JURNAL KEPEMIMPINAN & PENGURUSAN SEKOLAH
Homepage : https://ejurnal.stkip-pessel.ac.id/index.php/kp
Email : jkps.stkippessel@gmail.com

p-ISSN : 2502-6445 ; e-ISSN : 2502-6437
Vol. 11, No. 5, October 2026
Page 3784-3790
© Author
Jurnal Kepemimpinan & Pengurusan Sekolah

RETHINKING REVISION PRACTICES: SYNCHRONOUS ELECTRONIC COMMENTARY VIA GOOGLE MEET IN HIGHER EDUCATION WRITING CLASSROOMS

Asla Alayya[1], Mei Khopipah[2], Laila Safidri[3], Amrizal[4]
[1,2,3,4]STAIN Mandailing Natal, Indonesia

Email: alayyaasla@gmail.com

Check for updates OPEN ACCESS CC BY SA

DOI: https://doi.org/10.34125/jkps.v11i5.2936

Sections Info

Article history:
Submitted: 6 August 2026
Final Revised: 30 September 2026
Accepted: 9 October 2026
Published: 30 October 2026

Keywords:
Synchronous feedback,
Google Meet,
Revision practice,
Digital feedback

ABSTRAK

Digital technology has been increasingly integrated into higher education in recent decades, changing the landscape of teaching and learning, especially in writing classrooms. One innovative approach is the use of synchronous electronic feedback, in which instructors give comments on students' writing through online platforms like Google Meet. This is a study of how revision practices in writing courses are transformed through the synchronous feedback method of Google Meet among university students. The study assesses the impact of real-time feedback on students' writing quality, engagement, and revision strategies. Students' experiences and perceptions of synchronous feedback sessions were explored using a qualitative descriptive approach. Data were gathered from classroom observations, interviews, and students' revised drafts. The data shows that electronic feedback was synchronous and it improved students' comprehension of revision, increased engagement in the activity, and promoted co-learning for teachers and students. Moreover, the real time feedback helps learners rectify errors and implement advice better. The study also notes challenges, including technological limitations and students' differing levels of digital literacy. Overall, these results imply that utilizing synchronous feedback through Google Meet may represent a beneficial pedagogical tool to enhance writing instruction at the post-secondary level.

ABSTRAK

Teknologi digital semakin terintegrasi ke dalam pendidikan tinggi dalam beberapa dekade terakhir, mengubah lanskap pengajaran dan pembelajaran, terutama di kelas menulis. Salah satu pendekatan inovatif adalah penggunaan umpan balik elektronik sinkron, di mana dosen memberikan komentar terhadap tulisan mahasiswa melalui platform daring seperti Google Meet. Penelitian ini mengkaji bagaimana praktik revisi dalam mata kuliah menulis berubah melalui metode umpan balik sinkron Google Meet di kalangan mahasiswa. Studi ini menilai dampak umpan balik real-time terhadap kualitas tulisan mahasiswa, keterlibatan, dan strategi revisi. Pengalaman dan persepsi mahasiswa terhadap sesi umpan balik sinkron dieksplorasi menggunakan pendekatan deskriptif kualitatif. Data dikumpulkan dari pengamatan kelas, wawancara, dan draf revisi mahasiswa. Data menunjukkan bahwa umpan balik elektronik bersifat sinkron dan meningkatkan pemahaman mahasiswa tentang revisi, meningkatkan keterlibatan dalam kegiatan, serta mendorong pembelajaran bersama antara dosen dan mahasiswa. Selain itu, umpan balik secara real time membantu peserta didik memperbaiki kesalahan dan menerapkan saran dengan lebih baik. Studi ini juga mencatat adanya tantangan, termasuk keterbatasan teknologi dan perbedaan tingkat literasi digital di antara mahasiswa. Secara keseluruhan, hasil ini menunjukkan bahwa pemanfaatan umpan balik sinkron melalui Google Meet dapat menjadi alat pedagogis yang bermanfaat untuk meningkatkan pengajaran menulis di tingkat perguruan tinggi.

Kata kunci: *Umpan balik sinkron, Google Meet, Latihan ulangan, Umpan balik digital*

INTRODUCTION

In fact, writing has been regarded as one of the most demanding skills in language acquisition due to its interactive involvement of linguistic knowledge, cognitive processes, and communicative competence (Hyland, 2003). Writing serves fundamental functions in higher education contexts as it assists students in communicating their ideas, building arguments, and showcasing critical thinking skills (Swales & Feak, n.d.). Many students, however, continue to encounter difficulties developing good writing skills, especially with regard to integrating teacher feedback when revising text (Ferris, 2012).

