



Indonesian EFL students' narratives of corrective feedback in speaking instruction

ABSTRACT - Corrective feedback constitutes a critical component in the development of speaking proficiency within English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts. Nevertheless, learners' subjective experiences of such feedback remain underexplored, particularly within the landscape of Indonesian higher education. This study investigates Indonesian EFL students' narratives concerning the corrective feedback they receive in speaking classes and examines how such feedback shapes their speaking development. Employing a qualitative narrative inquiry design, data were collected through semi-structured interviews with eight fourth-semester students from the English Education Department at UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten. The findings indicate that direct corrective feedback is perceived as the most impactful type, particularly for improving pronunciation, lexical range, fluency, and speaking confidence, owing to its immediacy and clarity. Indirect feedback, primarily delivered in written form, was found to facilitate grammatical reflection and reduce learner anxiety, although its effectiveness was contingent upon subsequent reinforcement. Peer feedback emerged as the most emotionally comfortable and collaborative modality, fostering learner engagement, autonomy, and willingness to communicate, especially in informal and technology-mediated settings. Collectively, the results suggest that effective speaking instruction necessitates the flexible integration of direct, indirect, and peer feedback strategies that are responsive to learners' linguistic needs and affective dimensions. By foregrounding students' narrative accounts, this research contributes to a more nuanced understanding of corrective feedback practices in Indonesian EFL speaking classrooms and offers pedagogical insights to support more learner-centered feedback design.

Anita Anita¹
Abdul Gafur Marzuki^{2*}
Huriyah Huriyah³
Nuraeni Nuraeni⁴
Dhiza Yulia Sangkarini⁵
Ana Kuliahana⁶

^{1,4,5}Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten, Indonesia

^{2,6}Universitas Islam Negeri Datokarama Palu, Indonesia

³Universitas Islam Negeri Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon, Indonesia

*Corresponding email:

gafurmarzuki@uindatokarama.ac.id

Article History

Submitted: 26 January 2026

Accepted: 15 April 2026

Published: 31 May 2026

Keywords

Corrective feedback; Narrative inquiry; Peer feedback; Speaking skills

Recommended APA Citation

Anita, A., Marzuki, A. G., Huriyah, H., Nuraeni, N., Sangkarini, D. Y., & Kuliahana, A. (2026). Indonesian EFL students' narratives of corrective feedback in speaking instruction. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 13(2), 386-403.

<https://doi.org/10.22373/englisia.161>

1. Introduction

Effective communication is widely recognized as a fundamental competence in both academic and professional contexts, with speaking skills playing a central role in facilitating interpersonal interaction, public discourse, and knowledge exchange. Speaking allows individuals to articulate ideas, negotiate meaning, and engage audiences persuasively, serving as a key indicator of communicative competence (Alek et al., 2020; Bylkova et al., 2021; Kuliahana & Marzuki, 2024; Shamsiddin, 2024). Empirical evidence suggests that individuals with well-developed speaking abilities tend to achieve higher academic success and greater professional accomplishments, as they can convey ideas clearly and respond effectively to communicative demands. In higher education, speaking proficiency is closely associated with students' active participation in classroom discussions and collaborative learning activities (Blidi et al., 2018; Tampubolon, 2018; Hanh & Huyen, 2024). Consequently, the development of speaking skills has become a central objective in language education programs worldwide.

Despite its critical importance, achieving proficiency in speaking English as a foreign language remains a persistent challenge for many learners. Previous studies have documented that students often struggle with grammatical accuracy, structural organization, and fluency during oral production (Michel, 2017; Spring, 2020; Tokunaga, 2021; Kuliahana et al., 2024). These challenges are exacerbated by anxiety, limited exposure to authentic communicative situations, and insufficient opportunities for meaningful oral practice. In many classrooms, speaking activities are teacher-centered and offer limited interaction, further constraining learners' opportunities to practice spontaneous oral communication (Larasati, 2018; Albore, 2019); Marzuki & Kuliahana, 2021; Muthmainnah et al., 2022). Disruptions in fluency, such as excessive pauses and hesitations, may weaken speakers' credibility and reduce audience engagement, highlighting the need for more effective instructional support.

One instructional strategy widely recognized for addressing these challenges is corrective feedback. Feedback plays a crucial role in helping learners notice gaps between their current performance and target language norms, as well as in supporting the development of accuracy, fluency, and communicative effectiveness. Constructive corrective feedback enables learners to identify errors, refine their oral production, and reinforce successful speaking strategies (Alsolami, 2019). When delivered appropriately, feedback can also enhance learners' metacognitive awareness of their speaking processes. Empirical studies have shown that feedback in speaking classes can significantly contribute to the improvement of students' speaking abilities, particularly when it is timely, specific, and responsive to learners' needs (Mahara & Hartono, 2024).

However, despite extensive research on corrective feedback, limited attention has been given to learners' subjective experiences and interpretations of the feedback they receive, especially in English as a foreign language speaking classroom. Learners' perceptions, emotional responses, and personal experiences may influence how feedback is processed and whether it leads to meaningful and sustained improvement. Some learners may perceive corrective feedback as supportive, while others may experience it as discouraging or anxiety-inducing. This issue is particularly salient in the Indonesian context, where many students continue to struggle

with speaking fluently and accurately, often finding it challenging to respond constructively to corrective feedback due to cultural and affective factors (Mahara & Hartono, 2024). Narrative inquiry is particularly suited to this aim, as it enables learners to articulate their experiences, emotions, and meaning-making processes in their own words, providing insights that surveys or experimental designs cannot capture (Clandinin, 2019; Hiver et al., 2020).

