolios weekly, they were repeatedly exposed to course concepts, which strengthened retention and

understanding. As one student explained, "*indirectly, the e-portfolio makes me review the material and that is what makes us remember the material provided*." This practice reflects principles of iterative learning, where ongoing cycles of documentation, reflection, and revision deepen comprehension (Roberts, 2018). Revisiting previous entries also enabled students to identify progress, monitor understanding , and develop a stronger sense of academic responsibility—an outcome aligned with reflective learning theory (Veine et al., 2020).

From a CIPP perspective, the process dimension demonstrated that the programme operated largely as intended, fostering active engagement, creativity, sustained documentation, collaboration, and reflective learning. Although challenges existed, they were generally manageable and provided important insights for future refinement, particularly in the areas of peer-feedback structure, technical support, and instructional scaffolding.

### 3.4. Product Evaluation

The product evaluation examined the outcomes generated through the e-portfolio programme. Students repeatedly reported improved understanding of course materials. One stated: *"…after using the e-portfolio I feel that I understand the material better."* This aligns with research showing that reflective documentation promotes deep learning, conceptual clarity, and integration of course concepts (Aparicio-Ting et al., 2023). Reviewing and rewriting materials for their portfolio encouraged students to reconstruct information in their own words, strengthening conceptual internalisation and long-term retention (Al-rashidi et al., 2023)

The lecturer observed similar benefits, noting improvements in organisation, creativity, and confidence: "*Students find it helpful to put their archives and documents… they are proud and creative."* Thematically, students' portfolios demonstrated enhanced digital literacy (Yin et al., 2025), including the ability to organise information hierarchically, embed links, and create multimedia content (Chan, 2020). Digital literacy is considered a crucial 21st-century competency, especially for students preparing for professional teaching roles (Syzdykova et al., 2021). These digital competencies were not explicitly taught as course objectives but emerged organically through students' engagement with the e-portfolio platform.

A particularly significant finding was the transferability of e-portfolio skills beyond the course. The lecturer noted: "*Some use the e-portfolio for teaching, for campus teaching programmes… even for other subjects."* Transfer of learning is a hallmark of effective educational programmes (Roco & Barberà, 2022). The fact that students continued using Google Sites to organise teaching materials or document activities in other classes indicates that the programme produced functional and sustainable skills. This suggests that the e-portfolio contributed not only to learning performance in a single course but also to broader academic and professional development (López-Crespo et al., 2022).

Nevertheless, the outcome dimension also revealed weaknesses. Students expressed concerns about the time demands of portfolio creation and design (Dalton, 2022). The peer-feedback system, although conceptually beneficial, required improvement to ensure meaningful critique (Bravo et al., 2022). Another concern raised by the lecturer was academic integrity: *"Students can easily copy their friends or just copy material from the internet."* This highlights the need for explicit instruction on citing digital materials and maintaining originality. The lecturer's observations suggest that aspects of digital ethics, referencing, and proper attribution must be integrated into future iterations of the programme.

Additional findings revealed that the e-portfolio also influenced students' affective responses toward the course. Several students expressed pride, satisfaction, and enjoyment when viewing the final appearance of their digital portfolios (Chan, 2020), describing the experience as "fun" and "motivating" because they could personalise their work (Wong & Hughes, 2023). This aligns with research showing that portfolio-based learning enhances learner identity formation and fosters a sense of ownership (Goldsmith, 2007) students perceive their work as personally meaningful and visually appealing (Torres & Mckinley, 2023), they are more likely to engage deeply and consistently with the learning process (Song, 2021).

Furthermore, the product evaluation suggested that the e-portfolio strengthened students' metacognitive awareness. As students compiled weekly reflections and summaries, they became more aware of what they understood and what still needed clarification. One student reported that the e-portfolio "*makes me review the material and remember what the lecturer explained,"* demonstrating

how reflective writing supports metacognitive monitoring. This outcome is consistent with Roberts (Roberts, 2018), who argues that reflective cycles help students evaluate their progress, identify weaknesses, and adjust learning strategies more effectively.

Another notable product outcome relates to the visibility of learning. Because students' progress was documented in a cumulative and organised manner, the lecturer could easily monitor individual development across the semester. He could also identify students who struggled, as incomplete or inconsistent portfolio entries provided visible indicators of learning gaps. This transparency enhanced the lecturer's ability to provide targeted support or follow-up, making the e-portfolio not only an assessment tool but also a formative diagnostic instrument (Pospíšilová & Rohlíková, 2023). Visibility of learning outcomes is one of the key strengths of digital portfolio systems (Mgarbi et al., n.d.) and supports more responsive teaching practices .

Despite these limitations, the product evaluation demonstrates that the programme achieved its intended goals: improving comprehension, fostering digital literacy, promoting creativity, strengthening independent learning, and enhancing learning visibility. According to Stufflebeam's (Stufflebeam, 2003) criteria, these outcomes indicate strong programme effectiveness with manageable areas for improvement. Overall, the findings suggest that e-portfolio-based learning is viable, effective, and potentially scalable within broader ELT contexts in Indonesian higher education. Future refinements focusing on academic integrity, structured peer review, and streamlined digital support could enhance these outcomes further.

Table 1. Summary of CIPP-Based Evaluation Findings

| CIPP Component | Key Findings | Evidence | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Context | Pandemic challenges, documentation issues, engagement gaps. | Lecturer & student quotes. | Strong contextual need; aligns with reflective & self-regulated learning. |
| Input | Adequate digital tools; uneven connectivity; strong instructional scaffolding. | Interview & observation. | Inputs largely sufficient; consistent with digital readiness theory. |
| Process | High engagement, creativity, sustained documentation; time & technical challenges. | Multiple student quotes. | Reflective & constructivist learning; manageable barriers. |
| Product | Improved understanding, digital literacy, creativity, transferable skills. | Lecturer & student insights. | Programme effective; aligns with deep learning & digital competence. |

## 4. Conclusion

The findings of this study demonstrate that the e-portfolio-based learning programme implemented in the Evaluation in ELT course was effective, relevant, and responsive to both pedagogical and contextual needs. The use of the CIPP evaluation model provided a comprehensive lens for analysing how the programme aligned with the realities of hybrid learning and the challenges faced by students during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. The context evaluation confirmed that the programme addressed critical issues related to low engagement, insufficient documentation, and the need for flexible access to learning materials. These findings underscore the importance of integrating digital learning tools in higher education, particularly in ELT contexts that require continuous reflection and scaffolded development of language and pedagogical skills.

The input evaluation revealed that the combination of accessible digital platforms, adequate institutional infrastructure, and clear instructional preparation formed a strong foundation for the programme. Despite variations in students' digital readiness and occasional connectivity problems, the availability of Google Sites, learning modules, and lecturer support contributed significantly to the programme's success. The consistency between programme inputs and intended learning outcomes highlights the crucial role of resource readiness and digital scaffolding in facilitating meaningful engagement and learning autonomy.

The process evaluation showed that students engaged actively with e-portfolio tasks, constructed learning documentation consistently, and exercised creativity in designing and customising their portfolio pages. The iterative nature of the portfolio allowed students to revisit course concepts, connect ideas, and articulate reflective understanding. While challenges such as time constraints, technical difficulties, and inconsistent peer feedback emerged, these did not undermine the overall quality of the learning process. Instead, they offer important insights for refining instructional strategies, particularly in providing more structured peer-review frameworks and stronger technical support systems.

The product evaluation confirmed substantial learning gains. Students reported improved understanding of course materials, enhanced digital literacy, greater reflective awareness, and transferable skills relevant to their academic and professional trajectories. The lecturer also observed increased confidence, creativity, and ownership among students, indicating the potential scalability of the programme across other ELT courses. Based on these findings, it is recommended that future implementations incorporate clearer guidelines for academic integrity, enhanced peer-feedback protocols, and additional institutional support for addressing digital inequities. Expanding e-portfolio integration across other ELT subjects and practicum activities may further strengthen students' digital competence and professional readiness.

## 5. Limitation and Future Research

This study acknowledges several limitations that should be considered in interpreting its findings. The research was conducted within a single course at one university, which may limit the generalisability of the results to broader ELT contexts. The qualitative design, while effective for capturing rich experiences and contextual dynamics, did not include quantitative measures that could provide additional insights into learning outcomes, digital performance, or the statistical impact of e-portfolio use. Furthermore, data were collected primarily from students and one lecturer, without incorporating perspectives from administrators or other instructors who may influence institutional policy or digital infrastructure. These factors suggest that the findings represent a contextualised, course-specific interpretation rather than a universal model.