Also, because revision is a key step in the writing process, students need to clarify their ideas, improve performance, check language mistakes (Flower & Hayes, 1981). Follow-up practices are sometimes limited to written responses on students' drafts (which are not always fully comprehended by learners) despite their importance (Hyland, F., & Hyland, 2021). This can lead to ineffective use of feedback in their subsequent revisions. Digital technologies have provided new opportunities for improving feedback practices in writing instruction (Carless & Boud, 2018). More specifically, online platforms allow teachers to deliver feedback in more interactive and exciting forms. One such approach is synchronous electronic feedback, where teachers and students interact in real-time using digital channels of communication.

Immediate questioning and discussion of feedback may allow for a deeper understanding. As such, the investigation of technology-supported new feedback practices in writing classrooms has gained more and more significance. Morgan (2023) describes how including synchronous communication methods like Google Meet can help reframe historical feedback practices as more dialogic and collaborative processes. Synchronous interaction allows teachers to clarify comments more readily while the students have a language opportunity to question their ideas and negotiate meaning. Such interaction substantiates the idea of feedback as a learning dialogue and not merely a unidirectional transmission of information (Ingram et al., 2022). This shift is consistent with current views that recognize the importance of active student involvement in the feedback chain (Carless, 2015). Thus, the study of synchronous electronic feedback must be examined in order to understand how technology can enhance revision in higher education writing classrooms.

With the increasing prevalence of online learning environments, the implementation of digital feedback tools in education has been further accelerated (Garrison & Vaughan, 2008). In recent years, many universities have utilized video conferencing applications like Google Meet for teaching and learning process. On the other side, communication between teachers and students irrespective of physical distance is possible through these platforms Hrastinski, 2008.

Synchronous meetings are great in writing classrooms because teachers can conference students' drafts while screen sharing, so they can identify sections of interest in the text. This interactive process enables students to witness the ways in which teachers dissect their writing and offer troubleshooting tips. Feedback should clarify for the learner how far away they are from the expected goals (Nicol & Macfarlane Dick, 2006). Synchronous electronic feedback furthers this goal as it provides instant explanation and elaboration. Additionally, the audiovisual nature of video conferencing can help make feedback more digestible and tailored for students. Research also shows that discussions in real-time with peers can promote students' motivation and engagement with the learning process (Borup, West, & Graham, 2012). Students are also more likely to ask questions and engage in the revision process when they receive feedback directly from their instructors via online meetings.

Engaging with you in this way can encourage students to more fully reflect on writing conventions and academic expectations. Moreover, synchronous feedback sessions offer opportunities for students to engage in collaborative learning. For instance, group discussion of writing drafts may help students learn from each other's mistakes and strategies. Collaborative environments like these can bolster students' confidence in revising their work. So, synchronous communication platforms are very promising to advance feedback practices in writing instructions. It is an important area of research to find out how these platforms impact students' revision behaviors.

Teachers can see how students revise their drafts and offer more individual guidance as needed. This process of emerging through continuous interaction may result in better revision outcomes. The metacognitive awareness of students during the writing process is another vital aspect of synchronous electronic feedback. Metacognition is where learners reflect on their own learning strategies (Zimmerman, 2002) and regulate those strategies. Metacognitive awareness in writing classrooms allows students to read their drafts critically and pinpoint specific locations for improvement. Synchronous feedback conversations can lead to this awareness because they prompt students to articulate their writing decisions and contemplate other options.

Finally, being asked questions and offered explanations in the context of online meetings helps students become more aware of the rationale behind revisions. This form of reflection scaffolds the development of independent writing. In addition, Google Meet has screen-sharing features, that allow teachers to model editing strategies on students' writing. Students have an opportunity to see how modifying the organization, vocabulary, or grammar used in their writing impacts its clarity. Visual illustrations like these may help students better understand effective writing strategies. Dialogic feedback interactions promote deeper learning and critical thinking (Nicol, 2010).

By walking through their drafts, students learn to assess the quality of their own writing. This is similarly described through the lens of formative assessment, where data and facts are built to deliver actionable feedback (Black & Wiliam, 2009). Thus, synchronous electronic feedback can be crucial in supporting students' reflective writing skills. These advantages underscore the need to explore ways video conferencing tools may facilitate revision practices in academic writing courses.