To address this gap, the present study focuses on exploring Indonesian students' narratives regarding the corrective feedback they have received in speaking classes. Given the limited research capturing learners' subjective and experiential perspectives on corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL contexts, this study seeks to fill this gap by foregrounding students' voices through narrative inquiry. Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following research question: How do Indonesian students narrate and perceive the corrective feedback they have received in the classroom for the development of their speaking skills? By examining students' narratives, this research aims to provide deeper insight into how corrective feedback is experienced by learners and how it shapes their speaking development over time. The findings are expected to inform more effective pedagogical practices and feedback strategies that are sensitive to learners' perspectives in English as a foreign language context.

2. Literature review

2.1. Corrective feedback in second language learning

Corrective feedback has long been recognized as a defining feature of language classrooms and a central mechanism in second language learning. Hall (2017) and Rido & Sari (2018) emphasize that error correction, alongside questioning, is one of the instructional practices that most characterizes language classrooms. Corrective feedback is commonly defined as teachers' responses to learners' non-target-like language use, indicating deviations from the target language norms (Ha & Nguyen, 2021; Nhac, 2021). Lightbown and Spada (1999) further conceptualize corrective feedback as any utterance that signals to learners that their language production is erroneous in some way. From this perspective, corrective feedback functions as evaluative input that guides learners toward more accurate language use (Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, 2017; Li, 2018).

The importance of corrective feedback is further supported by theories of second language acquisition that distinguish adult second language learning from first language acquisition. Several scholars argue that adult learners cannot achieve native like accuracy solely through exposure to positive input or models of grammatical forms (Dąbrowska et al., 2020; Kenanidis et al., 2023). Consequently, learners require both positive and negative evidence to develop their interlanguage. In this regard, classroom settings play a crucial role, as they provide frequent opportunities for corrective feedback and exposure to modified input.

2.2. Roles of corrective feedback in speaking instruction

Corrective feedback serves multiple pedagogical roles in speaking instruction. Beshir & Yigzaw (2022) argue that corrective feedback occurring during teacher learner interaction helps learners repair communication breakdowns and resolve conversational impasses. Similarly,

Nhac (2021) highlights the role of corrective feedback in enhancing both linguistic accuracy and oral fluency. In genre-based classrooms, feedback is viewed as an essential form of scaffolding that supports learners in building confidence and acquiring the discourse resources necessary to participate in target communities (Nguyen, 2024).

Beyond linguistic development, corrective feedback also contributes to learners' affective and cognitive growth. Pérez-Dattari (2018) suggests that corrective feedback implicitly legitimizes teachers' expertise while promoting deep learning strategies rather than surface level learning. Ramadan Elbaoui Shaddad & Jember (2024) further note that appropriate oral or written corrective feedback can empower learners, enhance self-esteem, and foster interactive communication. Empirical evidence also indicates that learners who receive systematic corrective feedback become more capable of detecting errors and self-editing their utterances, which can lead to increased fluency in spoken production (Long, 2022).

2.3. Types of corrective feedback in speaking classes

The literature identifies a variety of corrective feedback types commonly used in speaking classrooms. Brown categorizes corrective feedback into recasts, clarification requests, elicitation, explicit correction, repetition, and metalinguistic feedback (Ghariblaki & Poorahmadi, 2017; Li, 2018). Explicit correction directly provides the correct form and leaves little ambiguity for learners. Recasts, by contrast, involve reformulating learners' incorrect utterances more implicitly, often embedded within natural interaction (Kim, 2018).

Other feedback types encourage learners' active engagement in self-correction. Metalinguistic feedback provides comments or explanations related to the nature of the error without supplying the correct form (Sato & Loewen, 2018), while elicitation prompts learners to retrieve the correct form from their existing knowledge. Clarification requests signal communication problems and encourage learners to reconsider their utterances. In addition, indirect feedback such as written feedback and peer feedback has gained prominence for promoting learner autonomy and collaborative learning (Er et al., 2021).

2.4. Affective factors in corrective feedback

Affective factors play a significant role in shaping how learners receive, interpret, and respond to corrective feedback in language learning contexts. Variables such as anxiety, motivation, and self-esteem can influence whether feedback is perceived as supportive or threatening, and consequently, whether it facilitates or hinders learning. According to Hadden and Frisby (2019), learners who experience high levels of feedback-related anxiety may be less likely to engage with corrective input, particularly in public speaking situations where errors are exposed in front of peers. Similarly, motivation has been identified as a key determinant in feedback uptake, as learners who are intrinsically motivated are more likely to actively process and apply corrective feedback to improve their performance.

In addition, self-esteem influences learners' emotional responses to correction. Learners with higher self-confidence tend to view feedback as an opportunity for growth, whereas those with lower self-esteem may perceive it as criticism, leading to avoidance behaviors or reduced

participation (Pérez-Dattari, 2018). These affective dimensions are particularly relevant in EFL speaking classrooms, where real-time communication and public performance can heighten emotional sensitivity. Therefore, understanding learners' affective experiences is essential for designing feedback practices that are both pedagogically effective and emotionally supportive. This perspective further supports the use of narrative inquiry, as it allows researchers to capture the nuanced emotional and experiential aspects of feedback that are often overlooked in purely cognitive or performance-based analyses.

2.5. Students' narratives as a lens for understanding corrective feedback

Despite extensive research on the effectiveness and types of corrective feedback, relatively limited attention has been paid to learners' subjective experiences, particularly as expressed through students' narratives. In narrative inquiry, students' narratives are understood as personal stories that reflect learners' experiences, beliefs, emotions, and meaning-making processes in educational contexts (Hutchinson, 2019). These narratives may be collected through interviews, written reflections, journals, or oral accounts, providing rich qualitative data for understanding classroom practices.

Students' narratives offer valuable insights into how corrective feedback is perceived, interpreted, and emotionally processed by learners. Bearman (2019) emphasizes that narrative analysis allows researchers to uncover underlying themes and patterns that shape learners' experiences. In language education, narrative inquiry has been used to explore how students make sense of instructional approaches and how these experiences influence their learning trajectories (Clandinin, 2019). In English as a foreign language context such as Indonesia, students' narratives can reveal how cultural norms, speaking anxiety, and classroom dynamics shape learners' responses to corrective feedback, thereby informing more learner-centered and context sensitive pedagogical practices.

Overall, existing studies show that corrective feedback is not a simple or one-dimensional practice, but rather a complex part of language instruction with various forms and purposes. Although a large body of research has focused on the types, timing, and effectiveness of feedback, less attention has been given to how learners themselves actually experience it. In practice, feedback does not work in the same way for every learner, as it is shaped by their perceptions, emotions, and past learning experiences. For this reason, narrative inquiry provides a useful approach to better understand these personal and subjective aspects. By exploring learners' stories, this study seeks to enrich previous research by offering a more in-depth view of how Indonesian EFL students experience and interpret corrective feedback in the development of their speaking skills.

3. Method

This study employed a qualitative research design utilizing a narrative inquiry approach, where participants' stories served as the primary source of data. Narrative inquiry is particularly suitable for exploring learners' lived experiences, beliefs, and emotions, as it enables researchers to understand how individuals construct meaning from their past, present, and anticipated

experiences (Nigar, 2020). Hiver et al. (2020) emphasize that narratives allow participants to reflect on their learning experiences, revealing both cognitive and affective dimensions. Consequently, narrative inquiry was deemed an appropriate methodological framework for representing and interpreting Indonesian students' experiences and perceptions of corrective feedback in speaking classes.

The study was conducted from March to August 2025 at the English Education Department. The participants consisted of eight fourth-semester students majoring in English Education who had been actively involved in speaking classes from their first to fourth semesters. A purposive sampling technique was employed to select participants who were considered information-rich cases, as they had sustained exposure to speaking instruction and corrective feedback practices. This criterion ensured that participants were able to provide detailed and reflective narratives relevant to the research objectives. The group included two male and six female students, allowing for diverse perspectives on their experiences with corrective feedback.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, which served as the main research instrument. Semi-structured interviews were chosen because they allow researchers to explore predetermined topics while also providing the flexibility to probe participants' responses in greater depth. According to Creswell, interviews involve direct interaction between researchers and participants, during which questions are asked and responses recorded. The interviews in this study were conducted online via Zoom in an informal setting to encourage openness and comfort. Each interview lasted approximately 30–45 minutes and was audio recorded with participants' consent. An interview guide was used to ensure alignment with the research objectives while allowing participants to narrate their experiences freely.

The data collection procedure followed the narrative inquiry framework proposed by Clandinin, Pushor, and Orr. First, an interview guide was designed based on the research objectives. Next, interviews were conducted and audio recorded with participants' consent. The recordings were then transcribed verbatim to preserve the authenticity of participants' narratives. The transcripts were returned to participants via email for verification. Participants were asked to confirm the accuracy of the transcripts and to clarify any statements they felt were unclear or misinterpreted. All participants confirmed the accuracy of their transcripts, and minor clarifications were incorporated into the final dataset. These procedures ensured that the collected data comprehensively and systematically captured students' experiences and perceptions of corrective feedback in speaking classes.

Data analysis was carried out using qualitative data analysis procedures. Following Lewis, the analysis involved several stages, including transcription, member checking, and coding. The transcripts were coded using a combination of deductive and inductive approaches. Deductive coding was based on the seven analytical components outlined in Table 1, while inductive coding was applied to identify emergent themes that were not captured within the initial framework. The first author conducted the initial coding process by organizing narratives chronologically, identifying key events, and assigning thematic codes. To enhance the reliability of the analysis, a second researcher independently coded approximately 20% of the data. The

coding results were then compared, and any discrepancies were discussed and resolved collaboratively. Based on this process, the coding scheme was refined to ensure consistency and representativeness of the data.

Coding was further developed into thematic categories that reflected patterns in participants' experiences, perceptions, and emotional responses to different types of corrective feedback. To ensure trustworthiness, the coded data were reviewed by colleagues with similar research expertise, allowing for peer examination and validation of the analytical process. This systematic approach enhanced the credibility, dependability, and transparency of the qualitative findings.

4. Findings

4.1. *Overview of participants' narratives*

This chapter presents the research findings derived from narrative inquiry data obtained through semi-structured interviews with eight fourth-semester students from the English Education Department at UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten. The participants hailed from diverse educational and experiential backgrounds, including Islamic boarding schools, English competitions, storytelling activities, online learning contexts, and informal English exposure through films, music, and family interactions. These varied backgrounds contributed to rich and nuanced narratives about their experiences with corrective feedback in speaking classes. Such diversity allowed the study to capture a wide range of perspectives on how feedback is perceived and utilized across different learning contexts. Consequently, the findings reflect not only individual experiences but also broader patterns of feedback practices in Indonesian EFL settings.

Despite their different learning trajectories, all participants reported receiving corrective feedback regularly during their speaking learning processes, both in formal classroom settings and informal learning environments. Their narratives revealed how corrective feedback shaped their pronunciation, grammar awareness, fluency, vocabulary development, confidence, and motivation in speaking English. The consistency of feedback exposure underscores its central role in speaking instruction. Furthermore, participants' reflections demonstrate that feedback influences not only linguistic development but also affective factors that are essential for sustained engagement in oral communication.

4.2. *Interview components and coding framework*

To analyze the interview data systematically, seven analytical components were employed. These components were operationalized into fifteen interview questions and served as the foundation for the coding process. Table 4.1 summarizes the interview components used in this study. The use of clearly defined analytical components ensured that the interview questions comprehensively captured participants' experiences, perceptions, and emotional responses to different types of feedback. This structured design also supported analytical consistency and facilitated the identification of recurring themes across the dataset.

Table 1

Interview components and operational definitions.

Component	Code	Description
Direct Feedback	DF	Immediate and oral correction delivered directly by teachers or lecturers
Indirect Feedback	IF	Written feedback or delayed correction provided through notes or texts
Peer Feedback	PF	Feedback provided by classmates or peers
Pronunciation	P	Correction related to articulation, stress, and intonation
Grammar	G	Correction related to sentence structure and tense usage
Fluency	F	Feedback on smoothness and continuity of speech
Vocabulary	V	Feedback on word choice and lexical accuracy

This coding framework allowed the researcher to map participants’ narratives systematically and identify dominant patterns of feedback preferences and perceived impacts. By organizing the data into clearly defined categories, the framework facilitated consistent comparison across participants’ experiences. This systematic approach enhanced the credibility and transparency of the qualitative analysis, ensuring that emerging themes were grounded in the participants’ narratives.

4.3. Distribution of corrective feedback types across speaking components

The findings in this section are organized into key themes reflecting participants’ experiences with different types of corrective feedback and their perceived impact on speaking development. Analysis of the coded interview data indicates that direct feedback emerged as the most frequently experienced and preferred feedback type, followed by peer feedback and indirect feedback. The categorizations of “High,” “Moderate,” and “Low” presented in Table 2 were derived from the frequency with which participants mentioned each type of corrective feedback in relation to specific speaking components during the interviews. These frequency patterns were identified through the coding process, which combined deductive categories (as outlined in Table 1) and inductive themes emerging from participants’ narratives. Table 2 presents the distribution of feedback types across speaking components. This pattern suggests that learners place high value on immediate and explicit correction in speaking activities. The prominence of direct feedback further reflects its perceived effectiveness in addressing performance-based aspects of oral communication, such as pronunciation and fluency.

Table 2

Distribution of feedback types across speaking components.

Feedback Type	Pronunciation	Grammar	Fluency	Vocabulary
Direct Feedback	High	High	High	High
Peer Feedback	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Indirect Feedback	Low	Moderate	Low	Low

Participants consistently emphasized that direct feedback enabled immediate error recognition and correction, particularly for pronunciation and fluency. For example, several participants recalled being corrected instantly during role plays, storytelling, and public speaking tasks, which allowed them to internalize the correct forms more effectively. This real time

correction facilitated repeated practice of accurate pronunciation and smoother speech production within the same interaction. As a result, learners reported increased confidence and greater automaticity in their subsequent speaking performances.

4.4. *Perceived impact of direct feedback on speaking skills*

This theme focuses on the perceived impact of direct corrective feedback on various aspects of speaking skills. All participants acknowledged that direct feedback had a significant positive impact on their speaking development. Direct feedback was perceived as clear, memorable, and effective because it occurred immediately after errors were made. The levels of perceived impact presented in Table 3 were similarly derived from the intensity and frequency of participants' narrative references to improvements in each speaking aspect during the coding process. Table 4.3 summarizes participants' perceptions of direct feedback. The immediacy of correction enabled learners to directly associate feedback with their performance, facilitating deeper cognitive processing and retention. Furthermore, the clarity of direct feedback minimized ambiguity, allowing learners to understand not only what was incorrect but also how to produce more accurate spoken output.

Table 3

Perceived impact of direct feedback.

Speaking Aspect	Perceived Impact
Pronunciation	Improved accuracy and articulation
Grammar	Increased awareness of tense usage
Fluency	Reduced hesitation and fillers
Vocabulary	More appropriate word choice

Participants such as Ilva, Zeera, Ita, and Wan reported that direct feedback helped them avoid repeating the same mistakes and increased their confidence in speaking performances. Immediate correction also enhanced interpersonal interaction between lecturers and students, making the learning process more engaging and meaningful. By receiving feedback at the moment of error, learners were able to immediately adjust their language use and reinforce accurate forms. This interactive exchange fostered a sense of support and attentiveness, which contributed to greater learner motivation and willingness to participate in subsequent speaking tasks.

4.5. *Indirect and peer feedback in students' narratives*

This theme highlights participants' experiences with indirect and peer feedback, particularly in relation to emotional comfort, reflection, and collaborative learning. While indirect feedback was perceived as less memorable by some participants, it played an important role in grammar improvement. Written feedback allowed learners to reflect independently and reduce anxiety associated with public correction. However, several participants admitted that they tended to forget written feedback if it was not reinforced orally. This finding suggests that the effectiveness of indirect feedback depends on the presence of follow up opportunities that

connect written comments to actual language use. Integrating brief oral clarification or revision tasks may help learners internalize grammatical feedback more effectively.