Future research may broaden the scope by implementing e-portfolios across multiple courses, institutions, or academic levels to examine their scalability and long-term impact. Mixed-methods designs combining qualitative insights with rubric-based assessments, learning analytics, or pre–post comparisons may offer more robust evidence of e-portfolio effectiveness. Researchers could also explore how e-portfolios support professional identity development, practicum readiness, and digital literacy across the ELT curriculum. Additionally, further investigation into digital equity, accessibility challenges, academic integrity, and sustainable peer-feedback mechanisms would help institutions refine policies and enhance the effectiveness of e-portfolio-based learning in diverse educational settings.

**Acknowledgment**

This program is financed by the Directorate of Research, Culture, and Community Service, Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia for the 2024 fiscal year, with contract number 102/PFR/LPPM UAD/VI/2024. The authors also acknowledge limited use of AI-generated language assistance (ChatGPT) for minor editorial refinement. All research ideas, methodological decisions, and analytical interpretations were developed independently by the authors in accordance with academic integrity standards.

**Declarations**

**Author contribution** : The research was collaboratively undertaken by all authors, encompassing topic selection, proposal development, methodological application, data analysis, and the preparation of the discussion section.

**Funding statement** : This program is financed by the Directorate of Research, Culture, and Community Service, Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia for the 2024 fiscal year, with contract number 102/PFR/LPPM UAD/VI/2024.

**Conflict of interest** : We declare that there are no competing interests.

**Ethics Declaration** : As the authors, we confirm that this work has been written based on ethical research principles in compliance with our university's regulations and that the necessary permission was obtained from the relevant institution during data collection. We fully support ELTEJ's commitment to upholding high standards of professional conduct and practicing honesty in all academic and professional activities.

**Additional information** : No additional information is available for this paper.

## REFERENCES

Afrilyasanti, R., Suhartoyo, E., & Widiati, U. (2024). Researching the use of e-portfolios to promote students thinking in digital age: a qualitative action study. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, *ahead-of-p*(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/ITSE-08-2023-0167

Aghazadeh, Z. (2020). *The Effect of E-portfolio on EFL Learners ' Writing Accuracy , Fluency , and Complexity*. *20*(2), 182–199.

Al-rashidi, H., Vadivel, B., Khalil, N. R., & Basim, N. (2023). The comparative impacts of portfolio - based assessment , self - assessment , and scaffolded peer assessment on reading comprehension , vocabulary learning , and grammatical accuracy : insights from working memory capacity. *Language Testing in Asia*, 1–38. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-023-00237-1

Alenezi, M., Wardat, S., & Akour, M. (2023). *The Need of Integrating Digital Education in Higher Education : Challenges and Opportunities*. 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15064782

Ali, R. M., Hastuti, D., Ananda, A. R., & Biddinika, M. K. (2024). Learning Speaking Using Google Sites-Based Eportfolio: Indonesian Student'S Experience. *Exposure Journal*, *197*(1), 197–214. https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/exposure

Ali, R. M., Narpaduita, P., Sanjani, M. I., Hastuti, D., Syam, U. K., & Biddinika, M. K. (2025). From struggles to strategies : Indonesian students ' use of e- portfolios in public speaking courses through the lens of self-regulated learning and sociocultural theory. *Journal of English Educators Society*, *10*(2), 135–144. https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v10i2.1969

Amin, M. M., & Paiman, N. (2022). University English Language Teachers' Use of Digital Platforms for Online Teaching. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, *17*(20), 134–148. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v17i20.31421

Amini, M. A., & Kruger, C. G. (2022). *The Role of Iranian EFL Teacher Autonomy and Reflectivity in Teacher Self-directed Learning : A Systematic Literature Review*. *10*(June 2021), 101–126.

Aparicio-Ting, F. E., Arcellana-Panlilio, M., Bensler, H., Brown, B., Clancy, T. L., Dyjur, P., Radford, S., Redwood, C., Roberts, V., Sabbaghan, S., Schroeder, M., Summers, M. M., Tézli, A., Wilks, L., & Wright, A. C. (2023). Fostering Student Success in Online Courses. *Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning Guide Series*. https://taylorinstitute.ucalgary.ca/resources/fostering-student-success-guide

Barrot, J. S. (2025). Social Media as an E-Portfolio Platform. In L. McCallum & D. Tafazoli (Eds.), *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Computer-Assisted Language Learning* (pp. 1–6). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-51447-0_174-1

Bassam, Z., & Baniyounes, M. (2024). *The Students are Also Invited : Portfolio Assessment and its Impact on EFL Learners ' Critical Thinking , Growth Mindfulness , and Autonomy*. *25*(4), 604–628.

Beckers, J., Dolmans, D., & Merriënboer, J. Van. (2016). *e-Portfolios enhancing students ' self-directed learning : A systematic review of influencing factors*. *32*(2), 32–46. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.2528

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: principles, policy & practice*, *5*(1), 7-74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

Bravo, M. C., Chalezquer, C. S., & Puche, J. S. (2022). *Dimensions of Digital Literacy in the 21st Century Competency Frameworks*.

Chan, Y. K. (2020). *Social Media and E-Portfolios: Impacting Design Students' Motivation Through Project-Based Learning*. *8*(3), 41–58. https://doi.org/10.22492/ije.8.3.03

Chittum, J. (2018). The Theory-to-Practice ePortfolio: An Assignment to Facilitate Motivation and Higher Order Thinking. *International Journal of EPortfolio*, *8*(1), 27–42.

Ciesielkiewicz, M. (2019). Education for employability: the ePortfolio from school principals' perspective. *On the Horizon*, *27*(1), 46–56. https://doi.org/10.1108/OTH-01-2019-0001

Dalton, G. M. (2022). Putting the ' e ' in portfolio design : an intervention research project investigating how design students and faculty might jointly reimagine the design portfolio activity. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, *32*(2), 1207–1225. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10798-020-09640-8

Douglas, M. E., Peecksen, S., Rogers, J., & Simmons, M. (2019). College Students' Motivation and Confidence for ePortfolio Use. *International Journal of EPortfolio 2019*, *9*(1), 1–16. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1214509.pdf

Goldsmith, D. J. (2007). Enhancing learning and assessment through e-portfolios: A collaborative effort in Connecticut. *New Directions for Student Services*, *2007*(119), 31–42. https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.247

Gulden, R. Van Der, Heeneman, S., Kramer, A. W. M., Laan, R. F. J. M., & Haan, N. D. S. (2020). *How is self-regulated learning documented in e-portfolios of trainees ? A content analysis*. *4*, 1–13.

Haggerty, C., & Thompson, T. (2017). The challenges of incorporating ePortfolio into an undergraduate nursing programme. *Open Praxis*, *9*(2), 245. https://doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.9.2.554

Halim, A. A., & Halim, N. (2024). *Exploring the integration and impact of google sites in teaching and learning : A structured scoping review*. *5*(1), 110–124. https://doi.org/10.55197/qjssh.v5iSI1.569

Harun, R. N. S. R., Hanif, M. H., & Choo, G. S. (2021). The pedagogical affordances of e-portfolio in learning how to teach: A systematic review. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *8*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i1.17876

Ho, W. Y. J., & Tai, K. W. H. (2020). Doing expertise multilingually and multimodally in online English teaching videos. *System*, *94*, 102340. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102340

Keshmiri, F., & Mehrparvar, A. H. (2023). The experiences of preparation and engagement of educators in teaching e-portfolio. *BMC Medical Education*, *23*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-023-04642-1

Kiffer, S., Bertrand, E., Eneau, J., & Gilliot, J.-M. (2021). *Enhancing Learners ' Autonomy With E-Portfolios And Open Learner Models : A Literature Review*. *1*(1), 1–9.

Kusuma, I. P. I., Mahayanti, N. W. S., Adnyani, L. D. S., & Budiarta, L. G. R. (2021). Incorporating E-portfolio with flipped classrooms: An in-depth analysis of students' speaking performance and learning engagement. *JALT CALL Journal*, *17*(2), 93–111. https://doi.org/10.29140/JALTCALL.V17N2.378

Kusuma, I. P. I., & Waluyo, B. (2023). *Language Teaching Research Enacting E-portfolios in Online English-Speaking Courses : Speaking Performance and Self-efficacy*. *11*(July 2022), 75–95.

Lam, R. (2022). E-Portfolios for self-regulated and co-regulated learning: A review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*(November), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1079385

Linda, O. C. (2025). *STUFFLEBEAM ' S CIPP MODEL OF EVALUATION*. 1–24.

López-Crespo, G., Blanco-Gandía, M. C., Valdivia-Salas, S., Fidalgo, C., & Sánchez-Pérez, N. (2022). The educational e-portfolio: preliminary evidence of its relationship with student's self-efficacy and engagement. *Education and Information Technologies*, *27*(4), 5233–5248. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10827-2

Maya, F., & Wolf, K. D. (2024). An Architecture for Formative Assessment Analytics of Multimodal Artefacts in ePortfolios Supported by Artificial Intelligence. In M. Sahin & D. Ifenthaler (Eds.), *Assessment Analytics in Education: Designs, Methods and Solutions* (pp. 293–312). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-56365-2_15

Mgarbi, H., Chkouri, M. Y., & Tahiri, A. (n.d.). *Purpose and Design of a Digital Environment for the Professional Insertion of Students Based on the E-portfolio Approach*. 36–48. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v17i01.26703

Michikyan, M., Subrahmanyam, K., Regan, P., Ángel, M., Linda, C., Harkness, A., & Schwartz, S. J. (2025). Differences in and relationship between digital access , use , connectivity , skill , engagement , and motivation : implications for digital inequality in online learning among first - generation and continuing - generation undergraduate students. *Discover Education*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00371-9

Mihret, D. G., Abayadeera, N., Watty, K., & McKay, J. (2017). Teaching auditing using cases in an online learning environment: the role of ePortfolio assessment. *Accounting Education*, *26*(4), 335–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/09639284.2017.1292466

Modise, M. E. P., & Mudau, P. K. (2023). Using E-Portfolios for Meaningful Teaching and Learning in Distance Education in Developing Countries: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *71*(3), 286–298. https://doi.org/10.1080/07377363.2022.2067731

Muin, C. F., Hafidah, H., & Daraini, A. M. (2021). Students' Perceptions on the Use of E-Portfolio for Learning Assessment. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *13*(1), 497–503. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v13i1.485

Namaziandost, E., Alekasir, S., Hassan Mohammed Sawalmeh, M., & Miftah, M. Z. (2020). Investigating the Iranian EFL learners' attitudes towards the implementation of e-portfolios in English learning and assessment. *Cogent Education*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1856764

Ni, Y., & Lam, R. (2025). Students ' perceptions of multiliteracies development using AI-assisted portfolio assessment. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, *00*(00), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2025.2545212

Okuonghae, O., Igbinovia, M. O., & Adebayo, J. O. (2021). *Technological Readiness and Computer Self-ef fi cacy as Predictors of E-learning Adoption by LIS Students in Nigeria*. 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1515/libri-2020-0166

Pospíšilová, L., & Rohlíková, L. (2023). Reforming higher education with ePortfolio implementation, enhanced by learning analytics. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *138*(November 2018). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107449

Rezadoust, H., Khaleh, S., Khalili, M., & Mahdavi, A. (2025). *The Effects of E-portfolio , Paper-based and Essay-writing assessments on Iranian EFL Learners ' Motivation and Autonomy*. *13*(July), 63–90.

Rhodes, T. L. (2010). Making Learning Visible and Meaningful Through Electronic Portfolios. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *43*(1), 6–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2011.538636

Roberts, P. (2018). Developing reflection through an ePortfolio-based learning environment: design principles for further implementation. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, *27*(3), 313–326. https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2018.1447989

Roco, M., & Barberà, E. (2022). ePortfolio to promote networked learning: an experience in the Latin American context. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *19*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00336-8

Romero, L., Saucedo, C., Caliusco, M. L., & Gutiérrez, M. (2019). *Supporting self-regulated learning and personalization using ePortfolios : a semantic approach based on learning paths*. 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0146-1

Salas-Pilco, S. Z., Yang, Y., & Zhang, Z. (2022). Student engagement in online learning in Latin American higher education during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *53*(3), 593–619. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13190

Scully, D., O'leary, M., & Brown, M. (2018). The Learning Portfolio in Higher Education "A Game of Snakes and Ladders." In *The Learning Portfolio in Higher Education "A Game of Snakes and Ladders"* (Issue March). https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.18883.71208

Sitthimongkolchai, N., Viriyavejakul, C., & Tuntiwongwanich, S. (2022). *Blended Experiential Learning with e-Portfolios Learning to Enhance Creative Imagination*. *6*, 25–39. https://doi.org/10.28991/ESJ-2022-SIED-03

Sobko, T., & Brown, G. (2019). Reflecting on personal data in a health course: Integrating wearable technology and ePortfolio for eHealth. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *35*(3), 55–70. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.4027

Song, B. K. (2021). E-portfolio implementation: Examining learners' perception of usefulness, self-directed learning process and value of learning. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *37*(1), 68–81. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.6126

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2003). The CIPP Model for Evaluation. *International Handbook of Educational Evaluation*, 31–62. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0309-4_4

Syzdykova, Z., Koblandin, K., Mikhaylova, N., & Akinina, O. (2021). Assessment of Learning in Higher Education. *IJET*, *16*(02), 120–134. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-5712-8.ch011

Torres, J. T., & Mckinley, M. C. (2023). *From Review to Practice : Implementing ePortfolio Research in Professional Identity Formation*. *13*(1), 1–9.

Tosun, N. (2011). E-Portfolio Applications in Education E-Portfolio Applications in Education. *TOJNED : The Online Journal Of New Horizons In Education*, *1*(4), 42–52.

Tur, G., Urbina, S., & Forteza, D. (2019). Rubric-based formative assessment in process eportfolio: Towards self-regulated learning. *Digital Education Review*, *35*, 18–35. https://doi.org/10.1344/der.2019.35.18-35

Vaishnav, P. B. (2024). *Current Trends and Future Prospects in English Language Teaching ( ELT )*. *50*(7), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i71438

Veine, S., Anderson, M. K., Andersen, N. H., Espenes, C., Søyland, T. B., Wallin, P., Reams, J., Veine, S., Anderson, M. K., Andersen, N. H., Espenes, C., Søyland, T. B., Wallin, P., & Reflection, J. R. (2020). Reflection as a core student learning activity in higher education - Insights from nearly two decades of academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *25*(2), 147–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2019.1659797

Walland, E., & Shaw, S. (2022). E-portfolios in teaching, learning and assessment: tensions in theory and praxis. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, *31*(3), 363–379. https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2022.2074087

Wardani, H. K., Darusuprapti, F., & Hajaroh, M. (2022). *446-1-2237-1-10-20220129*. *6*(1), 36–49. https://doi.org/10.28926/riset_konseptual.v6i1.446

White, A. (2019). ePortfolios : Integrating Learning , Creating Connections and Authentic Assessments Author Griffith Research Online Chapter 10 : ePortfolios : Integrating learning , creating connections and authentic assessments. In *Blended Learning Designs in STEM Higher EducationPutting Learning First*. Griffith University. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6982-7

Wong, J. T., & Hughes, B. S. (2023). Leveraging learning experience design : digital media approaches to influence motivational traits that support student learning behaviors in undergraduate online courses. In *Journal of Computing in Higher Education* (Vol. 35, Issue 3). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-022-09342-1

Yang, H., & Wong, R. (2024). An In-Depth Literature Review of E-Portfolio Implementation in Higher Education: Processes, Barriers, and Strategies. *Issues and Trends in Learning Technologies*, *12*(1), 65–101. https://doi.org/10.2458/itlt.5809

Yin, A., Chan, W., Cheung, C., & Sung, M. (2025). Enhancing students ' digital literacy skills through their technology use in a course - based research project : a Hong Kong case study. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *0123456789*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-025-10038-1

Zhang, P., & Tur, G. (2022). Educational e-Portfolio Overview: Aspiring for the Future by Building on the Past. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, *10*(3), 51–74. https://doi.org/10.22492/ije.10.3.03

Zimmerman, B. (1990). Goal Setting and Self-Efficacy During Self-Regulated Learning. *Educational Psychologist*, *25*(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2501