The synchronous electronic feedback also comes with some pedagogical pros and reflects larger trends in digital teaching. At the same time, Kolb (1999) describes a 17-fold increase in the number of online communication tools available from early 2000 to October 2023. Media like Google Meet break the barrier and allow you to review gathered feedback in a friendly user environment. Many include these platforms as vital aspects of blended and online learning models across higher education institutions. In automatic definitions, as a growing pattern is being to integrate the digital technology into their teaching practices, it's important over time to discover how helpful these tools are in student learning outcomes.

Technology-mediated feedback can narrow the gap between instructors and students in writing classrooms by keeping communication channels open. But factors like unreliable internet, lack of tech skills, and time can hinder asynchronous feedback loops. Gaining knowledge of the advantages and disadvantages of this methodology is essential for crafting successful teaching methods. Thus, this study explores synchronous electronic feedback via Google Meet and its impact on revision practices in higher education writing courses. More specifically, the study looks into students' experiences, perceptions, and reactions to real-time feedback sessions. Studying these facets helps attribute an argument that synchronous

feedback may offer a way to improve writing instruction. The results are anticipated to enrich current conversations concerning technology-facilitated feedback approaches in tertiary education.

RESEARCH METHOD

A qualitative descriptive research design was adopted to explore synchronous electronic feedback via Google Meet in higher education writing classrooms of this study. Because a qualitative approach provides greater insight into the experiences, perceptions, and interactions of participants in the learning process, it was deemed to be most appropriate. The study was carried out in an undergraduate English writing course in which students were encouraged to enhance their academic literacy at the college. Participants included 25 students in the course and one writing instructor (who led the feedback sessions).

They were chosen as they engaged with writing and revision activities during the semester. Data were collected using multiple methods to capture a holistic picture of the feedback process, including classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and analysis of students' writing drafts. For implementation, the instructor held multiple synchronous feedback sessions with Google Meet as a part of writing instruction during the semester. In these workshops, students presented their drafts as the instructor gave feedback, explanation, and revision advice in real time verbally. The teacher shared the screen to show students' texts and pointed out sections where the student needed improvement in aspects such as grammar mistakes, sentence structures, organization of ideas, and use of vocabulary. This participatory approach enabled students to witness firsthand how their writing was analyzed and enhanced. Students were also invited to ask for clarification and pose questions in the session, which made for a more dialogic and collaborative learning environment.

These interactions between the instructor and students were recorded for later analysis to observe each form of feedback process as well as answer patterns during revision. Selected students were interviewed to understand their perceptions of synchronous feedback and how it affected their revision practices. The interviews were designed to obtain information about students' experiences, their knowledge about the feedback received, and the challenges faced during online feedback sessions. Along with interviews, students' first drafts and revised drafts were evaluated to see how writing quality changed after the instructor provided feedback to them. The analysis concentrated on the enhancement of structure, sentence formation, clarity of concepts, and general cohesiveness across all chapters. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the data collected from observations, interviews, and document review for emerging themes regarding the effectiveness of synchronous feedback, student engagement, and the effect of Google Meet based feedback on students' revision practices.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Results

The findings of this study reveal that the implementation of synchronous electronic feedback through Google Meet significantly influences students' revision practices in higher education writing classrooms. Based on classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and analysis of students' drafts, several key results emerged.

First, students demonstrated enhanced comprehension of feedback. During synchronous sessions, students actively asked questions and sought clarification regarding

grammatical corrections, sentence structures, and organization. This interaction helped them better understand the feedback provided.

Second, the findings indicate increased student engagement in the revision process. Students participating in live feedback sessions were more involved in discussions, more willing to reflect on their errors, and more open to revising their work.

Third, there was a clear improvement in writing quality. Analysis of students' drafts before and after feedback sessions showed progress in organization, coherence, grammar, and vocabulary use. Students were able to produce clearer thesis statements and more structured arguments.

Fourth, the study identified the development of collaborative learning dynamics. Students benefited not only from feedback on their own work but also from observing feedback given to their peers during group sessions.

Fifth, the findings highlight an increase in students' metacognitive awareness. Through guided discussions, students became more aware of their writing strategies, strengths, and weaknesses.

Additionally, the study found affective benefits, such as increased confidence and reduced anxiety. Students reported feeling more supported and comfortable during synchronous feedback sessions. However, several challenges were also identified. These include technical issues such as unstable internet connections, variations in digital literacy, and time constraints in conducting real-time feedback sessions, particularly in large classes.

Discussion

Discussion is a basic the findings of this study support the view that synchronous electronic feedback transforms traditional feedback practices into a more interactive and meaningful process. The enhanced comprehension observed among students aligns with Hyland and Hyland's (2006) argument that written feedback alone can lead to misunderstanding. In this study, real-time interaction enabled immediate clarification, supporting Nicol's (2010) concept of feedback as a dialogic process.

The increased engagement found in this research reflects the importance of social interaction in learning environments. As Borup, West, and Graham (2012) suggest, interaction fosters a sense of presence and motivation. The synchronous setting encouraged students to actively participate, making the revision process more dynamic compared to traditional methods.

Improvements in writing quality further confirm the effectiveness of synchronous feedback. The use of screen-sharing and direct text discussion provided a multimodal learning experience, which made feedback clearer and easier to apply. This supports Hyland's (2013) emphasis on explicit and accessible feedback in writing development.

The emergence of collaborative learning also highlights the social dimension of feedback. Students learning from peers aligns with Carless and Boud's (2018) concept of feedback literacy, where learners actively engage in interpreting and using feedback. This shared learning environment enhances understanding beyond individual feedback.

Moreover, the development of metacognitive awareness suggests that synchronous feedback contributes not only to immediate revision but also to long-term learning. As Zimmerman (2002) notes, metacognitive skills are essential for self-regulated learning. The reflective discussions in this study helped students become more independent writers.

The affective benefits observed, such as increased confidence and reduced anxiety, are also significant. (Ferris, 2011) emphasizes that supportive feedback can positively influence

students' attitudes toward writing. The interactive nature of synchronous feedback created a more encouraging learning environment.

Despite these advantages, the challenges identified cannot be overlooked. Technical issues and digital literacy gaps highlight the need for institutional support and training. Additionally, time constraints suggest that a combination of synchronous and asynchronous feedback may be a more practical and sustainable approach.

Overall, the discussion confirms that synchronous electronic feedback is not only effective in improving writing performance but also in fostering engagement, collaboration, and independent learning. Its integration into writing instruction represents a valuable strategy, particularly in digital and blended learning contexts.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has demonstrated that the integration of synchronous electronic feedback through Google Meet significantly enhances students' revision practices in higher education writing classrooms. The findings indicate that real-time interaction between instructors and students fosters deeper comprehension of feedback, as learners are able to immediately clarify misunderstandings and engage in meaningful dialogue. This interactive process transforms feedback from a one-way transmission into a collaborative learning experience, aligning with contemporary perspectives on dialogic feedback (Carless, 2015)

Furthermore, synchronous feedback was found to increase student engagement and motivation during the revision process. Students became more actively involved in evaluating their own writing, which contributed to improvements in organization, grammatical accuracy, and clarity of ideas. The use of screen-sharing and live commentary enabled instructors to model revision strategies effectively, thereby supporting students' metacognitive awareness and self-regulated learning (Zimmerman et al., 2002)

However, despite its pedagogical benefits, the implementation of synchronous feedback also revealed certain challenges. Technical issues such as unstable internet connections and varying levels of digital literacy among students posed barriers to optimal participation. These findings suggest that while synchronous electronic feedback is a promising instructional strategy, its effectiveness depends on adequate technological infrastructure and digital readiness.

Overall, this study contributes to the growing body of literature on technology-mediated feedback by highlighting the potential of synchronous platforms like Google Meet to improve writing instruction. It underscores the importance of interactive, timely, and dialogic feedback in fostering effective revision practices and advancing students' academic writing skills

REFERENCES

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21*(1), 5–31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5

Borup, J., West, R. E., & Graham, C. R. (2012). Improving online social presence through asynchronous video. *The Internet and Higher Education, 15*(3), 195–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2011.11.001

Carless, D. (2015). *Excellence in university assessment: Learning from award-winning practice*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315887465

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling

uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43*(8), 1315–1325. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354

Ferris, D. R. (2011). *Treatment of error in second language student writing* (2nd ed.). University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.2173290

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (2014). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (3rd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203811827

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32*(4), 365–387. https://doi.org/10.2307/356600

Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). *Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines*. Jossey-Bass. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118269550

Hrastinski, S. (2008). Asynchronous and synchronous e-learning. *Educause Quarterly, 31*(4), 51–55.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667253

Hyland, K. (2013). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524744

Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2006). Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues. *Cambridge University Press*. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524744

Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: Improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(5), 501–517. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602931003786559

Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(2), 199–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (3rd ed.). University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.2173935

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice, 41*(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2

Copyright holder:
© Author

First publication right:
Jurnal Kepemimpinan & Pengurusan Sekolah

This article is licensed under: