Journal of English Language and Education
ISSN 2597- 6850 (Online), 2502-4132 (Print)
Journal Homepage: https://jele.or.id/index.php/jele/index

OPEN ACCESS Article

Corrective Feedback in Students' Narrative Writing: A Narrative Inquiry of Teacher's Pratices and Students' Experiences

https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v11i6.3394

Siti Hanna Sumedi, Fauzan Fawwaz Yusuf[ab]
[12]Universitas La Tansa Mashiro, Indonesia.
Corresponding Author: ssitihanna@gmail.com

A B S T R A C T

This study aimed to explore how the teacher implements corrective feedback in teaching narrative writing and investigate students' responses regarding corrective feedback in narrative writing. This study addresses the contextual and conceptual gap by exploring teacher corrective feedback practices and students' experiences to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how corrective feedback is implemented and experienced. Likewise, the study employed a qualitative approach with a narrative inquiry design to provide narrative stories as primary data sources from participants about their life experiences. Since the focus was on how the teacher's practices and students' experiences regarding the corrective feedback in narrative writing hence the participants were one English teacher and four eighth-grade students at a Modern Islamic Boarding School in Indonesia. Data were collected through teacher and students reflective journal and semi-structured interviews further analysed thematically. The findings showed teacher practiced synchronous and asynchronous mode of delivery, moderate level of explicitness, focus of Improvement on grammar and sentence structure, guided writing as structural approach, drafting and revising as process approach, and teacher-student engagement as post-process approach. Generally, the main corrective feedback was direct and indirect correction on grammar and structure of writing. Specifically, the students perceived corrective feedback is helpful in developing their narrative writing and support their confidence in narrative writing. This study highlights that corrective feedback is a contextual and interactive process that supports students' narrative writing preparation and process.

Keywords: *Corrective Feedback, Narrative Writing, Narrative Inquiry, Writing Instruction, Thematic Analysis*

Article History:
Received 07th October 2026
Accepted 05th November 2026
Published 17th November 2026

INTRODUCTION

Narrative writing is an important component of writing instruction that requires students to organize their ideas into coherent and meaningful stories. It enables students to communicate experiences imaginatively while developing their ability to express ideas through structured written language (K Hyland, 2003). The primary purpose of narrative writing is to entertain readers or communicate a story through a sequence of events. Its structure generally consists of an orientation, complication, and resolution, which guide readers in understanding the development of the story. In English language learning, particularly for eighth-grade students in Indonesian junior high schools, narrative writing provides opportunities to develop written communication, express ideas creatively, organize events into coherent storylines, and apply language features in meaningful contexts. Therefore, students need to understand how to organize narrative elements and provide sufficient details to make their stories clear and understandable.

However, narrative writing requires students to coordinate several linguistic and organizational competencies, including vocabulary selection, grammatical accuracy, particularly past-tense forms, sentence construction, sequencing of events, and the development of conventional narrative structures. These demands can present considerable challenges for EFL learners who are still developing their English proficiency. Hyland (2003) explains that second language writing involves the interaction of linguistic knowledge, writing skills, and the ability to communicate meaning effectively. Furthermore, students need

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Siti Hanna Sumedi & Fauzan Fawwaz Yusuf.

to understand how language choices contribute to the organization and communicative purpose of their texts. Consequently, teachers need to provide appropriate instructional support to help students overcome linguistic and structural difficulties. One important form of support is corrective feedback, which helps students identify writing problems and improve the quality of their narrative texts.

Corrective feedback provides students with information about errors and suggestions for improving their writing. It plays an important role in second language learning because it helps learners recognize gaps between their current language performance and the expected language forms (Ellis, 2009). In writing instruction, corrective feedback informs students about aspects of their texts that require improvement, including grammatical accuracy, vocabulary, sentence structure, organization, and writing mechanics. Hyland & Hyland (2006) emphasize that feedback is an essential component of second language writing because it provides guidance for improving students' written work and supports their development as writers. Similarly, Ferris (2010) discusses the contribution of written corrective feedback to second language acquisition and writing development. Corrective feedback can be delivered through different strategies, including direct and indirect feedback. Direct feedback involves explicitly providing the correct form of an error, whereas indirect feedback indicates the presence of an error without necessarily supplying the correction (Ellis, 2009). These strategies allow teachers to adjust their feedback according to students' writing difficulties and learning needs. In addition, corrective feedback may be delivered synchronously through immediate interaction or asynchronously through written comments and corrections provided after students submit their work.

Based on the preliminary observation conducted at a Modern Islamic Boarding School, corrective feedback in narrative writing is provided through both synchronous and asynchronous practices. Synchronous feedback is generally delivered through direct teacher–student interaction during classroom discussions, drafting, and revision activities. In contrast, asynchronous feedback is provided through written notes, corrections, or comments on students' writing that are returned after teachers assess their work. Both practices are implemented during and after the teaching and learning process. The purpose of corrective feedback extends beyond formal assessment because it also serves as instructional guidance that helps students recognize errors, understand corrections, and improve their narrative texts. Previous research has demonstrated the importance of feedback in second language writing. Hyland & Hyland (2006) highlight the pedagogical functions of teacher feedback, while Mao et al. (2024), through their synthesis of naturalistic classroom studies, provide further insights into written corrective feedback practices in second language writing. Furthermore, Shen & Chong (2023) emphasize that students' engagement with written corrective feedback is influenced by individual and contextual factors. Similarly, Elfiyanto & Fukazawa (2020) demonstrate the contribution of teacher and peer corrective feedback to different components of students' writing, including content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. These studies emphasize the importance of examining feedback not only as a correction technique but also as part of the broader teaching and learning process. Therefore, the present study focuses on how teachers implement corrective feedback in narrative writing and how students respond to the feedback they receive. Although previous studies have examined corrective feedback in second language writing, further investigation is needed to understand how teachers implement different feedback strategies in specific writing genre.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative approach with a narrative inquiry design to explore the implementation of corrective feedback in narrative writing regarding teacher's practices and how students respond to the corrective feedback implemented. A qualitative approach was appropriate because it enabled the researcher to explore participants' experiences, perspectives, and interpretations in depth rather than merely measure the effectiveness of corrective feedback through numerical outcomes (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Specifically,

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Siti Hanna Sumedi & Fauzan Fawwaz Yusuf.

narrative inquiry provided a framework for understanding how teachers and students experienced and interpreted corrective feedback within their authentic educational context. Narrative inquiry functions both as a research method and as a means of understanding human experiences through stories, allowing participants to articulate how they make sense of their teaching and learning practices (Barkhuizen et al., 2017). From this perspective, teachers' instructional experiences and students' responses are not simply treated as sources of data but are interpreted in relation to their personal meanings, interactions, and experiences. Accordingly, narrative inquiry was particularly relevant to the present study because it enabled the researcher to examine not only how corrective feedback was implemented in teaching narrative text writing but also how students interpreted, experienced, and responded to the feedback, thereby providing a contextualized understanding of the pedagogical practices and learner perspectives involved.

Participants

This research was conducted at a Modern Islamic Boarding School in Indonesia, specifically in an English subject classroom where narrative text writing was taught to Grade VIII students. The participants in this study consisted of one English teacher and four students who were actively engaged in writing narrative texts. The small sample size was deliberately chosen to facilitate an in-depth, micro-level examination of participants' experiences and journeys, consistent with the core principles of narrative inquiry, thereby generating rich insights into the experiences of teachers and students actively involved in implementing the corrective feedback. The teacher was selected because of his direct involvement in implementing and providing corrective feedback in the teaching and learning process. The teacher was pseudonyms as Angga.

Moreover, the student participants consisted of four Grade VIII junior high school students, with a balanced representation of male and female students. They were selected through purposive sampling, a non-probability sampling technique used to select participants who are most relevant to the objectives of the study (Campbell et al., 2020). The students were selected because they had experience in writing narrative texts and had received corrective feedback from the teacher. They were purposively selected based on their shared characteristics, including the duration and frequency of their engagement with corrective feedback, same levels of English proficiency (B1), and active participation. These criteria provided a basis for comparison while enabling a detailed and nuanced examination of their experiences, consistent with narrative inquiry's emphasis on understanding lived experiences in depth. The students were between 13 and 15 years old, which corresponds to the typical age range of Grade VIII students. Therefore, the students were pseudonyms, Student 1 as Rafa, Student 2 as Elsa, Student 3 as Omar, and Student 4 as Layla.

Instruments and Procedures

The study was conducted over a six-month period in English language subject, employing reflective journals and semi-structured interviews as the primary data collection instruments. In this study, the data were collected through reflective journal and semi-structured interviews spanning six months of data gathering. These instruments were selected to obtain comprehensive data on the implementation of corrective feedback in students' narrative text writing and to explore students' responses of this practice. First, a reflective journal is an essential instrument that enables both teacher and students to reflect their personal experiences related to the implementation of corrective feedback. As stated by Cohen et al. (2007), reflective journaling enables participants to critically examine their practices and gain deeper insight into their instructional decisions and the impact of feedback on students' learning. Participants submitted their reflective journal entries weekly, specifically every Friday. Throughout the data collection period, each participant contributed 14 journal entries, resulting in a total of 28 reflective journals. The teacher and students were assigned to write reflective journals describing their experiences related to the implementation of corrective feedback based on the two aspects proposed by Sheen (2011): the three dimensions of

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Siti Hanna Sumedi & Fauzan Fawwaz Yusuf.

corrective feedback and the role of corrective feedback in L2 writing. In the reflective journal, the participants explained how corrective feedback was implemented and responded. The participants also reflected on how corrective feedback supported students' development in second language writing, particularly in narrative writing.

Second, semi-structured interviews were conducted with the teacher and students to obtain deeper insights into their experiences of implementing corrective feedback. According to Galletta (2013), semi-structured interview allows the researcher to use guiding questions while giving participants the flexibility to express their thoughts and experiences in greater depth. This instrument enables the collection of rich and detailed data about how the participants experiences related to corrective feedback implementation. It also allows the researcher to explore both teacher and students' perspectives that may not be fully captured through reflective journals. The participants underwent eight 30-minutes interview sessions, they were interviewed to describe their understanding, feelings, and experiences toward the corrective feedback they had implemented and received. The interview questions along with its follow up questions designed according to Sheen (2011) framework focused on how the teacher implemented and how the students interpreted the implementation of corrective feedback and the extent to which it supported their teaching and learning process. Through these interviews, the researcher obtained a comprehensive understanding of how corrective feedback implemented and contributed to students' writing development and overall learning experience.

Data Analysis

In this study, data derived from reflective journals and semi-structured interview were analysed thematically following thematic analysis phases as proposed by Braun and Clarke. Thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns or themes within qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2022). This study employed a deductive approach to thematic analysis, in which the analysis was guided by predefined concepts derived from the theory of corrective feedback by Sheen (2011) and the themes were identified based on the explicit meanings of the participants' experiences. Specifically, the six phases of thematic analysis including: 1) familiarization with the data, 2) generating initial codes, 3) searching for themes, 4) reviewing themes, 5) defining and naming themes, and 6) producing the report as illustrated by Figure 1.



Figure 1. Six Phases of Thematic Analysis by Braun and Clarke

The reflective journals and semi-structured interviews were analysed separately in the initial stages to preserve the distinct perspectives represented by each data source. The reflective journals provided insights into corrective feedback practices, instructional decisions, and reflections on the implementation of corrective feedback in students' writing, whereas the semi-structured interviews captured experiences, interpretations, and responses of the corrective feedback received. Following the initial coding and theme development, the findings from both sources were systematically compared to examine how the teacher's

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Siti Hanna Sumedi & Fauzan Fawwaz Yusuf.

reported practices corresponded with students' responded experiences. This process guided the researcher to explore not only the intended implementation of corrective feedback but also how students experienced and interpreted its implementation in practice. In order to enhance the credibility of the findings, this study employed theoretical triangulation by interpreting the data through multiple theoretical perspectives on Corrective Feedback in L2 Writing (Gay et al., 2012). This strategy enabled the researcher to examine the participants experiences of corrective feedback implementation from different conceptual viewpoints rather than relying on a single theoretical framework. Analytically, the use of multiple perspectives helped identify areas of convergence, divergence, and complementarity in explaining how corrective feedback shaped students' writing processes, learning experiences, and perceptions of writing support. Theoretically informed interpretations also provided opportunities to critically examine the implementation of corrective feedback in writing, including its potential contributions to writing development and the challenges it may present for the participants. Therefore, theoretical triangulation strengthened the depth and credibility of the analysis by situating the participants' experiences within broader discussions of corrective feedback while supporting a more nuanced interpretation of the phenomenon under investigation.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Teacher's Implementation of Corrective Feedback in Narrative Text Writing

Angga as a teacher revealed that corrective feedback was implemented as an ongoing practice throughout the writing process. Thematically, Angga described implementing Sheen (2011) framework related to different modes of delivery, adjusting the level of explicitness, and doing focus on improvement. Inductively, Angga stated that mode of delivery that he implemented were synchronous and asynchronous, level explicitness was moderate, and focus of improvement was mostly on grammar and sentence structure. Thematically, Angga also implemented the role of corrective feedback in relation to Sheen (2011) framework, 1) structural approach, 2) process approach, and 3) post-process approach. Inductively, Angga specified during structural approach he focused on guided writing, process approach he centred on drafting and revising, and enclosed the practices with post-process approach on teacher-student engagement, as discussed comprehensively below:

Synchronous and Asynchronous Mode of Delivery

In corrective feedback, modes of delivery refer to give feedback delivered through two primary modes: synchronous or asynchronous responses or even both. Angga described using both synchronous and asynchronous corrective feedback. Although asynchronous feedback was used more often, synchronous feedback was also incorporated during classroom writing activities, as he and Rafa as representative student stated on the reflective journal:

> "*…. I use both synchronous and asynchronous feedback, but I tend to use asynchronous feedback more often. After students submit their drafts, I mark errors in grammar, structure, and tense, and provide written comments for revision. I also use synchronous feedback during the writing process by giving direct guidance in class.*" *(A-RJ-MOD-C)*
> *"My teacher is always doing both synchronous and asynchronous delivery of corrective feedback to check my grammatical errors in writing……" (R-RJ-MOD-C)*

During interview session, the two modes were experienced differently. Synchronous feedback was associated with immediate responses to students' difficulties, while asynchronous feedback provided more time for reflection, as emphasized:

> "*Synchronous feedback, which is given directly during the writing process, helps students correct their mistakes immediately. Meanwhile, asynchronous feedback, which is given after the writing has been collected, gives students the opportunity to reflect on the teacher's comments more calmly.*" *(A-I-MOD-C)*

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Siti Hanna Sumedi & Fauzan Fawwaz Yusuf.

> *"Synchronous feedback is feedback that I received directly from my teacher while asynchronous is feedback after I finished my writing. Those help me to know what errors that I need to justified and revised" (O-I-MOD-C)*

Moderate Level of Explicitness

In corrective feedback, level of explicitness referes to feedback that can be delivered in two ways: implicitly or explicitly and its intentiveness. In the practice, Angga as a teacher showed that moderate level of explicitness can be understood as a balanced approach in which the teacher provides sufficient guidance to help students recognize and correct their errors without always supplying the correct answers directly. In this matter, the explicitness was adjusted according to students' ability and the type of error. Explicit feedback was used when students needed a clear correction, while implicit feedback was used through hints or clues to encourage students to identify errors independently, as discussed below:

> *"……I usually adjust between explicit and implicit feedback depending on the students' ability level and the type of error. For basic or recurring errors, I tend to use explicit feedback by providing the correct form along with a brief explanation. However, for mistakes that have already been learned, I more often use implicit feedback, such as giving hints or clues without directly providing the answer." (A-RJ-LOE-E)*
>
> *"As a student, I experienced explicit feedback is so often done by my teacher. The level of explicit feedback was moderate meaning degree of feedback explicitness provided with sufficient guidance to recognize and correct my writing errors but also be independent thinker for self-correction." (O-RJ-LOE-E)*

Angga's and Elsa as a student interview indicates that explicitness was not treated as a fixed form of feedback. Instead, the teacher adjusted it according to the learning situation and students' needs:

> *"In my experience, students tend to respond more positively to explicit feedback because they immediately know the correct answer. They feel more helped and confident when revising their writing. However, some students can become too dependent on the teacher's corrections." (A-I-LOE-E)*
>
> *"I always happy when I received explicit feedback because I know my errors in my writing immediately. It gave me a lot of reflection and direct correction." (E-I-LOE-E)*

Focus of Improvement on Grammar and Sentence Structure

In corrective feedback, focus of improvement refers to whether feedback targets one or several specific linguistic features (or addresses various types of errors at once (unfocused or comprehensive corrective feedback). Angga primarily directed corrective feedback toward grammatical accuracy and sentence structure, particularly students' use of past tense in narrative writing. This emphasis reflects the importance of grammatical consistency in constructing narratives, as the recounting of past events requires appropriate verb forms and clear temporal relationships. Furthermore, feedback on sentence construction aimed to help students develop grammatically accurate and logically connected sentences that communicate ideas effectively, as reflected:

> *"When giving feedback, I usually focus on specific aspects first, especially grammar and structure, in line with the learning objectives at that time. For example, in narrative writing, I place more emphasis on the use of the past tense and coherent sentence structure." (A-RJ-FOI-C)*
>
> *"I experienced a lot of grammar and structure correction in narrative writing so that's why my narrative writing especially on grammar and structure got better" (L-RJ-FOI-C)*

Angga and Omar as representative student further explained the focus of improvement on interview, as stated:

OPEN ACCESS

© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Siti Hanna Sumedi & Fauzan Fawwaz Yusuf.

> *"In synchronous feedback, I usually focus more on the most urgent aspects, such as basic grammar or sentence structure, so that mistakes do not continue while students are still writing. Meanwhile, in asynchronous feedback, I can give broader attention, not only to grammar but also to paragraph structure." (A-I-FOI-C)*
> *"Focus of the improvement I experienced as a writer is on the grammar and structure of narrative writing because those were aspects that hit the spotlight of errors" (O-I-FOI-C)*

Guided Writing as Structural Approach

In second language writing, the role of structural approach emerged in the early stages of writing instruction to emphasize kind of strategy along with corrective feedback. Angga stressed that guided writing as a structural approach in corrective feedback emphasizes students' accurate use of grammatical patterns, sentence structures, and linguistic conventions when composing narrative texts. In its implementation, Angga provides explicit corrections, guided exercises, or structured writing tasks to help students identify and revise errors, particularly in past-tense forms, subject–verb agreement, and sentence construction, as follows:

> *"…….I use guided writing for corrective feedback in which focus on grammatical patterns. I focus on the use of the past tense and clarity of sentence structure because these are the main characteristics of narrative texts." (A-RJ-SA-GW)*
> *"I was always guided by my teacher; I experienced guided writing opportunity not only for corrections but also exercises especially on the grammar and sentence accuracy in narrative writing" (L-RJ-SA-GW)*

Angga and his student, Elsa, further explained that guided writing can strengthen students' grammatical accuracy and provide clear guidance for narrative writing, as stated:

> *"Guided writing supports the accuracy of students' narrative writing because it is provided immediately during the writing process. Students can correct errors such as the use of past tense or sentence structure. Also, it helps students through a more in-depth revision process because students have time to reread the teacher's comments, understand the mistakes, and correct them more thoroughly." (A-I-SA-GW)*
> *"Firstly, guided writing was the one that could enhance the accuracy of my narrative writing by providing immediate assistance and feedback throughout the writing process" (E-I-SA-GW)*

Drafting and Revising as Process Approach

In second language writing, the role of process approach is a series of cognitive processes that students must experience in writing instruction. Angga highlighted that Drafting and revising as a process approach emphasizes the continuous development of students' narrative writing through successive stages of composing, receiving corrective feedback, and refining their texts. In its implementation, he provides feedback on grammatical accuracy, sentence organization, and narrative coherence, enabling students to identify weaknesses, reconsider their writing choices, and make meaningful revisions, as written:

> *"During the drafting stage, I provide corrective feedback on basic errors, such as the use of the past tense and sentence structure. During the revising stage, I provide more detailed and targeted feedback." (A-RJ-PA-DR)*
> *"On my narrative writing process, my teacher was intended to always give feedback during drafting and revising process…." (R-RJ-PA-DR)*

Angga and his student, Rafa, further emphasized that drafting and revising as process approach promotes students' writing development by positioning corrective

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Siti Hanna Sumedi & Fauzan Fawwaz Yusuf.

feedback as an ongoing learning process rather than merely a means of correcting errors, although its effectiveness depends on students' ability to interpret feedback and apply it independently during revision, as explained:

> *"Drafting helps students construct narrative writing because it is given during the writing process……revising helps students refine their story construction after the draft is complete." (A-I-PA-DR)*
> *"I experienced a lot of corrections during drafting and revising process. It was giving an ongoing improvement on my writing" (R-I-PA-DR)*

Teacher-Student Engagement as Post-process Approach

In second language writing, post-process approach emphasizes that writing is not just an individual cognitive activity; it is also a social practice influenced by cultural, institutional, and identity contexts. Angga discussed that the post-process approach was reflected in the interactive nature of corrective feedback, in which teacher–student engagement existed, reflected, and extended. Angga and his student narrative indicated that feedback created opportunities for students to ask questions, discuss corrections, and negotiate their understanding of linguistic errors, as follows:

> *"In post-process approach, corrective feedback can increase student engagement and interaction with me as a teacher. Students usually start asking questions about their mistakes, asking for further explanation, or confirming whether their revisions are correct. This creates two-way communication, not just a correction process." (A-RJ-PPA-TSE)*
> *"Since corrective feedback exist especially on the post-process of it, I experienced the engagement between I and my teacher become greater. It was so meaningful because I could get a lot of feedback not only during the process of writing but also beyond it" (E-RJ-PPA-TSE)*

Angga and his student, Layla, also added that teacher-student engagement as post-process approach not only strengthen students' engagement but also, critical reflection, and ownership of their narrative writing:

> *"In addition, the way corrective feedback implemented it led to the teacher-student engagement that recognized as post-process approach to increase students' engagement, critical reflective doing, and their narrative writing skill." (A-I-PPA-TSE)*
> *"The implementation of corrective feedback on the post-process got me realized to enhance my critical and reflective thinking because off the greater engagement between my teacher and I."(L-I-PPA-TSE)*

Students' Responses to The Implementation of Corrective Feedback in Narrative Text Writing

Rafa, Elsa, Omar, and Layla as students' narratives showed that corrective feedback was not experienced in one uniform way. Their responses included how they perceived the feedback, and how they experienced it emotionally, as comprehensively discussed below:

Corrective Feedback Supporting Students' Narrative Text Writing

The students experienced corrective feedback supports their narrative text writing by helping them identify linguistic errors, improve grammatical accuracy, and organize story elements into coherent and meaningful narratives, as written by Rafa and Layla:

> *"In my experience, corrective feedback helps me more when revising my narrative text. When the teacher shows the correct answer or explains it clearly, I can understand my mistakes and fix them faster." (R-RJ-P-SS)*
> *"I perceive that corrective feedback is totally supporting my writing in narrative text. It helps me to know my mistakes on grammar and structure also to guide me to be better writing so I could write meaningful narrative story like fable or legend" (L-RJ-P-SS)*

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Siti Hanna Sumedi & Fauzan Fawwaz Yusuf.

Furthermore, Elsa and Omar emphasized during interview that corrective feedback through explicit corrections, guiding questions, and opportunities for revision, the teacher enables her and friends to recognize weaknesses in their writing and develop greater awareness of how language choices influence narrative clarity and effectiveness:

> *"Corrective feedback is extremely helpful. When I revise my writing, I need a clear explanation, so corrective feedback is existing to help me and my friends recognized our weakness in writing. If so, I would definitely could improve my writing including the way I choose appropriate vocabulary" (E-I-P-SS)*
> *"…. corrective feedback is helpful for example there are guiding questions and time for revision for correcting writing mistakes especially in the grammar, structure, and vocabulary delivered by my teacher so I perceive it as the points that support my narrative writing" (O-I-P-SS)*

Corrective Feedback Reinforcing Students' Confidence in Narrative Text Writing

The students experienced that Corrective feedback can reinforce students' confidence in narrative text writing by helping them recognize their errors as opportunities for learning rather than indicators of failure, as penned by Omar and Rafa:

> *"When I get feedback, I feel more confident to my writing because I read the teacher's comments and think about how to improve it because I could take it as an opportunity to help me recognizing my writing errors. So, I feel more confident when I revise my narrative text." (O-RJ-E-SC)*
> *"I think there is a big change in my confidence because after getting feedback, I understand my mistakes better. I can also ask the teacher, so I feel more confident, and my writing becomes better." (R-RJ-E-SC)*

Similarly, Layla and Elsa explained that corrective feedback through constructive guidance, clear explanations, and encouragement during the revision process, the teacher creates a supportive learning environment in which students feel more comfortable expressing ideas and improving their writing:

> *"Emotionally, corrective feedback helps me more confident when revising my narrative text. When the teacher shows the correct answer or explains it clearly, I can understand my mistakes and fix them faster." (L-I-E-SC)*
> *"The corrective feedback implemented by teacher makes me more emotionally connected to my writing because I don't just write and finish it, I read the comments and try to make it better, so I feel more confident in my narrative writing story." (E-I-E-SC)*

In this discussion section, the findings of first research question explored that the teacher implemented corrective feedback through modes of delivery, levels of explicitness, and focuses of improvement. According to Sheen (2011), modes of delivery refer to give feedback delivered through two primary modes: synchronous or asynchronous responses or even both. In the practices, the teacher used both synchronous and asynchronous corrective feedback, with asynchronous feedback used more frequently. This finding is supported by Fu & Li (2022), who examined corrective feedback delivered through different modes and highlighted differences in how learners engage with feedback. The present finding therefore suggests that synchronous and asynchronous corrective feedback served complementary functions rather than indicating that one mode was universally more useful. Then, it was further discovered that
teacher showed that moderate level of explicitness. In accordance with Sheen (2011) theory, level of explicitness referes to feedback that can be delivered in two ways: implicitly or explicitly and its intentiveness. In the practices, the teacher also adjusted the level of explicitness according to students' abilities and the type of error. Explicit corrective feedback was used when students needed clear explanations and corrections, while implicit corrective feedback was used through indications or hints to encourage students to identify errors independently. The students generally confirmed this practice and described these feedbacks easier to understand.

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Siti Hanna Sumedi & Fauzan Fawwaz Yusuf.

This finding is supported by Lira-Gonzales et al. (2024), who discussed differences in the effects of explicit and implicit corrective feedback on learners' language knowledge. In the present study, the usefulness of corrective feedback depended not only on the form of feedback provided but also on students' ability to understand and respond to it. Next, focus of improvement refers to whether feedback targets one or several specific linguistic features (or addresses various types of errors at once (unfocused or comprehensive corrective feedback) (Sheen, 2011). In the practices, the teacher primarily focused corrective feedback on grammar and sentence structure, particularly the use of past tense in narrative writing. The students' narratives were consistent with the teacher's practices, as they frequently mentioned grammar, tense, and sentence construction as the main areas corrected by the teacher. This indicates that the teacher generally focused feedback on relevant linguistic aspects while maintaining flexibility according to students' needs and the stage of writing. This finding is related to Gonzales et al. (2024), who emphasize the importance of considering the focus and amount of corrective feedback according to learners' needs. Therefore, the findings show that the teacher's corrective feedback was focused yet adaptable.

Corrective feedback was also integrated into the structural, process, and post-process approach of second language writing. In this study, the teacher's corrective feedback practices (mode of delivery, level of explicitness, and focus of improvement) were systematically connected to three roles of corrective feedback in second language writing: structural approach, process approach, and post-process approach. The relationship among corrective practices and roles highlights that corrective feedback was not merely a technique for writing error correction but a comprehensive pedagogical approach to developing students' writing accuracy, quality, autonomy, and awareness of the writing process. In second language writing, the role of structural approach emerged in the early stages of writing instruction to emphasize kind of strategy along with corrective feedback (Sheen, 2011). In the practices, the teacher stressed that guided writing as a structural approach to corrective feedback. It emphasizes to develop students' awareness of grammatical accuracy, particularly past tense and sentence construction. Students described noticing errors, correcting recurring mistakes, and becoming more careful with grammar after receiving feedback. This finding is consistent with Suharyanti & Fauziati (2020), who found that written corrective feedback junior high school context commonly addressed grammatical errors and emphasized the importance of clear correction. Therefore, the finding reflects students' reported awareness and perceived improvement rather than a causal effect of corrective feedback. Then, the role of process approach is a series of cognitive processes that students must experience in writing instruction in second language writing (Sheen, 2011). In the practice, the teacher highlighted that Drafting and revising as a process approach emphasizes the continuous development of students' narrative writing through successive stages of composing, receiving corrective feedback, and refining their texts. This shows that corrective feedback was not limited to evaluating completed texts but was part of the students' writing process. This finding is supported by Karim & Nassaji (2020), whose study examined the role of corrective feedback in revision and transfer, and by Berg (2023), who highlighted the importance of student engagement and follow-up in written corrective feedback. In the present study, students' responses indicate that they actively used corrective feedback while developing and revising their narrative texts, although the study does not establish long-term changes in writing performance. Lastly, the role of post-process approach in second language writing emphasizes writing is not just an individual cognitive activity meaning it is connected to interation (Sheen, 2011). In the practices, the teacher discussed the post-process approach was reflected in teacher–student engagement. The teacher described greater and better engagement in students' attentiveness for asking questions, requesting explanations, and confirming their revisions. The students similarly described feeling more involved, connected to their writing, confident, and interested in improving their stories. These experiences show that corrective feedback functioned not only as correction of language forms but also as an opportunity for interaction around the writing task. This finding is supported by Syakira & Nur (2022), who emphasized the importance of students' perceptions and responses to corrective feedback. It is also related to Rahman & Singh (2023), who highlighted the value

OPEN ACCESS
© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Siti Hanna Sumedi & Fauzan Fawwaz Yusuf.

of considering both teacher practices and learner experiences when examining corrective feedback.

The second research question focused on students' responses to the use of corrective feedback in narrative text writing. Overall, the students perceived corrective feedback is helpful for understanding errors and supporting their narrative writing. They responded by reading comments, identifying errors, correcting and revising their narrative writing. They also reported benefits related to grammatical accuracy, awareness of errors, reducing repeated mistakes, and improving clarity and organization. These responses correspond with the teacher's practices that corrective feedback supported students' narrative writing and are also related to Mao et al. (2024), who emphasized learner responses and experiences as important aspects of written corrective feedback. Nevertheless, the students did not experience corrective feedback in exactly the same way. Their preferences differed regarding synchronous and asynchronous corrective feedback, as well as explicit and implicit feedback. Explicit feedback was generally perceived as clearer, while implicit feedback could encourage independent thinking but could also create uncertainty when students could not interpret the teachers feedbacks. The students also differed in the stage at which feedback was most meaningful. Rather, they show that the teacher implemented feedback as an ongoing part of writing, while students interpreted and used the feedback according to their individual experiences and needs.

CONCLUSIONS

This study highlights the implementation of corrective feedback in teachers' practices and its pedagogical roles in students' narrative writing. The findings emphasize the importance of aligning feedback strategies with students' learning needs by balancing explicit guidance, linguistic accuracy, and learner autonomy. Clear and constructive feedback, supported by opportunities for independent reflection and revision, enables students to understand and apply corrections throughout the writing process. Corrective feedback is therefore a contextual and interactive process shaped by students' learning experiences. For EFL teachers, selecting appropriate feedback strategies, explaining corrections clearly, and encouraging active student engagement are essential. However, the findings should be interpreted considering the study's small sample size and single research context, which limit transferability. Future research should involve more diverse participants, educational settings, and proficiency levels. Further investigations could compare different corrective feedback strategies, examine students' responses, and analyze successive narrative drafts to explore changes in writing quality and development. Such studies may provide a broader understanding of corrective feedback across different educational contexts.

DECLARATIONS

Author Contributions: The authors contributed to the development of the manuscript. The first author was responsible for the Introduction, Method, Results, and Discussion sections, including data collection, data analysis, and manuscript preparation. The second author contributed to reviewing, editing, and providing academic guidance throughout the research and manuscript development process.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding: This research was independently funded by the authors (self-funded).

Ethical Approval: This study was conducted in accordance with the applicable research ethics guidelines and regulations of the author's institution. Ethical considerations and research procedures were carried out in compliance with institutional requirements.

Use of Generative AI: ChatGPT was used to assist the authors in developing and refining some paragraphs of the manuscript. The authors reviewed, revised, and verified the generated content and take full responsibility for the final content of the article.

REFERENCES

Barkhuizen, G., Benson, P., & Chik, A. (2017). Na*rrative inquiry in language teaching and learning*

OPEN ACCESS

© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright (c) 2026 Siti Hanna Sumedi & Fauzan Fawwaz Yusuf.

research. Routledge.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. SAGE Publications https://doi.org/10.53841/bpsptr.2022.28.1.64

Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing, 25*(8), 652–661. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). Research met*hods in education (6th ed.*). Routledge.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications*.

Elfiyanto, S., & Fukazawa, S. (2020). Effect of teacher and peer written corrective feedback on writing components in EFL classrooms. JE*ES (Journal of English Educators Society), 5*(2), 185–191. https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v5i2.826

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher develo*pment. L2* Journal, 1(1), 3–18. https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054

Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 181–201. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990490

Fu, M., & Li, S. (2022). The effects of immediate and delayed corrective feedback on L2 development. St*udies in Second Language Acquisition,* 44*(*1), 2–34. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263120000388

Galletta, A. (2013). *Mastering the semi-structured interview and beyond*. New York University Press.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2012). Educat*ional research: Competencies for analysis and applications. Pearson*.

Hyland, K. (2003). Second language writi*ng. Cambridge Universi*ty Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108693974

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

Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2020). The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing. L*anguage Teaching Research,* 24*(*4), 519–539. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818802469

Lira-Gonzales, M.-L., Nassaji, H., De Tejeda, M. L., Vasquez, D., & Saenz, K. (2024). The differential effect of oral and written corrective feedback on learners' explicit versus implicit knowledge. L*anguage Teaching Research.* https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688241248440

Mao, Z., Lee, I., & Li, S. (2024). Written corrective feedback in second language writing: A synthesis of naturalistic classroom studies. *Language Teaching*, *57*(4), 449–477. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000393

Rahman, M. M., & Singh, M. K. M. (2023). The relationship between oral corrective feedback beliefs, practices, and influence of prior language learning experience of EFL teachers: Multiple case studies. Education Rese*arch International, 2023, Article 6681*434. https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/6681434

Sheen, Y. (2011*). Corrective feedback, individual differences and second la*nguage learning. Springer.

Shen, B., & Chong, S. W. (2023*). Teacher written corrective feedback and learner engagement in EFL writing*.

Suharyanti, E. M., & Fauziati, E. (2020). Written corrective feedback on EFL students at an Islamic junior high school. JO*ALL (journal of applied linguistics and literature),* 5(2), 161–173. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v5i2.11207

Syakira, S., & Nur, S. (2022). Learners' perceptions on the use of oral corrective feedback in one-to-one EFL classroom. Er*alingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing dan Sastra,* 6(2), 286. https://doi.org/10.26858/eralingua.v6i2.26177

OPEN ACCESS

© 2021 The Author.This article is licensed CC BY SA 4.0.
visit Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.