IDEAS

Journal on Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

Volume 14, Number 2, December 2026
pp. 9553 - 9573

Copyright © 2026 The Author
IDEAS is licensed under CC-BY-SA 4.0 License



Issued by English study program of UIN Palopo

AI-Assisted Speaking Feedback through Speechace.com: Teacher Mediation and Learner Experiences in an Indonesian EFL Context

Zulkifli Surahmat[1], Ahmad Risal Majid[2], Rasmah. N[3], MN. Jamalia[4], Abdul Arif[5]

[1,2,4] Institut Agama Islam Darud Da'wah wal Irsyad Sidenreng Rappang, Sulawesi Selatan
[3,4] Universitas Kaltara, Kalimantan Utara

Article Info

Received: 2026-04-07
Revised: 2026-05-19
Accepted: 2026-11-21

Keywords:
Speechace.com; automated speaking feedback; teacher mediation; learner experiences; qualitative case study; Indonesian EFL context

DOI:
10.24256/ideas. v14i2. 13016

Corresponding Author:
Zulkifli Surahmat
zulkiflisurahmat9@gmail.com
Institut Agama Islam Darud Da'wah wal Irsyad Sidenreng Rappang, Sulawesi Selatan

Abstract

Research on automated speaking feedback has given limited attention to how teachers mediate AI-generated feedback and how learners engage with it in Indonesian EFL classrooms. This study explored the implementation of Speechace.com, focusing on automated feedback, teacher mediation, and learners' perceived speaking development. A qualitative single-case study involved three English teachers and fifteen students in the Intensive English Program at MA Ma'had DDI Pangkajene, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. Data from semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and Speechace.com feedback reports were analyzed using hybrid inductive–deductive thematic analysis. The findings were organized into four interconnected themes: automated feedback as information for speaking practice, teacher mediation of feedback, perceived changes in pronunciation awareness and speaking confidence, and learners' perceptions of Speechace.com. These findings describe participants' experiences and classroom practices rather than objectively measured gains in speaking proficiency. The study highlights teacher mediation as central to connecting automated feedback with classroom instruction and suggests that Speechace.com can serve as a complementary resource for EFL speaking practice.

1. Introduction

Speaking instruction in English as a foreign language (EFL) requires opportunities to practice, receive feedback, and use that feedback in subsequent performance. The importance of speaking skills in English language learning cannot be overstated, as they play a crucial role in developing learners' communicative competence (O'.J & Zakirova.Z.Z, 2026). Speaking enables learners to express ideas, negotiate meaning, and participate in real-world communication. (Qudratova, 2026) emphasizes that speaking is a fundamental component of language learning because it connects learners' linguistic knowledge with practical language use . In addition, English speaking ability is not only essential for academic purposes but also supports learners' participation in professional and social contexts. Ratnaningsih (2024) highlights that English speaking activities can enhance learners' confidence, vocabulary development, pronunciation awareness, and their ability to use English appropriately in contextual communication. Therefore, developing learners' speaking abilities remains a central goal in English language education, particularly in preparing learners to communicate effectively in diverse contexts.

Providing such support is challenging because teachers must attend to pronunciation, fluency, linguistic accuracy, and the communicative demands of speaking tasks. Automated feedback can offer additional information between classroom interactions, but its instructional relevance depends on how teachers and learners interpret and use it. Teacher mediation is therefore central to understanding the classroom implementation of AI-assisted speaking tools, including Speechace.com.

The challenges of speaking assessment concern both the information available about performance and the actions that follow assessment. Teachers need to identify difficulties while maintaining opportunities for meaningful communication, yet individualized feedback can be difficult to sustain across a class. AI-assisted assessment offers a possible supplementary source of feedback, particularly for features that can be analyzed from recorded speech. However, automated pronunciation feedback should be distinguished from a comprehensive evaluation of speaking: information about pronunciation or fluency alone does not establish learners' ability to negotiate meaning or interact appropriately. The relevant pedagogical question is how this information is connected to the purposes of classroom speaking activities.

Research on SpeechAce illustrates the distinction between evaluating outcomes and understanding implementation. Vu et al. (2025) examined pronunciation competency through a mixed-method experimental design involving experimental and control groups. Such a design addresses questions about learning outcomes, whereas the present qualitative study examines classroom practices and participants' interpretations. Mustagis and Muljanto

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

(2026), using narrative inquiry, explored how high-achieving male undergraduates in an Indonesian EFL context perceived and used SpeechAce feedback in pronunciation practice. Their focus establishes that learner experience has already received research attention. Taken together, these studies motivate a more specific question about how teacher use of automated reports and learner engagement with feedback are connected within a shared instructional setting.

Traditional speaking assessment methods, such as oral examinations and face-to-face interviews, often require considerable time and teacher effort, particularly in large classrooms. These approaches may also provide limited opportunities for individualized feedback and continuous assessment. Cancino (2025) argues that traditional speaking assessments can be constrained by issues of scalability, reliability, and consistency, as teachers may experience difficulties in evaluating multiple aspects of speaking performance, including pronunciation, fluency, accuracy, and interaction. Consequently, learners may not receive timely feedback that can support their continuous speaking development. Recent advances in artificial intelligence (AI) have created new possibilities for technology-enhanced language learning by providing learners with more personalized and accessible learning support. In language education contexts, AI-based applications have been increasingly utilized to facilitate learning processes, including providing contextualized materials, automated support, and opportunities for independent learning (Surahmat et al.2026). Recent advances in artificial intelligence (AI) have created new possibilities for technology-enhanced language learning by providing personalized feedback, adaptive learning support, and opportunities for autonomous practice (Idul et al., 2026; Kamal, 2026) . AI-based language learning systems can facilitate personalized learning by adapting feedback according to learners' performance and learning needs (Derakhshan et al., 2026) . These developments indicate that AI technology has the potential to complement traditional language instruction by expanding learners' access to digital learning resources.

The advancement of educational technology has introduced new possibilities for addressing these challenges through automated speaking assessment and feedback systems. Digital platforms equipped with artificial intelligence (AI) technologies, such as Speechace.com, provide automated evaluation of various speaking components, including pronunciation, fluency, articulation, and intonation. Such platforms enable learners to receive immediate feedback and allow teachers to obtain additional information regarding students' speaking performance. Previous studies have indicated that technology-supported feedback can facilitate language learning by promoting self-directed practice, learner autonomy, and more personalized learning experiences (Xing, 2025). In addition, automated assessment tools have the potential to complement

teacher assessment by providing continuous feedback that may be difficult to achieve through conventional classroom practices.

Speechace.com represents one example of an AI-based platform designed to support speaking development through automated analysis and feedback. AI-based pronunciation assessment systems have increasingly been explored as tools for supporting learners' pronunciation awareness and speaking practice (Avrianti et al., 2026) . Automated pronunciation assessment has been shown to provide learners with opportunities for repeated practice and immediate corrective feedback (Saplagio, 2026) .The platform provides learners with opportunities to practice speaking repeatedly while receiving information regarding pronunciation accuracy, fluency, and other aspects of oral performance. Previous research has shown that Speechace.com can support learners' speaking practice and encourage positive perceptions toward technology-based language learning (Vu et al., 2025). However, the successful implementation of automated feedback systems depends not only on technological capabilities but also on how teachers and learners interact with and integrate these tools into classroom practices.

In this study, teacher mediation refers to teachers' interpretation of Speechace.com feedback reports, explanation of learners' speaking difficulties, and integration of feedback into follow-up practice. Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) provides a conceptual lens for understanding these actions through the interaction among technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). Technological knowledge concerns understanding the platform's feedback and its limitations; content knowledge concerns the speaking features addressed; and pedagogical knowledge concerns selecting explanations and practice activities appropriate to learners' needs. TPACK therefore helps frame how teachers connect automated information with speaking instruction. It is used as an interpretive lens rather than as a measured construct, and the study does not assess teachers' TPACK competence.

Formative assessment further clarifies the distinction between generating feedback and using it pedagogically. Black and Wiliam (2009) link formative assessment to interpreting evidence of learning and using it to inform subsequent instructional decisions. From this perspective, an automated score or error indication is a source of information; its formative role depends on how teachers or learners use it to plan explanation, correction, or further practice. In this study, attention therefore falls on the connection between platform feedback, teachers' instructional responses, and learners' subsequent engagement. This perspective does not assume that automated feedback is inherently formative or that its availability demonstrates learning gains.

The gap addressed here lies at the intersection of these issues. The SpeechAce studies discussed above examine pronunciation outcomes and learner accounts, while research on digital feedback demonstrates that application

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

affordances and teacher practices can differ. These contributions do not fully explain how Speechace.com reports are interpreted by teachers, incorporated into follow-up speaking activities, and experienced by learners within the same Indonesian EFL school program. The present study addresses this contextual and relational gap through a qualitative single case at MA Ma'had DDI Pangkajene. Its central problem concerns the interaction among automated feedback, teacher mediation, and learner experience during implementation, rather than the experimental effectiveness of the platform.

Accordingly, the study is guided by three research questions:

1. What automated speaking feedback does Speechace.com provide in the program, and how do teachers interpret and integrate it into speaking instruction?

2. How do learners engage with automated feedback and teacher guidance during speaking practice, and what changes in pronunciation awareness and speaking confidence do they perceive?

3. How do learners perceive the usefulness and limitations of Speechace.com within this teacher-supported EFL program?

By combining teacher and student interviews, classroom observations, and feedback reports, the study offers a contextual account of how automated speaking feedback is connected to instructional action and learner engagement. Its specific contribution is to make teacher mediation visible between platform-generated information and learners' experiences of speaking practice. The resulting insights concern implementation and perceived development within one case; they do not establish causal effects on speaking proficiency.

2. Method

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative single-case study design to explore the implementation of Speechace.com and the interaction among automated feedback, teacher mediation, and learner experiences. A qualitative case study was appropriate for examining instructional practices and participants' perspectives within their real-world context (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The case was bounded by the use of Speechace.com in the Intensive English Program at MA Ma'had DDI Pangkajene during the first semester of the 2026/2027 academic year, with data collected from July to September 2026.

The study focused on how teachers and students interpreted and used automated feedback during speaking activities. It was not designed to establish the causal effectiveness of Speechace.com or to measure gains through pre- and post-testing. Accordingly, references to speaking development concern participants' perceived changes and observed classroom practices rather than objectively established improvements in speaking proficiency.

Research Setting

The study was conducted at one institution, MA Ma'had DDI Pangkajene, Sidenreng Rappang, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. The Intensive English Program was the instructional context within this institution, not a separate research site. The institution was purposively selected because Speechace.com had been incorporated into speaking activities for approximately one academic semester.

Speechace.com was used as a supplementary resource for pronunciation exercises, repeated speaking practice, and self-monitoring. Teachers reviewed platform feedback, identified areas requiring further attention, and provided additional classroom guidance. The study describes this setting as an English as a foreign language (EFL) context.

Participants and Sampling

Participants were selected through purposive sampling based on their direct involvement in the implementation of Speechace.com. The study included three English teachers and fifteen students enrolled in the Intensive English Program at MA Ma'had DDI Pangkajene during the first semester of the 2026/2027 academic year.

The teacher participants were certified English language teachers with three to five years of teaching experience. They had used Speechace.com in their instruction for at least one academic semester. Their experience with AI-assisted language learning included using Speechace.com to review automated speaking feedback, identify pronunciation difficulties, and provide follow-up classroom guidance.

The student participants were in Grade XI, the second year of Madrasah Aliyah, and ranged in age from 15 to 17 years. Their experience with AI-assisted language learning included using Speechace.com for pronunciation exercises, repeated speaking practice, and reviewing automated feedback. The study focused on their experiences with the platform rather than assigning them a standardized English proficiency classification.

Student selection required enrollment in the Intensive English Program and direct experience completing speaking activities using Speechace.com. For this study, active engagement concerned participation in platform-based speaking tasks, review of automated feedback, and subsequent speaking practice during the July–September 2026 data-collection period. The fifteen students were purposively selected from program participants with relevant experience of these activities so that they could describe how they used the feedback and experienced teacher guidance. Participant characteristics are reported in aggregate to protect anonymity.

Instructional Procedure

Speechace.com was used as a supplementary resource in the Intensive English Program during the first semester of the 2026/2027 academic year, with

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

data collected from July to September 2026. Its use involved pronunciation exercises, repeated speaking practice, and preparation for classroom oral performance. Students also reported practicing independently outside classroom activities. The available evidence describes these practices without establishing a fixed frequency or duration of platform use.

Teachers incorporated Speechace.com into speaking activities and provided guidance on students' speaking difficulties. Students completed oral tasks through the platform and received automated feedback. The feedback reports examined in this study contained pronunciation information, accuracy scores, and indications of areas requiring further practice. These reports served as supplementary information for classroom instruction rather than as independent measures of overall speaking proficiency.

Teachers reviewed the reports to identify pronunciation difficulties, interpreted the automated feedback, and incorporated relevant points into classroom explanations and follow-up activities. Students reported using the feedback to identify aspects requiring attention, repeat speaking practice, and revise their performance before completing classroom tasks or presentations. The instructional process therefore connected speaking practice, automated feedback, teacher guidance, and further practice. This description reflects the classroom practices reported and observed in the study rather than a standardized experimental intervention imposed by the researchers.

Data Collection Techniques

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and analysis of Speechace.com feedback reports. These sources provided complementary evidence about participants' reported experiences, classroom practices, and the feedback available to teachers and students.

Data collection was conducted by the research team as external researchers visiting MA Ma'had DDI Pangkajene. The researchers were not members of the institution's teaching staff and did not hold teaching or supervisory roles over the participants. Their role was to examine the implementation of Speechace.com and document teachers' and students' experiences. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained before data collection.

Semi-Structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews explored teachers' and students' experiences of Speechace.com, including platform usability, automated feedback, teacher guidance, learner engagement, and perceived changes in speaking practice. These areas corresponded to the study's focus on the interaction among automated feedback, teacher mediation, and learner experiences.

Interviews involved the three English teachers and fifteen student participants in the Intensive English Program at MA Ma'had DDI Pangkajene. They

were conducted in Indonesian during the July–September 2026 data-collection period to allow participants to express their experiences comfortably. Teacher interviews addressed the interpretation of automated feedback and its integration into classroom instruction. Student interviews addressed their experiences of using the platform, responding to feedback, receiving teacher guidance, and practicing speaking.

The interview material was transcribed and translated into English for analysis. Interpretation focused on participants' experiences and perceived changes in speaking practice rather than treating their accounts as evidence of objectively measured improvement.

Classroom Observations

Classroom observations examined how Speechace.com was integrated into speaking instruction in the Intensive English Program at MA Ma'had DDI Pangkajene during July–September 2026, within the first semester of the 2026/2027 academic year.

The research team attended the institution as external researchers. Observations focused on teacher facilitation, students' interaction with Speechace.com, classroom engagement, and the ways automated feedback was incorporated into speaking activities.

Particular attention was given to how teachers interpreted feedback reports, explained speaking difficulties, and connected feedback with follow-up practice. Observations also examined how students responded to feedback during speaking activities. The observation evidence was considered alongside interview accounts and Speechace.com reports to contextualize participants' experiences and examine the relationship between reported practices and classroom implementation.

Document Analysis

Document analysis examined Speechace.com feedback reports associated with speaking activities in the Intensive English Program at MA Ma'had DDI Pangkajene during the July–September 2026 data-collection period. These documents complemented teacher and student interviews and classroom observations by providing information about the automated feedback available during speaking practice.

The reports contained information about pronunciation performance, accuracy scores, and areas requiring further practice. Analysis focused on these elements and their relationship to participants' accounts of feedback use, teacher guidance, and observed classroom practices. The documents provided contextual evidence for examining how automated feedback was incorporated into speaking instruction.

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

Numerical scores served as contextual information supporting qualitative interpretation rather than as independent evidence of gains in speaking proficiency. Their role was to contextualize interview and observation findings, not to establish pre- and post-test improvement or the causal effectiveness of Speechace.com.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using hybrid inductive–deductive thematic analysis, informed by Braun and Clarke (2006). The analysis involved familiarization, initial coding, categorization, theme development, and review. Deductive coding reflected the research focus, while inductive coding enabled additional patterns to be identified from interview accounts, classroom observations, and Speechace.com feedback reports.

The deductive framework comprised four domains.

1. Automated feedback concerned information supplied by Speechace.com, including pronunciation feedback, accuracy scores, and areas requiring further practice.
2. Teacher mediation concerned teachers' interpretation of feedback and its integration into explanations, correction, and follow-up activities.
3. Perceived speaking development concerned participants' accounts of changes in pronunciation awareness, confidence, and speaking practice.
4. Learner perceptions concerned participants' views of the platform's usefulness, accessibility, usability, and limitations. These domains provided an initial analytical structure rather than predetermined final themes.

First, the researchers repeatedly read interview transcripts, observation records, and feedback reports to become familiar with the material. Second, relevant passages were assigned initial codes reflecting the deductive domains and patterns identified inductively within the data. Coding distinguished the feedback provided by the platform, teachers' instructional responses, and learners' experiences of using feedback. Third, related codes were compared and organized into broader categories. These categories were examined to develop themes addressing the research questions. The developing themes were reviewed against interview, observation, and documentary evidence to assess their coherence and evidential support. Comparisons across sources informed the interpretation of participants' accounts within the classroom context.

Peer discussions supported the review and refinement of interpretations, while the audit trail documented the analytical process. The final themes represented patterns across the qualitative material rather than numerical changes in platform scores. Accordingly, participants' descriptions of greater awareness or confidence were interpreted as perceived development, not as independently

measured gains in speaking proficiency.

Table 1 illustrates the relationship between interview excerpts, initial codes, categories, and the themes presented in the Results. The excerpts concern teachers' use of feedback, students' repeated practice, and perceived speaking confidence.

Table 1. Examples of Coding and Theme Development

Data excerpt and source	Initial code	Category	Theme
Teacher interview: "Speechace.com has helped me identify exact pronunciation errors that I might have missed in a typical classroom setting."	Identifying pronunciation difficulties through automated feedback	Teacher use of diagnostic information	Automated Feedback as Information for Speaking Practice
Student interview: "I can practice as many times as I want, and the system tells me exactly what to work on."	Using feedback to direct repeated practice	Feedback-directed practice	Automated Feedback as Information for Speaking Practice
Student interview: "Now I feel more comfortable speaking English since I can practice a lot before the actual class presentation."	Reporting greater comfort after rehearsal	Perceived speaking confidence	Perceived Changes in Pronunciation Awareness and Speaking Confidence

3. Result

The findings are presented in four interconnected themes: (1) Automated Feedback as Information for Speaking Practice, (2) Teacher Mediation of Automated Feedback, (3) Perceived Changes in Pronunciation Awareness and Speaking Confidence, and (4) Learners' Perceptions of Speechace.com. This presentation distinguishes the feedback provided by the platform, teachers' instructional responses, and learners' reported experiences. Figure 1 summarizes the themes and the evidence described in the study.

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)



Figure 1. Themes in Automated Feedback

1. Automated Feedback as Information for Speaking Practice

Speechace.com was used as a supplementary source of information about students' speaking performance. The feedback reports described in the document analysis contained pronunciation information, accuracy scores, and areas requiring further practice. These report contents indicated the feedback available to participants; they did not independently establish improvement in speaking proficiency.

Teachers reported that the platform helped them identify pronunciation difficulties that could be overlooked during ordinary classroom activities. One teacher explained:

"*Speechace.com has helped me identify exact pronunciation errors that I might have missed in a typical classroom setting*."

This quotation reflects the teacher's perception of the feedback's diagnostic usefulness. It does not establish that the automated identification of errors was independently validated.

Students also described using feedback to identify aspects of their speaking that required attention. One student stated:

"*I can practice as many times as I want, and the system tells me exactly what to work on*."

Teacher and student accounts therefore described complementary uses of automated feedback: teachers used it to identify difficulties, while students used it to direct further practice. The report contents provided contextual support for the availability of pronunciation-related feedback.

2. Teacher Mediation of Automated Feedback

Teacher mediation was evident in the interpretation of platform reports and their incorporation into classroom instruction. Teachers reported using automated feedback to identify speaking difficulties and determine areas requiring additional explanation or practice.

Classroom observations provided a complementary account of these practices. The observation findings described teachers reviewing feedback reports and incorporating relevant information into classroom discussions and follow-up activities. Automated feedback was therefore used alongside teacher explanation rather than serving as the sole basis for instructional responses.

The interview and observation evidence converged on teachers' continuing involvement after feedback had been generated. Teacher accounts described the instructional purposes of using the reports, while observations described their use during classroom activities. This convergence supports the finding that teachers mediated the classroom use of automated feedback. It does not, by itself, demonstrate that their interpretations were always accurate or that mediation produced measurable proficiency gains.

3. Perceived Changes in Pronunciation Awareness and Speaking Confidence

Teachers and students described perceived changes in pronunciation awareness and speaking practice. Teachers reported that students who experienced difficulty producing particular English sounds became more aware of these difficulties after receiving feedback. These statements represent teachers' accounts of changes they noticed, rather than independently assessed changes in pronunciation performance.

Students described using feedback to focus their practice and prepare before classroom speaking tasks. They also reported feeling more confident when they had opportunities to rehearse. One student stated: "*Now I feel more comfortable speaking English since I can practice a lot before the actual class presentation.*"

This account connects the student's perceived confidence with opportunities for preparation and repetition. Other student accounts described reduced hesitation when they could practice privately before classroom performance.

Teacher and student interviews thus provided different perspectives on perceived development. Teachers emphasized awareness of pronunciation difficulties, whereas students emphasized preparation, repeated practice, and comfort in speaking. These accounts support a finding of perceived changes in awareness and confidence. They do not establish objectively measured improvement in pronunciation, fluency, or overall speaking proficiency. The analysis also distinguished these perceptions from platform scores. Feedback reports were used to contextualize the information available during practice, not to demonstrate a pre- and post-test increase in speaking ability.

4. Learners' Perceptions of Speechace.com

Learners generally described Speechace.com positively, emphasizing

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

immediate feedback, accessibility, and opportunities for repeated practice. Students valued receiving information about their speaking without waiting for subsequent teacher evaluation. They reported using this information to identify areas requiring attention and prepare for classroom activities.

Students also described opportunities to practice beyond scheduled classroom time. These accounts indicate that learners perceived the platform as extending access to speaking practice. They do not establish how consistently all participants practiced independently or whether independent practice resulted in proficiency gains.

These perceptions occurred within a teacher-supported program. Classroom observations described teachers interpreting reports and organizing follow-up activities, while student interviews emphasized the opportunities available through the platform. Taken together, these sources situate learners' positive accounts within an instructional setting that combined automated feedback with teacher guidance.

The evidence presented in this section is predominantly positive. It should not be interpreted as demonstrating that all participants had uniformly positive experiences or that inaccurate feedback, technical problems, or other concerns were absent.

4. Discussion

This study examined how automated feedback, teacher mediation, and learner experiences interacted during the implementation of Speechace.com in an Indonesian EFL program. The findings provide stronger evidence of opportunities for feedback-directed practice and teacher-supported interpretation than of measurable speaking outcomes. The discussion follows the four Results themes and develops a provisional teacher–AI–learner feedback cycle to explain their relationship.

1. Automated Feedback as Information for Speaking Practice

Addressing the first research question, the findings indicate that Speechace.com provided information that teachers and students used to identify aspects of speaking requiring attention. Teachers described its usefulness for recognizing pronunciation difficulties, while students reported using feedback to direct repeated practice. These findings concern the availability and use of feedback rather than independent confirmation of the accuracy of every automated judgment.

A distinction is necessary between technological affordances and learning outcomes. Immediate feedback, accessibility, and opportunities to repeat a task are affordances that can make practice possible. Improved pronunciation, fluency, or communicative competence would constitute outcomes requiring appropriate

performance evidence. In this study, feedback reports contextualized participants' experiences; they were not analyzed as pre- and post-test measures of proficiency. Consequently, the findings support claims about feedback use and perceived development without demonstrating that Speechace.com caused improvement.

This distinction clarifies the study's relationship to Vu et al. (2025), who investigated SpeechAce using an experimental comparison and pre- and post-testing. The present study does not replicate that outcome evaluation. Instead, it adds a contextual account of how feedback entered classroom practice through teacher interpretation and learner responses. Its contribution lies in explaining aspects of implementation that outcome comparisons alone cannot describe.

The findings can also be interpreted through formative assessment. Black and Wiliam (2009) emphasize the use of learning evidence to inform subsequent instructional decisions. From this perspective, an automated report becomes a formative resource when its information informs explanation, further practice, or revision. The relevant contribution of Speechace.com in this case was therefore the information it made available for instructional action, rather than the production of a score alone.

2. Teacher Mediation of Automated Feedback

Teacher interviews indicated that automated feedback informed subsequent instruction by helping teachers identify speaking difficulties requiring further explanation and practice. Classroom observations complemented these accounts by documenting teachers' review of feedback reports and their incorporation into classroom discussions and follow-up activities. Students also reported using feedback to identify areas requiring attention and repeat speaking practice.

Together, these sources describe the relationship among automated feedback, teacher interpretation, and learner engagement. However, they do not trace a specific report through a single instructional episode and subsequent learner revision. The findings therefore support a contextual account of teacher-mediated feedback use rather than independently verified improvement in speaking proficiency.

The second theme further addresses the first research question by explaining how teachers connected automated feedback with speaking instruction. Teacher interviews and classroom observations described report interpretation, explanations of speaking difficulties, and follow-up activities. These actions matter because identifying a possible problem and deciding how to teach it are different instructional tasks. A report can direct attention to a pronunciation feature without explaining its linguistic basis or determining an appropriate response for a particular lesson.

Teachers contributed contextual interpretation by connecting report

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

information with the speaking activities students were undertaking. They also contributed linguistic explanation and decisions about subsequent practice. These findings locate mediation in the movement from feedback information to instructional response. However, the evidence does not establish whether teachers systematically prioritized errors, individualized every task, or provided specific forms of emotional support. Those possibilities should remain questions for further investigation rather than additional findings.

TPACK offers a useful interpretation of this relationship (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). Technological knowledge concerns teachers' engagement with the platform and its feedback reports. Content knowledge concerns understanding the pronunciation difficulties to which the reports refer. Pedagogical knowledge concerns explaining those difficulties and organizing opportunities for further practice. Their interaction becomes visible when a teacher uses report information about a speaking feature to select an explanation or follow-up activity. Merely accessing a report would not demonstrate the same integration.

This interpretation does not constitute an assessment of teachers' TPACK competence. The study did not measure the knowledge domains separately or establish that every instructional decision represented successful integration. Rather, TPACK helps explain why the reported classroom practices involved more than operating the technology. Muslu and Siegel (2024) similarly distinguished application affordances from teacher feedback practices in a science classroom. The present case brings that distinction into EFL speaking instruction: automated reports supplied information, while teachers connected that information with classroom explanation and practice. The contribution is a situated account of this connection, rather than a claim that teacher mediation is a newly discovered requirement of technology integration.

3. Perceived Changes in Pronunciation Awareness and Speaking Confidence

Addressing the second research question, teachers and students described perceived changes in awareness, preparation, and confidence. Teachers reported that students became more aware of pronunciation difficulties, whereas students emphasized opportunities to rehearse and feel more comfortable before classroom performance. These perspectives are related but should not be treated as interchangeable measures of improvement.

The student account linking comfort with practice suggests that rehearsal was meaningful to the learner's experience. It does not isolate whether that experience resulted from automated feedback, additional preparation time, teacher guidance, or their combination. Likewise, teachers' descriptions of increased awareness provide an instructional perspective without independently establishing changes in pronunciation accuracy.

The findings also require a cautious interpretation of learner autonomy.

Repeated practice outside scheduled activities demonstrates access to independent practice, but access alone does not establish autonomy. Learners' accounts of identifying areas for attention and directing further practice suggest elements of self-monitoring and feedback use. However, the study did not systematically document independent goal setting, selection among learning strategies, sustained regulation of practice, or evaluation of progress over time. The evidence therefore supports opportunities for self-directed engagement rather than a conclusion that learner autonomy increased.

Mustagis and Muljanto (2026) examined Indonesian undergraduates' experiences of using SpeechAce feedback in pronunciation practice. The present study adds teacher accounts and classroom observations to the examination of learner experience in a school program. This broader perspective situates students' reported practice within teacher-supported instruction and helps explain why independent engagement should not be interpreted as learning entirely without guidance.

4. Learners' Perceptions of Speechace.com

The third research question concerns learners' perceptions of the platform's usefulness and limitations. Positive accounts of immediate feedback, accessibility, and repeated practice suggest that students valued having information available when preparing for speaking tasks. These perceptions help explain the platform's place in their learning experience, but perceived usefulness is distinct from demonstrated instructional effectiveness.

Positive perceptions also require consideration of the implementation context. Students used Speechace.com within an organized program that included teacher guidance. Their accounts therefore concern this combination of resources and practices; they cannot establish how the same learners would experience the platform without instructional support.

The predominantly positive evidence does not demonstrate that inaccurate feedback, confusion, technical difficulties, or other concerns were absent. The current findings do not provide sufficient detail to evaluate those experiences. These issues remain boundaries of the account rather than negative findings that can be inferred from the technology's general limitations.

A further pedagogical concern is that learners may treat numerical scores as authoritative judgments of their overall speaking ability. This possibility was not established as an observed behavior in the present case. Nevertheless, it identifies an important responsibility for classroom implementation: teachers should explain what a score represents, consider it alongside the student's recording and task requirements, and distinguish automated judgments from comprehensive assessment. Such interpretation can help prevent practice from becoming focused exclusively on increasing a platform score.

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

Taken together, the themes suggest a provisional teacher–AI–learner feedback cycle. In this interpretation, AI generates feedback; the teacher interprets its instructional relevance; the learner practices or revises; the teacher provides further contextual guidance; and the learner monitors aspects requiring continued attention. A subsequent attempt can generate additional feedback and renew the process.

The conceptual contribution lies in distinguishing feedback generation from feedback interpretation, enactment, and review. The platform supplies information, teachers connect that information with instruction, and learners engage with it through practice. This account moves beyond describing technological features by showing how their use is situated within relationships among teachers, learners, and classroom tasks.

The cycle is an interpretive synthesis of the reported practices, not a validated model or an observed sequence followed identically in every lesson. In particular, the evidence for sustained learner monitoring is less developed than the evidence for repeated practice and teacher interpretation. Future research could examine the proposed connections through linked recordings, feedback reports, classroom observations, and learner reflections across successive tasks.

Teachers considering automated speaking feedback can begin by defining a specific speaking goal and explaining how platform feedback relates to that goal. After students complete a task, teachers can review selected feedback alongside the recordings, clarify relevant pronunciation difficulties, and identify a manageable focus for further practice. Asking learners to explain what they changed and why can make feedback use more visible than a score comparison alone.

Teachers can also invite students to report unclear feedback or disagreements between automated judgments and their own understanding. Such discussion allows feedback to be examined rather than accepted automatically. Follow-up activities should connect pronunciation practice with meaningful speaking tasks so that attention to individual features remains related to communication.

These recommendations are implications of the case, not procedures whose effectiveness was tested in this study. Their value should be examined in relation to learners' needs, classroom resources, and the feedback features available.

The findings are bounded by a single institutional context involving three teachers and fifteen students in one Intensive English Program. They provide contextual understanding rather than a basis for broad generalization. Selection of students with direct experience using Speechace.com may also leave less-engaged learners' perspectives insufficiently represented.

Although observations and reports complemented interviews, interpretations of awareness and confidence relied substantially on participant

accounts. The July–September 2026 data-collection period and limited implementation history do not establish whether reported practices or perceptions persisted over time. The absence of a comparison group and objective pre- and post-speaking measures prevents causal conclusions about proficiency development.

The study also did not independently validate automated judgments or systematically trace score changes across submissions. Its predominantly positive account provides limited understanding of unsuccessful feedback use, technical barriers, or dependence on scores. Future studies could examine these experiences, follow the proposed feedback cycle longitudinally, and combine qualitative evidence with independently assessed speaking performances.

5. Conclusion

This study explored the implementation of Speechace.com in supporting EFL learners' speaking practices through automated feedback, teacher mediation, and learner experiences. The findings indicate that Speechace.com functioned as a supportive tool for speaking evaluation by providing feedback on pronunciation, fluency, accuracy, and other speaking components. The platform also provided opportunities for repeated practice, self-monitoring, and independent learning, while teachers remained important in interpreting feedback and integrating it into classroom instruction.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the discussion of AI-assisted language learning by highlighting that the value of automated feedback is not determined solely by technological capabilities but by how technology interacts with pedagogical practices. The findings emphasize the importance of teacher-mediated AI integration, where automated feedback serves as a complementary resource that supports learner engagement and reflective speaking practice.

Practically, the findings suggest that English teachers may consider incorporating AI-based speaking tools as additional resources to support speaking instruction. However, effective implementation requires teachers to critically evaluate automated feedback and adapt it according to learners' needs and classroom contexts. This study is limited by its small number of participants and focus on specific Indonesian EFL settings; therefore, the findings should be interpreted as contextual insights rather than broadly generalizable conclusions. Future research may explore AI-assisted speaking tools through longitudinal or mixed-method approaches across diverse educational contexts to gain deeper understanding of their sustained contribution to language learning.

6. References

Akhter, E. (2025). *THE IMPACT OF HUMAN-MACHINE INTERACTION ON ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION AND FLUENCY: CASE STUDIES USING AI SPEECH ASSISTANTS*. *4*(2), 473–500. https://doi.org/10.63125/1wyj3p84

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

Al-Barakat, A. A., AlAli, R., Bataineh, R. F., Alotaibi, S. B., Alribdi, N. I., Abdullatif, A. K. A., & Bataineh, R. F. (2026). Digitizing ESP beyond chalk and talk in the English for tourism classroom. *Scientific Reports*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-026-55864-4

Avrianti, N., Yuliana, Y. G. S., & Ikhsanudin, I. (2026). AI-BASED PRONUNCIATION TRAINING TOOLS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW. *Journal of English Education Program*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.26418/jeep.v7i1.99864

Bani, M., & Masruddin, M. (2021). Development of Android-based harmonic oscillation pocket book for senior high school students. JOTSE: Journal of Technology and Science Education, 11(1), 93-103.

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

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

Butarbutar, R., Ruing, F. H., Basri, N., Tuharea, V. U., & Leba, S. M. R. (2023). Unpacking Online Collaborative Learning in Teaching EFL Speaking: Insights from Three Rural Area Case Studies. *The Qualitative Report*. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2023.6165

Cancino, P. A. (2025). Prospective Feedback to Improve Speaking and Affective Dimensions in Higher Education Students. *HOW*, *32*(1), 29–48. https://doi.org/10.19183/how.32.1.639

Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The Use of Triangulation in Qualitative Research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, *41*(5), 545–547. https://doi.org/10.1188/14.onf.545-547

Chai, R. (2026). Deep learning-based intelligent diagnosis and adaptive training system for university english oral proficiency. *Scientific Reports*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-026-51608-6

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Derakhshan, A., Lalli, G. S., & Park, Y. (2026). Unpacking EFL teachers' perceived opportunities and challenges of multimodal AI-driven language testing. *Language Testing in Asia*, *16*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-026-00445-5

Fathurrachman, S. (2026). Exploring the Use of AI-Based Speech Recognition Platforms to Support Elementary Students' Speaking Skills in Distance Learning. *Inspiring English Education Journal*, *9*(1), 153–169. https://doi.org/10.35905/inspiring.v9i1.16462

Furwana, D., Muin, F. R., Zainuddin, A. A., & Mulyani, A. G. (2024). Unlocking the Potential: Exploring the Impact of Online Assessment in English Language Teaching. IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning,

Linguistics and Literature, 12(1), 653-662.

Hue, B. T. H. (2024). Utilizing Communicative Activities to Teach Oral English Skills to Students at Tuyen Quang School for Excellence (TSE). *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*, *2*(4), 222–236. https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2024.2(4).19

Idul, M., Mujahidah, & Ramdani, A. (2026). Artificial Intelligence in English Language Learning: A Systematic Review of Applications, Benefits, and Challenges in EFL Classrooms. *Inspiring English Education Journal*, *9*(1), 188–211. https://doi.org/10.35905/inspiring.v9i1.16651

Kamal, G. (2026). From algorithm to classroom: artificial intelligence as cultural event in language education — a conceptual analysis through the digital humanities. *Frontiers in Education*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1876290

Khoiriyah, K., Sholahuddin, M. F. T., & Ananta, B. D. B. (2025). Educational Speaking Technology Tools in English Pronunciation. *LETS Journal of Linguistics and English Teaching Studies*, *7*(1), 69–85. https://doi.org/10.46870/lets.v7i1.1834

Khoirunnisa, N., Junyes, H. R., & Widarsono, A. (2026). The integration of hybrid audit models in modern auditing: A systematic review of audit effectiveness and efficiency across emerging and developed countries. *Journal of Contemporary Accounting*, 209–225. https://doi.org/10.20885/jca.vol8.iss2.art4

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record, 108*(6), 1017–1054. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x

Muslu, N., & Siegel, M. A. (2024). Feedback Through Digital Application Affordances and Teacher Practice. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, *33*(5), 729–745. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-024-10117-9

Mustagis, R. M. S. G., & Muljanto, S. (2026). Exploring students testimonials on Speechahe pronunciation assessment: A qualitative investigation using narrative inquiry. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, *13*(1), 23–51. https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v13i1.6482

Ofem, U. J., Orim, F. S., Edam-Agbor, I. B., Amanso, E. O. I., Eni, E., Ukatu, J. O., Ovat, S. V., Osang, A. W., Dien, C. A., & Abuo, C. B. (2025). Teachers' preparedness for the utilization of artificial intelligence in classroom assessment: the contributory effects of attitude toward technology, technological readiness, and pedagogical beliefs with perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness as mediators. *Frontiers in Education*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1568306

O'.J, Yuldosheva., & Zakirova.Z.Z. (2026). THE ROLE OF SPEAKING SKILLS IN LANGUAGE LEARNING. *Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research)*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18710142

Qudratova, S. (2026). THE ROLE OF COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING IN

ISSN 2338-4778 (Print)
ISSN 2548-4192 (Online)

DEVELOPING SPEAKING SKILLS OF EFL LEARNERS. *Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research)*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18346690

Ratnaningsih, P. W. (n.d.). *English speaking activities for raising entrepreneurship awareness: EFL students' view*. https://doi.org/10.22219/englie

Saplagio, M. A. (2026). The New Language Lab: Reshaping My Pronunciation Through the Lens of AI Technology. In *Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research)*. European Organization for Nuclear Research. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18896668

Sivasankar, A. (2026). Artificial Intelligence Tools in Blended Learning: A Systematic Study on Evidence, Challenges and New Teaching Approaches. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology (IJISRT)*, 1289. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun973

Surahmat, Z., Basri, M., & Halim, A. (n.d.). *Pemanfaatan Teknologi AI untuk Mendukung Pemahaman Membaca melalui Materi Autentik Kontekstual dalam Konteks Perguruan Tinggi Islam*.

Vu, N. N., Vo, T. T., & Tran, V. (2025). AI-Driven Pronunciation Assessment: The Impact of SpeechAce on EFL Learners' Pronunciation Competency. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal*, *26*(3), 84–106. https://doi.org/10.54855/callej.252635

Wagdi, O., & Hasaneen, A. (2026). Financial Reporting Challenges in Hybrid Systems and Platform-Based Accounting Disclosure: Evidence for Emerging Markets. *Qubahan Academic Journal*, *6*(3), 181–202. https://doi.org/10.48161/qaj.v6n3a2500

Xing, C. (2025). A Systematic Review on Artificial Intelligence (AI) Technologies in ESL/EFL Speaking Skills. *International Journal of TESOL Studies*. https://doi.org/10.58304/ijts.250908

Yan, H., & Singh, M. K. S. (2026). The impact of AI-mediated instruction on speaking proficiency, enjoyment, anxiety, and emotional engagement: a mixed-methods approach. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-026-06705-2

Zou, D., Xie, H., & Wang, F. L. (2018). Future trends and research issues of technology-enhanced language learning: A technological perspective. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning An International Journal*, 426–440. https://doi.org/10.34105/j.kmel.2018.10.026