Peer feedback was viewed as the most comfortable and less intimidating form of correction. Feedback from classmates encouraged openness, engagement, and collaborative learning. Participants reported that peer feedback was particularly effective for pronunciation, vocabulary enrichment, and fluency adjustment, especially when delivered in informal settings or small group discussions. Such environments appear to lower learners' affective barriers and promote active participation in speaking activities. Consequently, peer feedback functions not only as a linguistic resource but also as a social mechanism that supports sustained speaking development.

5. Discussion

5.1. *Direct corrective feedback as the most impactful strategy in speaking development*

The findings of this study indicate that participants consistently viewed direct corrective feedback as the most impactful method for developing speaking skills. Narratives from Ilva, Zeera, Ita, Ika, Iyan, Kira, Fli, and Wan highlight that direct feedback facilitated immediate error recognition, strengthened memory retention, and boosted confidence in oral performance. This aligns with previous research suggesting that immediate and explicit feedback enhances learners' awareness of linguistic forms and accelerates interlanguage development (Fu & Li, 2022; Fernández, 2023; Barone, 2024). From a cognitive perspective, the immediacy of direct feedback enables learners to connect corrections directly to communicative events, making the learning experience more significant and memorable. This aligns with cognitive-interactionist perspectives in second language acquisition, which emphasize the importance of immediate feedback in facilitating noticing and interlanguage development. From a narrative perspective, participants' accounts further illustrate how direct feedback is not only processed cognitively but also experienced as meaningful interaction, reinforcing the role of feedback as both instructional input and social mediation.

Additionally, participants' narratives demonstrate that direct feedback was particularly effective for pronunciation, vocabulary choice, and fluency. For example, Ilva's and Ika's experiences with pronunciation correction illustrate how direct modeling and guided repetition help learners internalize phonological features, supporting Tan et al. (2024) claim that oral corrective feedback is especially beneficial for phonological accuracy. Similarly, Iyan's experience with vocabulary correction underscores the role of explicit feedback in refining semantic understanding, corroborating findings by Suer (2023) that explicit feedback clarifies form-meaning relationships in second language learning.

Moreover, participants emphasized the interpersonal aspect of direct feedback. The direct interaction between lecturers and students fostered engagement, reduced ambiguity, and strengthened teacher-student relationships. This supports sociocultural perspectives that argue feedback serves as dialogic mediation, scaffolding learners' development through social interaction (Rassaei, 2019). Therefore, direct corrective feedback in speaking classrooms

functions not only as an error correction mechanism but also as a pedagogical tool that supports both the linguistic and affective dimensions of learning.

5.2. Indirect corrective feedback and its selective effectiveness

While direct feedback was generally preferred, the findings indicate divergent perceptions regarding indirect corrective feedback. Several participants perceived written or delayed feedback as less effective for improving speaking performance, primarily due to reduced memorability and limited emotional engagement. This observation aligns with previous studies suggesting that delayed feedback may be less salient for oral skills because learners may struggle to reconnect written comments with their actual speaking performance (Ellis, 2017; Estaji & Farahanynia, 2019). Ita's experience during online learning further highlights how indirect feedback may lose its pedagogical impact when not reinforced through interaction. Without immediate opportunities for clarification or practice, learners may fail to internalize the feedback, resulting in repeated errors. This suggests that indirect feedback requires additional scaffolding to remain meaningful in speaking instruction.

Conversely, other participants viewed indirect feedback as beneficial, particularly for grammatical accuracy. Written feedback allows learners to reflect on errors without the pressure of public correction, which resonates with findings by Harris (2023) that written feedback supports analytical processing and self-regulation. Additionally, Wan's narrative emphasizes the affective benefit of indirect feedback in reducing speaking anxiety, supporting Hadden & Frisby (2019) argument that anxiety can negatively influence oral performance when feedback is perceived as threatening. This reflective space enables learners to process feedback at their own pace and develop a deeper understanding of grammatical forms. As such, indirect feedback may be especially valuable for learners who are sensitive to public evaluation. These findings can also be understood through affective theories of language learning, particularly in relation to anxiety and motivation. Learners who perceive feedback as less threatening are more likely to engage with it meaningfully, whereas high levels of anxiety may hinder feedback uptake. In this sense, indirect feedback provides a lower-pressure environment that supports reflective learning and sustained engagement with grammatical development.

These contrasting perceptions suggest that indirect feedback may function optimally when aligned with specific learning objectives and learner needs. While it may be less effective for pronunciation and fluency, indirect feedback appears to support grammatical awareness and affective comfort. This finding reinforces the argument that no single feedback strategy is universally effective and that feedback effectiveness is mediated by task type, linguistic focus, and learners' emotional responses (Ellis, 2017). Accordingly, teachers should consider adopting a selective and adaptive approach to feedback provision. By combining indirect feedback with opportunities for follow-up interaction, instructors can maximize its pedagogical value in speaking classrooms.

5.3. *Peer feedback as a source of comfort, engagement, and collaborative learning*

The participants' narratives reveal that peer feedback is perceived as the most convenient and emotionally comfortable form of feedback. Many participants described peer feedback as less intimidating, more relatable, and easier to accept due to shared learning experiences and similar proficiency levels. This finding aligns with social constructivist views, which suggest that learning is enhanced through collaboration and shared meaning-making (Cui & Pacheco, 2023). Peer feedback creates a supportive environment that encourages openness and active engagement in speaking activities. This emotional safety appears to lower learners' affective filters, enabling them to take greater risks in oral communication. As a result, peer feedback not only facilitates linguistic development but also supports learners' willingness to communicate in the target language. This finding further supports social constructivist perspectives on learning, particularly Vygotsky's view that knowledge is co-constructed through social interaction. Peer feedback creates opportunities for learners to operate within their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), where they can receive support from more capable peers and gradually develop their speaking competence. In this sense, feedback is not merely transmitted from teacher to student, but is collaboratively negotiated among learners.

Pronunciation and vocabulary emerged as the most frequently corrected components in peer feedback interactions. Zeera's and Ita's experiences suggest that peers can effectively identify surface-level errors and provide practical suggestions, supporting previous findings that peer feedback can enhance awareness of language use and promote learner autonomy (Shelton-Strong, 2018). Moreover, Ilva's preference for feedback from more competent peers highlights the role of peer expertise, indicating that peer feedback is most effective when learners perceive the feedback provider as knowledgeable and credible. This finding implies that structured peer feedback activities may benefit from grouping strategies that consider relative proficiency levels, allowing learners to maximize both the accuracy and instructional value of peer-provided feedback.

Interestingly, several participants reported receiving peer feedback outside formal classroom contexts, such as through private messaging platforms. This informal feedback environment reduced anxiety and fostered reflective learning, echoing findings by Wood (2022) that technology-mediated peer feedback can enhance learner engagement and reduce power imbalances. Thus, peer feedback functions not only as a linguistic resource but also as an effective and social support system in speaking development. The integration of digital platforms further extends opportunities for interaction beyond classroom boundaries, promoting continuous learning. Consequently, incorporating technology-supported peer feedback may strengthen the sustainability of speaking practice in EFL contexts.

5.4. *Integrating feedback strategies for effective speaking instruction*

Taken together, the findings indicate that direct, indirect, and peer feedback each serve distinct yet complementary roles in speaking instruction. Direct feedback is particularly effective for immediate correction, pronunciation accuracy, and confidence building. Indirect feedback supports grammatical reflection and reduces anxiety, while peer feedback fosters comfort,

collaboration, and learner autonomy. This supports the growing consensus in corrective feedback research that feedback effectiveness depends on the interaction between feedback type, linguistic focus, and learner characteristics (Sato & Loewen, 2018; Yu et al., 2018; Winstone et al. 2022). These results suggest that feedback practices should be strategically aligned with specific instructional goals and learners' developmental needs. Moreover, combining multiple feedback types may enhance both linguistic outcomes and learners' engagement in speaking activities.

Importantly, the use of narrative inquiry in this study provides deeper insight into how learners experience and interpret feedback in real classroom contexts. By foregrounding students' voices, this study highlights the affective and experiential dimensions of corrective feedback that are often overlooked in quantitative research. These findings suggest that effective speaking pedagogy should adopt a flexible and learner responsive feedback approach that integrates multiple feedback strategies rather than relying on a single method. Such an approach acknowledges learners as active agents in the feedback process and allows teachers to respond more sensitively to students' emotional and cognitive needs. Consequently, incorporating learners' perspectives into feedback design may lead to more sustainable improvements in speaking proficiency. From a theoretical standpoint, these findings highlight that corrective feedback should be understood as a multidimensional process shaped by cognitive, social, and affective factors. The integration of different feedback types reflects the need to move beyond one-size-fits-all approaches and toward more adaptive and learner-centered feedback practices.

5.5. Implications for pedagogy

The findings of this study offer several important implications for language teaching practices, particularly in the design and implementation of corrective feedback in speaking classrooms. First, teachers should adopt a balanced and flexible approach by integrating direct, indirect, and peer feedback strategies. Direct feedback can be used strategically for immediate correction, especially in pronunciation and vocabulary development, while indirect feedback may be more appropriate for promoting grammatical reflection and reducing learner anxiety. At the same time, peer feedback should be incorporated to foster collaborative learning and increase students' engagement in speaking activities.

Second, the findings highlight the importance of addressing learners' affective needs in feedback practices. Teachers should create a supportive and non-threatening classroom environment where feedback is perceived as constructive rather than evaluative. This can be achieved by using encouraging language, allowing opportunities for self-correction, and facilitating small-group or peer-based feedback sessions that reduce the pressure of public correction.

Third, teachers should consider the role of technology in extending feedback beyond the classroom. As indicated in participants' narratives, technology-mediated peer feedback can provide additional opportunities for interaction, reflection, and continuous learning in less formal and more comfortable settings. Integrating digital platforms may therefore enhance both the accessibility and effectiveness of feedback practices.

Finally, the use of narrative inquiry in this study underscores the importance of listening to learners' voices in shaping pedagogical decisions. Teachers are encouraged to regularly reflect on students' experiences and perceptions of feedback in order to design more responsive and learner-centered instructional practices. By aligning feedback strategies with learners' cognitive and affective needs, educators can create more meaningful and sustainable learning experiences in EFL speaking contexts.

6. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that Indonesian EFL students' experiences with corrective feedback in speaking instruction are shaped by a complex interplay of linguistic, affective, and social factors. Direct feedback is valued for its immediacy and clarity, particularly in improving pronunciation and vocabulary, while peer feedback provides a more comfortable and collaborative environment that enhances engagement and willingness to communicate. In contrast, indirect feedback supports reflective learning and helps reduce anxiety, especially in relation to grammatical development. These findings highlight that no single feedback type is sufficient on its own; rather, effective speaking instruction requires a balanced and adaptive integration of multiple feedback strategies that respond to learners' cognitive and emotional needs.

By centering learners' narratives, this study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of corrective feedback practices in the Indonesian EFL context. It underscores the importance of considering how feedback is experienced, not just how it is delivered. As language education increasingly emphasizes learner-centered approaches, understanding students' perspectives becomes essential for designing feedback practices that are both effective and responsive to diverse learner needs. Future research may further explore how feedback strategies can be adapted across different contexts and proficiency levels to support more sustainable speaking development.

Declaration on the use of AI

Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools were used to assist in language refinement and improving the clarity of writing during manuscript preparation. The authors reviewed and validated all content and take full responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of the manuscript.

References

- Albore, A. K. (2019). Examining factors that obstruct the practice of learner-centered approach in teaching speaking skill in English language classroom: The case of five government primary schools in Wolaita Sodo city. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 62(1), 1-14.
- Alek, A., Marzuki, A. G., Farkhan, M., & Deni, R. (2020). Self-assessment in exploring EFL students' speaking skill. *Al-Ta'lim Journal*, 27(2), 208-214.
<https://doi.org/10.15548/jt.v27i2.613>

- Alsolami, R. (2019). Effect of oral corrective feedback on language skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(6), 702-707. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0906.06>
- Barone, S. (2024). The importance of interlanguage in language teaching: An analysis of its development in L2 learners. *Vestnik of Samara State Technical University: Psychological and Pedagogical Sciences*, 21(3), 81-97. <https://doi.org/10.17673/vsgtu-pps.2024.3.6>
- Bearman, M., Greenhill, J., & Nestel, D. (2019). The power of simulation: A large-scale narrative analysis of learners' experiences. *Medical Education*, 53(4), 369-379. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13747>
- Beshir, M., & Yigzaw, A. (2022). Students' self-repair in EFL classroom interactions: Implications for classroom dynamics. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 7(1), 26. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00152-9>
- Blidi, S., Chaou, A., & Al Ajmi, A. (2018). Improving language proficiency through student-directed collaborative learning activities. *PONTE International Journal of Science and Research*, 74(3), 1-10.
- Bylkova, S., Chubova, E., & Kudryashov, I. (2021). Public speaking as a tool for developing students' communication and speech skills. In *E3S Web of Conferences* (Vol. 273, Article 11030). EDP Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202127311030>
- Clandinin, D. J. (2019). *Journeys in narrative inquiry: The selected works of D. Jean Clandinin*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429273895>
- Cui, Y., & Pacheco, M. B. (2023). Meaning-making and collaboration: Teacher scaffolds within a translanguaging pedagogy. *Journal of World Languages*, 9(3), 371-399. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jwl-2022-0023>
- Dąbrowska, E., Becker, L., & Miorelli, L. (2020). Is adult second language acquisition defective? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1839. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01839>
- Ellis, R. (2017). Oral corrective feedback in L2 classrooms: What we know so far. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 3-18). Routledge.
- Er, E., Dimitriadis, Y., & Gašević, D. (2021). A collaborative learning approach to dialogic peer feedback: A theoretical framework. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(4), 586-600. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1786097>
- Estaji, M., & Farahanynia, M. (2019). The immediate and delayed effect of dynamic assessment approaches on EFL learners' oral narrative performance and anxiety. *Educational Assessment*, 24(2), 135-154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2019.1589465>
- Fernández, C. B. (2023). Explicit and implicit learning in second language acquisition. In *Teaching English in global contexts: Language, learners and learning* (p. 157).
- Fu, M., & Li, S. (2022). The effects of immediate and delayed corrective feedback on L2 development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 44(1), 2-34. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226312100012X>
- Ghariblaki, Z., & Poorahmadi, M. (2017). The effect of recast vs. clarification request as two types of corrective feedback on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' structural knowledge. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(1), 87-96. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0801.11>

- Ha, X. V., & Nguyen, L. T. (2021). Targets and sources of oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classroom: Are students' and teachers' beliefs aligned? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 697160. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697160>
- Hadden, A. A., & Frisby, B. N. (2019). Face threat mitigation in feedback: An examination of student feedback anxiety, self-efficacy, and perceived emotional support. *Communication Quarterly*, 67(1), 60-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2018.1486423>
- Hall, G. (2017). *Exploring English language teaching: Language in action*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315629765>
- Hanh, N. H., & Huyen, P. M. (2024). A review of collaborative learning activities to help students reduce speaking anxiety in EFL classroom settings. *American Research Journal of Humanities & Social Science (ARJHSS)*, 7(3), 86-90.
- Harris, S. G. K. R. (2023). The role and development of self-regulation in the writing process. In *Self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 203-228). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003314577>
- Hiver, P., Zhou, S. A., Tahmouresi, S., Sang, Y., & Papi, M. (2020). Why stories matter: Exploring learner engagement and metacognition through narratives of the L2 learning experience. *System*, 91, 102260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102260>
- Hutchinson, D. A. (2019). Making meaning of meaning-making: Understanding experience through story. In *Landscapes, edges, and identity-making* (Vol. 33, pp. 79–95). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-368720190000033008>
- Kenanidis, P., Dąbrowska, E., Llompарт, M., & Pili-Moss, D. (2023). Can adults learn L2 grammar after prolonged exposure under incidental conditions? *PLoS ONE*, 18(7), e0288989. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0288989>
- Kim, J. H. (2018). Recasts and prompts in dyadic interaction: Explicitness of feedback and learner proficiency. *English Teaching*, 73(4), 3-28. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.73.4.201812.3>
- Kuliahana, A., & Marzuki, A. G. (2024). Utilizing group discussion technique in developing speaking skill in an EFL classroom. *English Franca: Academic Journal of English Language and Education*, 7(2), 305-316.
- Kuliahana, A., Marzuki, A. G., & Rustam, R. (2024). Developing speaking skill through opinion expression method in Islamic higher education context. *English Franca: Academic Journal of English Language and Education*, 8(1), 121–132.
- Larasati, F. (2018). Student-centered learning: An approach to develop speaking skill in EFL classroom. *English Community Journal*, 2(1), 153-157.
- Li, S. (2018). Corrective feedback in L2 speech production. In J. I. Liantas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1-9). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784234.eelt0231>
- Long, R. W. (2022). Online grammar checkers versus self-editing: An investigation of error correction rates and writing quality. *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, 7(1), 441-458. <https://doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol7iss1pp441-458>
- Mahara, A. D., & Hartono, D. (2024). The effect of corrective feedback to improve students' motivation in speaking skills: A perspective from EFL learners. *Cetta: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 7(4), 42-53.

- Marzuki, A. G., & Kuliahana, A. (2021). Using language games to enhance EFL students' speaking skill in Indonesia. *Al-Ta'lim Journal*, 28(3), 213-222. <https://doi.org/10.15548/jt.v28i3.691>
- Michel, M. (2017). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in L2 production. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 50-68). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315676967>
- Muthmainnah, M., Marzuki, A. G., Santiana, S., Erizar, E., & Nursyam, N. (2022). Utilizing smartphone-based Pinterest applications in developing EFL students' speaking skills in Indonesia. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 7(2), 205-209. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v7i2.1690>
- Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (2017). Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 1-23). Routledge.
- Nguyen, C. D. (2024). Scaffolding student engagement with written corrective feedback: Transforming feedback sessions into learning affordances. *Language Teaching Research*, 28(5), 1918-1939. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211015202>
- Nhac, H. T. (2021). Effect of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral accuracy in English speaking lessons. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(10), 313-330. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.10.17>
- Nigar, N. (2020). Hermeneutic phenomenological narrative enquiry: A qualitative study design. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 10(1), 10-18. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1001.02>
- Pérez-Dattari, R., Celemin, C., Ruiz-del-Solar, J., & Kober, J. (2018). Interactive learning with corrective feedback for policies based on deep neural networks. In *International Symposium on Experimental Robotics* (pp. 353-363). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33950-0_31
- Ramadan Elbaoui Shaddad, A., & Jember, B. (2024). A step toward effective language learning: An insight into the impacts of feedback-supported tasks and peer-work activities on learners' engagement, self-esteem, and language growth. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9(1), 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00218-7>
- Rassaei, E. (2019). Tailoring mediation to learners' ZPD: Effects of dynamic and non-dynamic corrective feedback on L2 development. *The Language Learning Journal*, 47(5), 591-607. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2017.1369959>
- Rido, A., & Sari, F. M. (2018). Characteristics of classroom interaction of English language teachers in Indonesia and Malaysia. *International Journal of Language Education*, 2(1), 40-50. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v2i1.5246>
- Sato, M., & Loewen, S. (2018). Metacognitive instruction enhances the effectiveness of corrective feedback: Variable effects of feedback types and linguistic targets. *Language Learning*, 68(2), 507-545. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12283>
- Shamsiddin, X. (2024). The subject is interactive methods that develop communicative competence in students. *International Journal of Pedagogics*, 4(5), 117-122.
- Shelton-Strong, S. J. (2018). Fostering the development of language learner autonomy through peer and self-assessment. *Relay Journal*, 1(1), 21-46.

- Spring, R. (2020). Can video-creation project work affect students' oral proficiency? An analysis of fluency, complexity and accuracy. *TESL-EJ*, 24(2), Article 2.
- Suer, F. A. (2023). Integrating form and meaning in language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 3(4), 90-97.
- Tampubolon, T. C. (2018). Improving students' motivation in speaking through collaborative learning. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 3(2), 185-191. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.3.2.17>
- Tan, X., Reynolds, B. L., & Ha, X. V. (2024). Oral corrective feedback on lexical errors: A systematic review. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 15(3), 1177-1221. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2022-0027>
- Tokunaga, M. (2021). Investigating fluency and accuracy of Japanese university EFL learners' spoken English production. *Journal of English Teaching*, 7(1), 163-178.
- Winstone, N., Boud, D., Dawson, P., & Heron, M. (2022). From feedback-as-information to feedback-as-process: A linguistic analysis of the feedback literature. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(2), 213-230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1902467>
- Wood, J. (2022). Making peer feedback work: The contribution of technology-mediated dialogic peer feedback to feedback uptake and literacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(3), 327-346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1902464>
- Yu, S., Wang, B., & Teo, T. (2018). Understanding linguistic, individual and contextual factors in oral feedback research: A review of empirical studies in L2 classrooms. *Educational Research Review*, 24, 181-192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.04.001>