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 3842-3848
© Author
Jurnal Kepemimpinan & Pengurusan Sekolah

THE USE OF GOOGLE MEET AS A PLATFORM FOR SYNCHRONOUS ELECTRONIC FEEDBACK: IMPLICATIONS FOR STUDENTS' WRITING DEVELOPMENT

Siti Nia Rama Dani[1], Syamsul Ma'arif[2], Fania Raisa Sauqina[3], Amrizal[4]
[1234] STAIN Mandailing Natal, Indonesia

Email: nia.rahmadani0206@gmail.com

Check for updates OPEN ACCESS CC BY SA

DOI: https://doi.org/10.34125/jkps.v11i5.2937

Sections Info

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

Keywords:
Google Meet;
synchronous feedback;
writing instruction;
feedback literacy;
online learning.

ABSTRAK

This study investigated the feasibility of Google Meet as a synchronous electronic feedback tool for writing teaching in higher education. A qualitative dominant mixed methods design was used with purposive sampling to select 25 undergraduate students and two writing professors. Data were collected by means of semi-structured interviews, questionnaires, classroom observations and document analysis. The qualitative data were analysed using thematic analysis and the quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics. The results indicated that the real-time interaction, screen-sharing, chat and recording features of Google Meet made it a useful platform for synchronous feedback.The features increased student involvement in the editing process, improved the clarity of feedback, and decreased misconceptions. When feedback was given at the same time, around 80% of those asked said they understood it better, Students' writing skills improved, particularly in terms of organization, grammatical accuracy and critical engagement with revision exercises. The findings also suggested that contact and feedback literacy were important for students' development as writers. However, there were some barriers as well, such as the intermittent nature of the internet connection, the differences in digital literacy, and the time it takes to give personalized feedback. The study suggests a hybrid feedback paradigm mixing synchronous and asynchronous methods for improved learning outcomes.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini menyelidiki kelayakan Google Meet sebagai alat umpan balik elektronik sinkron untuk pengajaran menulis di pendidikan tinggi. Desain metode campuran dengan dominasi kualitatif digunakan dengan pengambilan sampel purposif untuk memilih 25 mahasiswa sarjana dan dua dosen menulis. Data dikumpulkan melalui wawancara semi-terstruktur, kuesioner, observasi kelas, dan analisis dokumen. Data kualitatif dianalisis menggunakan analisis tematik dan data kuantitatif dianalisis menggunakan statistik deskriptif. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa interaksi real-time, fitur berbagi layar, chat, dan rekaman di Google Meet membuatnya menjadi platform yang berguna untuk umpan balik sinkron. Fitur-fitur ini meningkatkan keterlibatan siswa dalam proses mengedit, memperjelas umpan balik, dan mengurangi kesalahpahaman. Ketika umpan balik diberikan secara bersamaan, sekitar 80% dari yang ditanya mengatakan mereka lebih memahaminya. Keterampilan menulis siswa meningkat, terutama dalam hal organisasi, ketepatan tata bahasa, dan keterlibatan kritis dengan latihan revisi. Temuan ini juga menunjukkan bahwa kontak dan literasi umpan balik penting untuk perkembangan siswa sebagai penulis. Namun, ada beberapa hambatan juga, seperti sifat koneksi internet yang tidak selalu stabil, perbedaan literasi digital, dan waktu yang dibutuhkan untuk memberikan umpan balik yang personal. Studi ini menyarankan paradigma umpan balik hybrid yang menggabungkan metode sinkron dan asinkron agar hasil pembelajaran lebih baik.

Kata kunci: *Google Meet; umpan balik sinkron; instruksi menulis; literasi umpan balik; pembelajaran online.*

INTRODUCTION

Digital technology has developed very fast and has changed a lot the teaching and learning process, especially in online and distance education (Dhawan, 2020). Developing effective academic writing in higher education relies on consistent practice and constructive feedback (Hyland, 2020). Writing is not only a cognitive activity, but also a social activity where interaction and feedback are important to affect learners' understanding and performance (Vygotsky). Feedback is generally accepted as one of the most powerful influences on learning (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). It can help students to recognise errors, organise ideas and communicate their thoughts better. Traditionally feedback has been delivered asynchronously in the form of written comments. These may result in delayed responses and misinterpretation (Nicol, 2010).

Synchronous electronic feedback is an alternative that allows real-time interaction between the instructor and the student. This immediacy allows for clarification, diminishes ambiguity, and promotes a dialogic learning environment (O'Connor-Petruso, 2008). Such an approach is particularly useful for writing instruction, where students can be at a loss to interpret their own feedback. This is especially useful in writing instruction where students may find it hard to read their own feedback. Video conferencing tools such as Google Meet have improved synchronous feedback practices through multimodal features such as screen sharing, audio communication, chat and session recording (Borup et al., 2012). These features allow teachers to give much richer, interactive feedback than they could before with traditional methods.

Previous research has demonstrated that synchronous feedback really makes a difference to student engagement and involvement, and makes them more interested in learning. Active use of feedback requires interpretation of the meaning of the feedback and a holistic, programmatic approach to reporting feedback through practice cycles. More recent research has concentrated on synchronous learning tools for effective communication and interaction in an online environment (Martin et al., 2020) indicate that the opportunity for students to support each other in real-time helps with more meaningful learning and enhances the understanding of the instructional content. This interaction encourages learners to understand and practise negotiation of meaning in writing contexts.

Feedback is important to the development of student writing. In EFL contexts, it helps the learners to understand the concept of "writing" itself by showing them what they rarely experience outside the classroom (i.e., natural language production). Feedback is not only corrective, but scaffolds learners' language proficiency and writing (K. Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Well-designed feedback leads to better error identification and understanding, revision of students' texts and identification of wider errors (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). Moreover, feedback fosters learner autonomy as students are engaged in the rework and share responsibility for their learning (Lee, 2020).

The way feedback is given and the way students respond to feedback is also a strong influence on the effectiveness of feedback. Asynchronous written feedback offers flexibility but is often lacking in the interactive clarification and immediacy that is so vital to deeper understanding. In contrast, synchronous feedback allows students to actively negotiate meaning, ask questions, and receive clear explanations, leading to improved learning outcomes and reduced misinterpretation. This reinforces the view that good feedback is a two-way conversation with students engaged in the process, not a one-way communication. In addition, feedback processes include technology, and the role of the instructors has changed from information providers to learning facilitators.

Tools like Google Meet allow teachers to combine text comments, visual cues and verbal explanations all at once for a more holistic feedback experience. This interaction with different modalities caters to different learning styles and helps students to decode feedback. Real-time interaction in feedback sessions can also promote the social aspect of learning, where knowledge is created through interaction. Despite these potential advantages, the implementation of synchronous electronic feedback is not without problems. Issues of equal access to reliable internet connections and variation in digital literacy and time constraints to conduct live feedback sessions could affect its effectiveness.

Sometimes the immediacy of the feedback can be overwhelming for pupils if not well supervised. Therefore, it is important to consider the benefits and pragmatic limitations of using tools such as Google Meet for synchronous input. Despite the increasing use of online technologies, there is still a lack of research exploring Google Meet as a platform for synchronous feedback in writing instructions. Therefore, this study investigates the effectiveness of synchronous electronic feedback given through Google Meet and its impact on students' writing development

Research Question: The role of synchronous electronic feedback through Google Meet in the development of students' writing in higher education.

METHODOLOGY

This study used qualitative-dominant mixed methods design to study students' perceptions of synchronous electronic feedback via Google Meet. This approach allowed for in-depth qualitative insights, and was supported by quantitative data. The participants were 25 undergraduate students and two writing instructors from an Islamic higher educational institution in Indonesia. Participants with experience in synchronous feedback sessions were recruited via purposive sampling (Palinkas et al., 2015). The study was conducted in one semester in an online learning environment. Data were collected with a variety of instruments. Students' drafts were analysed in terms of improvements in coherence, grammatical accuracy and organization.

Synchronous feedback sessions were observed to study the interaction patterns and strategies of feedback delivery. We conducted semi-structured interviews to elicit students' perceptions and challenges, as well as administered questionnaires to measure quantitatively clarity, time efficiency and satisfaction. The qualitative data were analysed through thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), and the quantitative data through descriptive statistics. Data triangulation and member checking were used to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings.

Additionally, the researchers were able to obtain a more thorough picture of students' experiences with synchronous electronic feedback by using a mixed-methods strategy that combined qualitative and quantitative data. According to (Moeller et al., 2016)by integrating data from several sources, mixed methods research expands the reach and improves the credibility of educational research. A more thorough understanding of how Google Meet supported feedback processes and aided students' writing development was made possible by the combination of document analysis, observations, interviews, and surveys.

The results were more reliable and less prone to bias due to the use of multiple instruments. Interviews offered participants a more in-depth avenue to share their views and experiences while observational data demonstrated real interaction during feedback sessions. Such conclusions were supported by questionnaire data, which provided quantifiable information about students' satisfaction levels, perceptions of the clarity and efficacy of

comments they received. The use of these tools gave researchers the chance of data triangulation and a more complete knowledge of the phenomenon they were studying.

There were three steps in the research process. Initially, during writing instruction, students took part in synchronous feedback sessions via Google Meet. Second, in order to find patterns of interaction and enhancements in students' written work, observations and document analyses were conducted. Lastly, participants' opinions about the advantages and difficulties of synchronous electronic feedback were gathered using questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. By combining both methods, the study was able to fully capture both the learning process and the results of implementing feedback

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results show that Google Meet was a successful platform for synchronous electronic feedback in writing instruction. With the screen-sharing function, instructors were able to give more direct and explicit feedback on student texts, which helped to clarify and reduce ambiguity in revisions. The interaction was synchronous which facilitated immediate clarification and thus dialogic feedback processes (Nicol, 2010). The combination of audio, visual and text feedback formed a multimodal learning environment that augmented students' understanding and retention. About 80% of students indicated that they better understood feedback when it was provided synchronously. This finding highlights the significance of immediacy and interactivity for effective feedback (Winstone et al., 2017).

Students' writing quality improved, especially concerning coherence, grammatical accuracy and organisation. Socio-culturally, it is believed that learning happens through interaction and scaffolding. The real-time feedback encouraged students to actively engage in revising their work and to develop critical thinking skills. However, some challenges were noted. Communication was affected by technical problems such as unstable internet connectivity. Students' varying levels of digital literacy affected their ability to participate fully, and giving individual synchronous feedback was time-consuming for instructors. The results provide evidence of the pedagogical usefulness of synchronous feedback, but its effectiveness depends on technology readiness and contextual factors.

The findings are in line with recent literature emphasizing the importance of feedback literacy in higher education. (Carless & Winstone, 2023)assert that the effectiveness of feedback is based on the quality of feedback provided by instructors and the ability of students to understand, interpret, and use feedback for the improvement of their learning. The synchronous environment meant students in this study had greater involvement with revision tasks as there was opportunity for immediate clarification and dialogue. The results also provide support for the notion that feedback needs to be viewed as a dialogic process and not one-way information transfer. Effective feedback is a product of the interaction, dialogue and active involvement between teachers and students (Gravett & Carless, 2024)

Google Meet facilitated students' ability to pose direct questions and negotiate meaning in feedback sessions. That way they could rewrite their written work with more confidence and understanding. Additionally, the improvement in students' writing skills aligns with earlier studies on feedback literacy interventions. (Little et al., 2024)showed that when students actively engage in feedback processes, it can improve both their academic achievement and their self-regulated learning skills. Likewise, the immediacy and interactive nature of Google Meet encouraged students to be more reflective and responsible for their own development as writers.

The results also emphasize the importance of students' feedback literacy for

maximizing the benefits of synchronous feedback. Feedback literacy is the capacity of students to understand, analyse and use feedback to enhance future performance. Students with a higher feedback literacy are more likely to actively respond to criticism and are more motivated to revise their work (Woitt et al., 2025)In the present study, it was shown that students who actively took part in the Google Meet conversations benefited more from the feedback process and improved their writing more.

Similarly, (Karunarathne et al., 2024)pointed out the importance of students' ability to assess and utilize feedback for their academic development. Google Meet's synchronous format allowed students to ask questions, argue interpretations, and respond to teachers' comments instantaneously. Such experiences may lead to students becoming more self-reliant learners and improving their feedback literacy. As students become more comfortable analyzing criticism, they are better able to use revision techniques on their own and improve the overall quality of their work. Another important finding is the multimodality of feedback delivery. Students received feedback through a variety of communication channels, including written comments, visual demonstrations through screen sharing, and spoken explanations.

This is in line with the findings of (Inan-Karagul & Seker, n.d.)who stated that technology-mediated feedback may improve learner engagement, self-regulation, and writing performance through more transparent and accessible feedback experiences. But these benefits were not without their technological obstacles. Digital skills varied affecting participation and some pupils had intermittent internet connections. Similar issues were also identified by (Rapanta et al., 2020) who argued that the effectiveness of online learning environments is highly dependent on learners' ability to adapt to digital learning environments, teacher presence, and technological preparedness. Hence, the provision of technological support and digital literacy development is crucial for the effective utilization of synchronous electronic feedback

CONCLUSION

This study shows that Google Meet can be an effective platform for providing synchronous electronic feedback in writing instruction. The findings reveal that features such as real-time interaction, screen sharing, and multimodal communication help students better understand feedback and improve their writing skills. Improvements were observed in several areas of writing, including coherence, grammatical accuracy, organization, and students' involvement in the revision process. The study also found that synchronous feedback encourages more active communication between instructors and students. Through direct discussion and immediate clarification, students were able to better understand the feedback they received and apply it during revision. This process helped students become more engaged in learning and develop a stronger awareness of how feedback can be used to improve their work.

In addition, the findings highlight the importance of student participation in the feedback process. The opportunities for discussion provided through Google Meet encouraged students to take a more active role in revising their writing and supported the development of independent learning skills. This suggests that synchronous feedback can contribute not only to writing improvement but also to students' overall learning development. Despite these benefits, several challenges were identified, including internet connectivity problems, differences in digital literacy, and the amount of time needed to provide individualized feedback. These issues may affect the effectiveness of synchronous

feedback and therefore need to be considered when implementing this approach in educational settings.

Based on these findings, a combination of synchronous and asynchronous feedback is recommended. Such an approach may provide a balance between immediate interaction and flexibility while allowing students to benefit from different forms of feedback. Future research could involve a larger number of participants and examine the long-term effects of synchronous electronic feedback on writing development, learner autonomy, and feedback literacy in different educational contexts.

REFERENCES

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203832400

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.2012.08.002

Dhawan, S. (2020). Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 49*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239520934018

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hyland, K. (2020). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching, 39*(2), 83–101. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399

Lee, I. (2020). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3924-9

Martin, F., Sun, T., & Westine, C. D. (2020). A systematic review of research on online teaching and learning from 2009 to 2018. *Online Learning Journal, 24*(2), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v24i2.2005

Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: Improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 35*(5), 501–517. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070903545050

O'Connor-Petruso, S. A. (2008). Asynchronous and synchronous e-learning. *EDUCAUSE Quarterly, 31*(4), 51–55.

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research, 42*(5), 533–544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y

Vygotsky, L. S. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Parker, M., & Rowntree, J. (2017). Supporting learners' engagement with feedback: A systematic review. *Educational Psychology Review, 29*(1), 17–37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9338-9

Carless, D., & Winstone, N. E. (2023). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. Teaching in Higher Education, 28(1), 150–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372

Moeller, A. J., Creswell, J. W., & Saville, N. (2016). *Second Language Assessment and Mixed*

Methods Research from testing and innovation theory solution academic writing in higher education use of multilingual proficiency frameworks.

Gravett, K., & Carless, D. (2024). Feedback literacy-as-event: Gravett, K., & Carless, D. (2024). Feedback literacy-as-event: relationality, space and temporality in feedback encounters. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *49*(2), 142–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2189162

Inan-Karagul, B., & Seker, M. (2021). Improving language learners' use of self-regulated writing strategies through screencast feedback. SAGE Open, 11(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211064895

Karunarathne, W., Selman, C., & Ryan, T. (2024). Evaluating student feedback literacies: A study using first-year business and economics students. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 49(3), 471–484. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2267803

Little, T., Dawson, P., Boud, D., & Tai, J. (2024). Can students' feedback literacy be improved? A scoping review of interventions. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 49(1), 39–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2177613

Rapanta, C., Botturi, L., Goodyear, P., Guàrdia, L., & Koole, M. (2021). Online university teaching during and after the COVID-19 crisis: Refocusing teacher presence and learning activity. Postdigital Science and Education, 3(3), 923–945. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-020-00155-y

Woitta, S., Weidlich, J., Jivet, I., Göksün, D. O., Drachsler, H., & Kalz, M. (2023). Students' feedback literacy in higher education: An initial scale validation study. Teaching in Higher Education, 29(2), 257–276. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2023.2263838

Copyright holder:
© Author

First publication right:
Jurnal Kepemimpinan & Pengurusan Sekolah

This article is licensed under: