

Arabic Speaking Class Student's Perception Towards Oral Corrective Feedback

¹Azwir*, ²Ahmad Arifin bin Sapar, ³Zulkhairi, ⁴Muhammad Yasir

Email : ¹azwirm.ali@ar-raniry.ac.id*, ²arifin@um.edu.my, ³zulkhairi.sofyan@ar-raniry.ac.id,
⁴yasiradnan446@gmail.com

^{1,3}Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh, Indonesia; ²University of Malaya, Malaysia;

⁴Ez-Zitouna University, Tunisia

ABSTRACT

This study investigated university students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback (OCF) in Arabic speaking classes at State Islamic University Ar-Raniry, Banda Aceh. Employing a qualitative approach, semi-structured interviews were conducted with twelve purposively selected students from a cohort of seventy enrolled in Arabic speaking courses at an Islamic higher education institution in Indonesia. Data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis framework. The findings revealed that students unanimously perceived OCF as essential for their Arabic speaking development. Explicit correction emerged as the most preferred feedback type, particularly among lower-achieving students, while high-achieving students favored clarification requests that promote self-repair. Students' affective responses were shaped primarily by the timing and manner of delivery, with post-performance and collective feedback strongly preferred over mid-performance correction, which triggered anxiety and embarrassment. OCF was perceived to improve phonological accuracy, morphosyntactic precision, self-monitoring capability, and speaking confidence. The study recommends that instructors diversify feedback strategies according to learners' proficiency levels and prioritize supportive, post-performance delivery to maximize pedagogical effectiveness.

Article history

Received 2026-03-09

Revised 2026-04-18

Accepted 2026-06-08

Keywords

Oral Corrective feedback; Arabic Speaking; Student Perceptions; Qualitative Research; Foreign Language Learning.

*Correspondence Author

This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Introduction

The acquisition of speaking proficiency in Arabic as a Foreign Language (AFL) presents considerable phonological, morphosyntactic, and lexical challenges for university-level learners that necessitate systematic instructional intervention. Oral corrective feedback (hereafter OCF) has emerged as a principal pedagogical mechanism through which instructors

signal linguistic inaccuracies in learners' spoken output (Lyster et al., 2013). Theoretically, OCF is grounded in Schmidt's (1990) Noticing Hypothesis, which posits that conscious attention to linguistic forms is prerequisite for acquisition, and in Long's (1996) Interaction Hypothesis, which emphasizes negotiation of meaning during communicative exchanges as a catalyst for interlanguage restructuring. From these perspectives, OCF functions as a developmental scaffold that propels interlanguage progression beyond its immediate corrective purpose.

Lyster and Ranta's (1997) seminal taxonomy identified six principal OCF categories: explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Subsequent meta-analyses have reinforced the facilitative role of OCF in language development. Li (2010) demonstrated that corrective feedback yields statistically significant positive effects on accuracy, while Lyster and Saito (2010) found that prompts generated comparatively greater gains than recasts. Brown (2016) confirmed that feedback effectiveness is modulated by the type of linguistic target addressed. More recently, Li and Vuono (2019) noted that oral feedback demands immediate cognitive processing during communicative interaction, introducing both opportunities and constraints for learners.

Scholarly opinion remains divided on the consequences of OCF. Advocates argue that without corrective intervention, erroneous patterns risk becoming fossilized (Han, 2004; Han, 2013), and that interactional feedback is indispensable for developing metalinguistic awareness (Nassaji, 2016). Conversely, excessive or poorly timed correction can engender foreign language anxiety, diminish willingness to communicate, and cultivate defensive dispositions (Rassaei, 2015a; Rassaei, 2015b; Tavakoli & Zarrinabadi, 2018). Hartono et al. (2022) documented that the manner and timing of feedback delivery significantly influence students' affective responses and subsequent oral performance.

An expanding body of research has investigated how learners perceive OCF. Zhang and Rahimi (2014) established that learners' beliefs about corrective feedback are intertwined with their anxiety levels. Roothoof and Breeze (2016) found misalignments between teachers' and students' attitudes toward OCF, while Zhu and Wang (2019) revealed that learner beliefs are shaped by proficiency level, prior experiences, and cultural norms. Ha and Nguyen (2021) demonstrated that discrepancies between correction practices and student preferences can compromise pedagogical effectiveness, and Papi et al. (2021) showed that language mindsets and achievement goals predict feedback preferences. Despite these insights, existing studies reveal three major patterns: the interplay of beliefs with anxiety and mindsets, misalignments in attitudes between teachers and learners, and the influence of proficiency, experiences, and goals on preferences.

Recent studies suggest that the understanding of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) dynamics has become increasingly nuanced, particularly in relation to how feedback timing interacts with learner readiness and task complexity (Fu & Li, 2022). A growing body of research indicates that explicit correction tends to yield more durable effects, especially for morphosyntactic targets (Zhao & Ellis, 2022). An emerging concern is the inconsistency between teachers' stated cognitions and their actual classroom practices, pointing to a gap between pedagogical beliefs and implementation (Nassaji et al., 2023). At the same time, affective dimensions have gained increasing attention, as delayed correction appears to reduce anxiety among certain groups of learners (Rassaei, 2023). From the learner perspective, OCF is generally perceived as beneficial; however, this perception is not uniform. In the Indonesian context, students tend to view OCF positively, although their preferences vary across proficiency levels, suggesting that perceptions are shaped by both individual differences and contextual factors (Muslem et al., 2021).

Despite extensive OCF research in ESL/EFL settings, corrective feedback dynamics in Arabic classrooms remain conspicuously underdeveloped. Arabic's morphophonological complexity, including its consonantal root system, emphatic consonants, and context-dependent assimilation rules, presents distinctive challenges differing fundamentally from English. Arabic speaking instruction in Indonesian universities often requires students to navigate both Modern Standard Arabic and colloquial registers simultaneously (Sutaman & Febriani, 2021). Prior Arabic pedagogy studies have focused predominantly on reading, writing, and vocabulary (Rachmawati et al., 2020; Amin et al., 2022). Uddin (2024) examined translingual OCF in an Arabic heritage classroom in the United States, and Abd Hamid et al. (2021) analyzed written corrective feedback preferences among Arabic instructors, yet neither addressed learner perceptions of oral feedback in Arabic speaking courses within Indonesian higher education.

The cultivation of Arabic speaking proficiency (*Mahārah al-Kalām*) is a paramount objective in Arabic programs at Indonesian universities (Marlius et al., 2021), yet students persistently struggle with phonological accuracy, morphosyntactic precision, and lexical selection (Mubalighb et al., 2023). Limited opportunities for authentic practice outside the classroom render instructors' corrective intervention critical. Tarigan et al. (2023) documented Indonesian teachers' consensus that OCF is instrumental for improving speaking competence while acknowledging the need for affective sensitivity. Irfani and O'Boyle (2024) found that scaffolded feedback aligned with learners' zones of proximal development elicited more favorable perceptions and higher uptake in Indonesian classrooms. Notwithstanding these contributions, a conspicuous lacuna persists regarding how Arabic speaking students at Indonesian universities perceive the oral corrective feedback they receive.

The present study addresses this gap by investigating university students' perceptions of OCF in Arabic speaking classes at State Islamic University Ar-Raniry, Banda Aceh, pursuing four objectives: (1) to examine students' perceptions regarding the importance and value of OCF; (2) to identify preferred types of OCF; (3) to explore affective responses elicited by different feedback practices, including timing, manner, and frequency; and (4) to ascertain the perceived impact of OCF on Arabic speaking development.

In contrast to prior studies that have focused predominantly on ESL/EFL contexts or on written corrective feedback in Arabic settings, corrective feedback dynamics in Arabic classrooms remain conspicuously underdeveloped. Arabic's morphophonological complexity, including its consonantal root system, emphatic consonants, and context-dependent assimilation rules, presents distinctive challenges differing fundamentally from English. This indicates that the effectiveness and processing of OCF cannot be assumed to operate uniformly across languages and points to a lack of theoretical understanding of OCF in morphologically complex languages such as Arabic.

Arabic speaking instruction in Indonesian universities often requires students to navigate both Modern Standard Arabic and colloquial registers simultaneously (Sutaman & Febriani, 2021), further complicating the feedback process. Prior Arabic pedagogy studies have focused predominantly on reading, writing, and vocabulary (Rachmawati et al., 2020; Amin et al., 2022). Uddin (2024) examined translingual OCF in an Arabic heritage classroom in the United States, and Abd Hamid et al. (2021) analyzed written corrective feedback preferences among Arabic instructors, yet neither addressed learner perceptions of oral feedback in Arabic speaking courses within Indonesian higher education.

The present research therefore offers a distinct contribution by situating oral corrective feedback within Modern Standard Arabic speaking instruction at an Indonesian state Islamic university. Furthermore, while earlier research has either examined OCF preferences in isolation or investigated corrective feedback in non-Arabic languages, this study uniquely integrates learners' perceptual, affective, and developmental dimensions of OCF within a cohesive Arabic as a foreign language classroom. By situating this inquiry within Arabic speaking instruction, a domain receiving disproportionately limited scholarly attention, this study contributes to the broader understanding of OCF dynamics in linguistically diverse classrooms and provides empirically grounded recommendations for instructional practice.

This study contributes theoretically by extending existing OCF frameworks to account for the interaction between feedback practices, learner perception, and the morphophonological complexity of Arabic, thereby offering a more context-sensitive understanding of how OCF operates in non-Indo-European language classrooms.

Method

This study used a qualitative, descriptive design to explore university students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback (OCF) in Arabic speaking classes. A qualitative paradigm was chosen because perceptions and affective responses are subjective and require interpretive, in depth inquiry rather than numerical quantification (Creswell, 2018). Qualitative research is also well suited to capture the complexity of participants' experiences and meaning making beyond what standardized instruments can accommodate (Braun and Clarke, 2006). The descriptive method provided a detailed account of students' views of OCF, including its importance, preferred feedback types, affective reactions, and perceived impact on speaking development. This approach fit the exploratory research questions, allowed semi structured interviews to probe emerging themes, and was appropriate given the limited research on OCF in Arabic speaking instruction in Indonesian higher education.

Research Setting and Participants

The research was conducted in the Arabic Language Education Department of an Islamic higher education institution in Indonesia during the 2024/2025 academic year, focusing on a compulsory Arabic speaking course (Mahārah al-Kalām) with 70 enrolled students from the third and fifth semesters who had completed at least two prior semesters of Arabic instruction and thus had sufficient experience with instructors' corrective feedback practices to provide informed reflections. From this population, 12 participants were selected through purposive sampling for in-depth semi-structured interviews, consistent with the qualitative principle that participants should be chosen for their capacity to provide information-rich data relevant to the phenomenon under investigation (Creswell, 2018). Selection criteria included: (1) enrollment in the Arabic speaking class for at least one full semester, (2) willingness and articulateness in discussing classroom experiences, and (3) representation of varied proficiency levels, including four high-achieving, four average-achieving, and four lower-achieving students based on their most recent Arabic speaking course grades, ensuring a range of perceptual perspectives across competence levels. The 12 interviewees comprised seven female and five male students aged 19 to 22.

Research Instruments

The primary instrument was a semi-structured interview protocol comprising fifteen open-ended questions across nine literature-based domains on oral corrective feedback: (1) the perceived importance of error correction in speaking classes, (2) the preferred agent of correction (instructor, peer, or self), (3) perceptions of the instructor's OCF practices, (4) preferred OCF types based on the taxonomy of Lyster and Ranta (1997) (explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition), (5)

immediate affective responses to feedback, (6) behavioral reactions following feedback episodes, (7) preferences for feedback timing, (8) error types considered most in need of correction, and (9) the perceived long-term impact of OCF on speaking development. The protocol was developed through a systematic process beginning with a thorough literature review, drawing especially on interview instruments used in prior studies of OCF perceptions (Muslem et al., 2021; Roothoof & Breeze, 2016; Zhu & Wang, 2019), then undergoing expert validation by two applied linguistics scholars for content validity, clarity, sequencing, and alignment with the research objectives, after which minor revisions were made, mainly rewording two questions to improve accessibility for participants whose primary language of instruction was Arabic. Finally, a pilot interview with three non-participant students was conducted to check question comprehensibility, estimate interview duration, and refine the interviewer's probing strategies.

Data Collection Procedure

Data collection involved conducting semi-structured interviews over a four-week period, which took place near the end of the academic semester. This timing allowed participants to observe the instructors' feedback in action, which enhanced their understanding and retention of the material. Before starting the study, we obtained informed consent by clearly outlining its goals, emphasizing the voluntary nature of participation, assuring confidentiality, and informing participants of their right to withdraw at any time without consequence. To protect their identities, we used pseudonyms (S1–S12) in our analysis and reporting. Each interview was conducted individually in a quiet campus room and lasted 30–45 minutes in Indonesian. This helped participants share their views, feelings, and experiences clearly. With their approval, we recorded the sessions using a digital voice recorder. We followed a flexible guide from Creswell (2018), blending fixed questions with natural conversation, adding probes, seeking elaboration, or clarifying as needed.

Data Analysis

The data obtained from the semi-structured interviews were analyzed using the thematic analysis framework articulated by Braun and Clarke (2006). Thematic analysis was selected because of its theoretical flexibility, capacity to identify and organize patterned meaning across qualitative datasets, and widespread recognition as a rigorous, transparent approach in applied linguistics research (Nowell et al., 2017). The analytical process proceeded through six sequential phases, elaborated below.

Phase one, familiarization with the data, involved verbatim transcription of all twelve audio-recorded interviews. Transcripts were read and reread multiple times for intimate acquaintance with the data corpus's breadth and depth; the researcher made preliminary

annotations and marginal notes on initial impressions, recurring ideas, and potential patterns. Phase two, generating initial codes, entailed systematic identification and labelling of meaningful data segments. Coding was inductive, with codes derived directly from the data, each representing a discrete unit of meaning like “preference for delayed correction,” “anxiety triggered by public correction,” or “valuing pronunciation feedback.” Phase three, searching for themes, collated initial codes into broader thematic clusters based on shared conceptual characteristics, involving iterative grouping and exploration of relationships into overarching themes. Phase four, reviewing themes, evaluated candidates against coded extracts and the full dataset for internal coherence (consistent patterns) and external distinctiveness; unsupported themes were refined, merged, or discarded. Phase five, defining and naming themes, articulated each finalized theme's essence with concise labels and narrative descriptions tied to research questions. Phase six, producing the report, selected representative extracts for a coherent narrative weaving findings with extant literature and theoretical underpinnings. The complete sequence is presented in the following flowchart for visual overview from design through interpretation.

Trustworthiness of the Study

To enhance the credibility, dependability, and confirmability of the findings, the study applied established qualitative rigor criteria (Nowell et al., 2017) through four strategies. First, member checking was conducted by sharing interview transcripts and preliminary thematic interpretations with participants to verify transcription accuracy and confirm that the themes reflected their experiences, with all twelve participants affirming accuracy and providing minor clarifications where needed. Second, peer debriefing involved two researchers with expertise in qualitative methodology and Arabic language education who independently reviewed the coding scheme and thematic structure, leading to refined labels for two themes and recategorization of several data extracts. Third, thick description was used in reporting the findings by presenting detailed contextual information about the setting, participants, and data collection circumstances to support judgments about transferability. Fourth, an audit trail documented methodological decisions, analytic procedures, and interpretive reflections, including preserved recordings, transcripts, coding tables, thematic maps, and researcher memos to enable external scrutiny of the transparency and systematic nature of the analysis.

Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to the ethical principles governing research involving human participants. Prior to data collection, ethical clearance was obtained from the institutional review board of the university. Informed consent was secured from all participants, who were fully apprised of the study's objectives, procedures, and their rights as research subjects. Participation was entirely voluntary, and participants were assured that their decision to

participate or withdraw would have no bearing on their academic standing. All data were stored securely, accessible only to the research team, and all identifying information was removed from the transcripts and replaced with pseudonymous codes to safeguard participant anonymity.

As the lead researcher, the first author is a lecturer in Arabic language education at a university in Aceh, Indonesia, with several years of experience teaching in this field. This professional background situates the researcher as an insider to the academic context and a practitioner familiar with the realities of language teaching. The researcher acknowledges that this position may influence the interpretation of data, particularly in understanding classroom practices and teacher perspectives. To address this, a reflexive stance was maintained throughout the study, including mindful bracketing of preconceptions and consultation with co researchers during data analysis

Result and Discussion

The thematic analysis of twelve semi-structured interviews yielded a comprehensive account of students' perceptions toward oral corrective feedback (OCF) in Arabic speaking classes. Through the systematic coding and categorization process outlined in the methodology, five overarching themes emerged from the data: (1) the perceived importance and value of oral corrective feedback; (2) preferred types of oral corrective feedback; (3) affective responses to corrective episodes; (4) preferences regarding the timing and manner of feedback delivery; and (5) the perceived impact of oral corrective feedback on Arabic speaking development. Each theme is presented below alongside representative interview excerpts from selected participants, followed by an integrated discussion that situates the findings within the broader scholarly literature on corrective feedback in second and foreign language education.

The Perceived Importance and Value of Oral Corrective Feedback

The first research objective sought to examine students' perceptions regarding the importance and value of OCF in their Arabic speaking classes. The interview data revealed an overwhelming consensus among participants that corrective feedback from instructors constitutes an indispensable element of the Arabic speaking learning process. All twelve interviewees expressed the conviction that oral corrective feedback is essential for their linguistic development, albeit with varying degrees of emphasis and nuanced reasoning. Table 1 presents a thematic summary of participants' responses regarding the perceived importance of OCF across the three proficiency groups.

Table 1. Perceived Importance of Oral Corrective Feedback by Proficiency Group

Proficiency Group	Primary Rationale	Key Concern	Illustrative Response
High-achieving (S1, S5, S8, S11)	Prevents fossilization of phonological and morphosyntactic errors; refines accuracy	Feedback should be precise and linguistically informative	"Without correction, I would continue mispronouncing words without realizing it" (S1)
Average-achieving (S2, S4, S7, S10)	Improves overall communicative competence; builds awareness of recurring errors	Feedback should be delivered respectfully and constructively	"Correction helps me realize mistakes I keep repeating in every class" (S4)
Lower-achieving (S3, S6, S9, S12)	Provides essential guidance for basic accuracy; offers a learning reference	Feedback should not be overwhelming or publicly humiliating	"I need correction the most because my Arabic is still weak" (S9)

As Table 1 illustrates, participants across all proficiency levels affirmed the value of OCF, although their underlying motivations and concerns diverged along proficiency lines. High-achieving students articulated a particularly strong emphasis on the role of corrective feedback in preventing the entrenchment of errors, particularly at the phonological level. S1, a high-achieving participant, provided a representative account of this perspective:

S1: "Corrective feedback is absolutely crucial, especially for pronunciation. Arabic has sounds that do not exist in Indonesian, like the emphatic consonants. If the lecturer does not correct my pronunciation of these sounds, I will keep producing them incorrectly and it becomes a permanent habit. So I really appreciate it when my lecturer points out the exact error and shows me how to produce the sound correctly."

This finding resonates with Han (2004; 2013) theoretical account of fossilization, which posits that linguistic errors left uncorrected over extended periods become resistant to subsequent remediation. The recognition by high-achieving students that unaddressed pronunciation errors can become entrenched suggests a sophisticated metalinguistic awareness consistent with Schmidt (1990) Noticing Hypothesis, which maintains that learners must consciously attend to the gap between their interlanguage output and target language norms for acquisition to proceed.

Among average-achieving students, the perceived importance of OCF was predominantly framed in terms of building communicative competence and identifying recurring patterns of error. S7 articulated this perspective clearly:

S7: "I think feedback is very important because sometimes I do not realize that I am making the same grammatical mistake over and over. For example, I always confuse the masculine and feminine verb conjugation. When the lecturer corrects me, I become aware of it and I try harder to remember the correct form next time."

Lower-achieving students, by contrast, tended to characterize OCF as a form of essential guidance without which they would lack a reliable reference point for accurate language use. S9 expressed this dependency forthrightly, noting that corrective feedback from the instructor represents the primary, and in many cases the sole, source of accurate linguistic input available to students whose exposure to Arabic outside the classroom is minimal. This observation aligns with the findings of Sutaman and Febriani (2021), who documented the limited opportunities for authentic Arabic oral practice available to Indonesian university students beyond the classroom setting.

Preferred Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

The second research objective aimed to identify the types of OCF preferred by students in the context of Arabic speaking instruction. Participants were asked to reflect upon and express their preferences regarding the six feedback types delineated in Lyster and Ranta(1997) taxonomy: explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. The thematic analysis revealed considerable variation in preferences, with explicit correction and clarification requests emerging as the two most frequently favored types. Table 2 summarizes the distribution of feedback type preferences across the participant sample.

Table 2. Students' Preferred Types of Oral Corrective Feedback

Feedback Type	Frequency of Preference	Representative Justification	Participants
Explicit Correction	7 of 12	Provides immediate clarity; directly identifies the error and supplies the correct form	S1, S3, S4, S6, S8, S9, S12
Clarification Request	5 of 12	Encourages self-correction; promotes	S1, S2, S5, S7, S11

		deeper cognitive processing	
Elicitation	3 of 12	Prompts recall of previously learned forms; fosters learner autonomy	S2, S5, S10
Recast	2 of 12	Less threatening; reformulates the utterance naturally without overt criticism	S7, S10
Metalinguistic Feedback	1 of 12	Useful for understanding grammar rules but can feel patronizing	S11
Repetition	1 of 12	Draws attention to the error subtly but can be ambiguous	S2

The pronounced preference for explicit correction, endorsed by seven of the twelve participants, indicates that students in the Arabic speaking context predominantly value directness and unambiguity in corrective episodes. S3, a lower-achieving student, provided a compelling rationale for this preference:

S3: "I prefer when the lecturer directly tells me the correct form. For example, if I say a word with the wrong pronunciation, I want the lecturer to say, 'No, you should pronounce it like this,' and then demonstrate the correct pronunciation. That way I immediately know what was wrong and what is correct. I do not want to guess."

S8, a high-achieving student, echoed this sentiment while adding a nuanced observation about the interpersonal dynamics of explicit correction:

S8: "I appreciate explicit correction very much because in Arabic, especially with the emphatic letters like ḍād and ṭā', even a slight mispronunciation changes the entire meaning of the word. The lecturer needs to be direct about it. But I also notice that when the lecturer corrects explicitly without sounding harsh, it feels more like learning and less like criticism."

The preference for clarification requests, expressed by five participants, reflects an alternative orientation toward feedback that prioritizes learner agency and self-repair. S5, a high-achieving participant, articulated the cognitive benefits of this feedback type:

S5: "I actually like it when the lecturer just asks, 'Are you sure about that word?' or 'Can you rethink that sentence?' Because it forces me to analyze my own

speech and find the error myself. When I discover the error on my own, I remember it much better than when someone simply tells me the answer."

This finding is consistent with the broader SLA literature, which has documented that output-pushing feedback types such as clarification requests and elicitation tend to generate higher rates of self-repair and deeper levels of cognitive engagement compared to input-providing types such as recasts (Lyster & Saito, 2010; Brown, 2016). However, the relatively lower preference for recasts among participants in this study, endorsed by only two of twelve interviewees, merits attention. S7 acknowledged the non-threatening nature of recasts but expressed concern about their potential ambiguity:

S7: "Sometimes when the lecturer repeats my sentence in the correct way, I am not sure whether the lecturer is correcting me or just confirming what I said. So I might not even realize that I made an error. That is why I think the correction needs to be more obvious."

This observation corroborates the findings of Lyster et al. (2013), who noted that recasts, while prevalent in classroom discourse, are frequently overlooked by learners due to their implicit nature. The Arabic language context may intensify this issue, as the morphophonological complexity of Arabic demands that learners attend to subtle distinctions that may be obscured by the reformulative character of recasts. The finding also aligns with Zhao and Ellis (2022), who concluded that explicit forms of feedback tend to produce more durable acquisitional effects for morphosyntactic targets, a finding particularly relevant to Arabic, where verb conjugation and noun declension patterns constitute persistent sources of learner difficulty.

Affective Responses to Oral Corrective Feedback

The third research objective explored the affective responses elicited by different corrective feedback practices, encompassing the timing, manner, and frequency of correction. The thematic analysis revealed a spectrum of emotional reactions ranging from appreciation and gratitude to anxiety, embarrassment, and frustration. Notably, the affective valence of participants' responses was less determined by the occurrence of correction itself than by the contextual and interpersonal conditions under which correction was delivered. Table 3 presents a synthesis of the affective responses reported by participants across the three proficiency groups.

Table 3. Affective Responses to Oral Corrective Feedback

Affective Response	Contextual Trigger	Frequency (n=12)	Proficiency Distribution
Appreciation / Gratitude	Feedback delivered after performance; private or general correction	10 of 12 participants	All groups equally
Anxiety / Nervousness	Immediate correction during speaking performance; public singling out	8 of 12 participants	Higher among lower-achieving
Embarrassment	Correction delivered in front of peers with explicit identification of the student	6 of 12 participants	Predominantly lower-achieving
Motivation / Determination	Constructive feedback with encouragement; error treated as learning opportunity	7 of 12 participants	Predominantly high-achieving
Frustration / Confusion	Unclear or ambiguous feedback; correction without explanation	4 of 12 participants	Average and lower-achieving

The most salient finding pertaining to affective responses was the critical role of feedback timing in shaping students' emotional experiences. The overwhelming majority of participants (ten of twelve) expressed a strong preference for receiving corrective feedback after the completion of their speaking performance rather than during its delivery. S6, a lower-achieving student, provided a particularly vivid account of the anxiety generated by mid-performance correction:

S6: "When the lecturer corrects me while I am still speaking, I completely lose my train of thought. My mind goes blank and I cannot continue. I start to feel very nervous because everyone is watching me struggle. It is much better when the lecturer waits until I finish and then explains the errors. That way, I can listen calmly and actually learn from the correction."

S11, a high-achieving participant, offered a contrasting but equally instructive perspective:

S11: "Honestly, I do not mind being corrected during my speaking because I am confident enough to continue. But I understand why some of my classmates feel anxious about it. I think the lecturer needs to know which students can handle

immediate correction and which students need it afterwards. It really depends on the individual."

These findings substantiate the work of Rassaei (2023), who demonstrated that the timing of corrective feedback interacts significantly with learners' foreign language anxiety levels, with delayed correction attenuating the adverse affective consequences experienced by high-anxiety learners. The proficiency-mediated pattern observed in the present study, wherein lower-achieving students reported markedly higher levels of anxiety and embarrassment compared to their high-achieving counterparts, aligns with the findings of Zhang and Rahimi (2014), who established that learners with elevated anxiety levels tend to perceive corrective feedback more negatively. Hartono et al. (2022) similarly documented that OCF can exert differential psychological impacts depending on learners' self-efficacy and prior communicative experiences, reinforcing the principle that corrective feedback practices should be differentiated in accordance with learner characteristics.

The finding that six participants reported feelings of embarrassment when corrected publicly before their peers carries important pedagogical implications. S9 recounted an experience that encapsulated this concern:

S9: "There was one time when the lecturer stopped me in the middle of my presentation and said my grammar was completely wrong. Everyone was looking at me. I felt so embarrassed that I could barely finish. After that, I was afraid to volunteer to speak in class for several weeks."

This account vividly illustrates the potential for poorly managed corrective episodes to undermine learners' willingness to communicate, a finding corroborated by Tavakoli and Zarrinabadi (2018), who demonstrated that overt negative feedback can suppress learners' communicative initiative in foreign language classrooms. The finding also resonates with Zare et al. (2022), who documented the complex interplay between OCF delivery and learners' willingness to participate in oral activities across different proficiency levels.

Preferences Regarding the Timing and Manner of Feedback Delivery

Closely related to the affective dimension, participants expressed nuanced preferences concerning how and when corrective feedback should be delivered. As noted above, the prevailing preference was for post-performance feedback. However, the interview data also revealed preferences regarding the manner of delivery, specifically whether feedback should be directed at individual students or disseminated to the class as a collective learning exercise.

Five participants explicitly advocated for a collective feedback approach, wherein the instructor compiles observed errors from multiple students' performances and addresses them

as a group at the end of the class session without identifying the individual sources of each error. S4 articulated the rationale for this approach:

S4: "I think the best way is when the lecturer writes down all the common errors from everyone and then discusses them at the end of the class. That way, everyone can learn from each other's mistakes without anyone feeling singled out. It also makes the correction feel more like a normal part of learning rather than a punishment."

This preference mirrors the finding reported by Muslem et al. (2021), who observed that students in English speaking classes similarly favored collective error analysis over individualized correction during or immediately after performance. The pedagogical wisdom of this approach is further supported by Roothoof & Breeze (2016), who argued that depersonalizing error correction can reduce the face-threatening potential of feedback while preserving its instructional value.

Conversely, four participants, predominantly from the high-achieving group, expressed a preference for individualized and immediate feedback, provided it was delivered in a supportive and private manner. S1 explained:

S1: "For me personally, I prefer the lecturer to correct me right away, one on one if possible. Because if the lecturer waits until the end and addresses errors generally, I might not realize which errors were mine. I want to know exactly what I said wrong and how to fix it specifically."

The coexistence of these divergent preferences underscores the necessity for instructors to adopt a flexible and learner-sensitive approach to feedback delivery, a conclusion consistent with Ha & Nguyen (2021) finding that alignment between teacher correction practices and student preferences enhances the pedagogical efficacy of corrective episodes. Irfani & O'Boyle (2024) similarly emphasized the importance of calibrating feedback practices to individual learners' developmental readiness, drawing upon Vygotsky's concept of the zone of proximal development to argue that effective OCF must be responsive to learners' current competence levels and affective dispositions.

Perceived Impact of Oral Corrective Feedback on Arabic Speaking Development

The fourth research objective aimed to ascertain the perceived impact of OCF on students' Arabic speaking development. The interview data yielded a robust consensus that oral corrective feedback has contributed positively to multiple dimensions of participants' spoken Arabic proficiency. Table 4 summarizes the specific areas of improvement attributed by participants to the OCF they received.

Table 4. Perceived Areas of Improvement Attributed to Oral Corrective Feedback

Area of Improvement	Reported by (n=12)	Representative Participant Statement
Phonological Accuracy (Pronunciation)	11 of 12	"My pronunciation of emphatic letters has improved significantly because of constant correction" (S8)
Morphosyntactic Precision (Grammar)	9 of 12	"I used to confuse verb forms constantly, but now I am more careful after repeated correction" (S2)
Self-Monitoring and Error Awareness	8 of 12	"Now I automatically check myself before speaking because I remember previous corrections" (S5)
Speaking Confidence	7 of 12	"After knowing my mistakes and fixing them, I feel more confident to speak in class" (S10)
Lexical Appropriateness	5 of 12	"The lecturer helped me use more precise vocabulary instead of general words" (S11)
Preparedness for Future Performance	6 of 12	"I prepare more carefully before speaking now because I do not want to repeat the same errors" (S4)

The finding that phonological accuracy was the most widely cited area of improvement, reported by eleven of twelve participants, is particularly noteworthy in the context of Arabic language learning. The phonological system of Arabic encompasses a number of consonantal and vocalic distinctions that are absent from Indonesian, including pharyngealized consonants, the uvular fricative, and the distinction between short and long vowels that carries morphological significance. S12, a lower-achieving student, described the transformative effect of sustained phonological correction:

S12: "At the beginning of the semester, I could not pronounce the letter 'ayn properly at all. My lecturer corrected me patiently many times, showing me where to position my tongue and how to produce the sound from the throat. Now I can produce it much more accurately. I think without that correction, I would never have learned it on my own."

The role of OCF in enhancing self-monitoring capabilities, reported by eight participants, represents a particularly significant finding from a theoretical standpoint. The development of self-monitoring skills indicates that corrective feedback has facilitated not only the correction of specific errors but also the cultivation of broader metacognitive strategies that enable learners to evaluate and regulate their own linguistic output. This finding supports Nassaji (2016) argument that interactional feedback contributes to the development of learners'

metalinguistic awareness, extending this principle to the specific context of Arabic speaking instruction. The finding is also consonant with the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990), which predicts that heightened awareness of linguistic forms, facilitated through corrective feedback, promotes the internalization of target language structures.

The positive impact on speaking confidence, reported by seven participants, merits further consideration in light of the earlier finding regarding anxiety and embarrassment. These apparently contradictory tendencies can be reconciled by recognizing that the affective impact of OCF is contingent upon the conditions of its delivery. When feedback is perceived as constructive, clearly articulated, and delivered at an appropriate time, it fosters confidence by equipping learners with the knowledge needed to improve their performance. Conversely, when feedback is perceived as abrupt, public, or unclear, it undermines confidence and generates negative affect. This dual potential of OCF has been documented across multiple linguistic contexts (Rassaei, 2015; Hartono et al., 2022; Zare et al., 2022) and is confirmed by the present study within the specific domain of Arabic speaking instruction.

Taken collectively, the findings of this study yield several overarching observations that contribute to the scholarly understanding of OCF in foreign language speaking instruction. First, students enrolled in Arabic speaking classes at the university level overwhelmingly endorse the importance of oral corrective feedback, viewing it as a necessary and beneficial component of their language learning experience. This finding is congruent with the broader literature on learner perceptions of corrective feedback (Zhu & Wang, 2019; Ha & Nguyen, 2021; Muslem et al., 2021) and extends it to the relatively underexplored domain of Arabic as a Foreign Language.

Second, the preference for explicit correction as the most favored feedback type suggests that Arabic language learners, particularly those at lower proficiency levels, prioritize clarity and directness in corrective episodes. This finding departs partially from studies conducted in English language contexts, where recasts have been documented as the most frequently employed feedback type by instructors (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Sheen, 2004). The discrepancy may be attributable to the distinctive phonological and morphological characteristics of Arabic, which require precise and unambiguous correction to ensure that learners can accurately distinguish among linguistically similar forms. The concurrent preference for clarification requests among high-achieving students indicates that as proficiency increases, learners develop a greater appreciation for feedback types that promote self-repair and autonomous learning, a pattern consistent with Papi et al. (2021) finding that learners' motivational orientations influence their feedback preferences.

Third, the affective dimension of OCF emerged as a critical mediating factor in determining whether feedback is perceived as facilitative or inhibitory. The finding that the

timing, manner, and privacy of feedback delivery exert a more powerful influence on students' affective responses than the mere occurrence of correction itself carries significant implications for pedagogical practice. Instructors of Arabic speaking courses are advised to adopt differentiated feedback strategies that account for individual learners' proficiency levels, anxiety dispositions, and personal preferences. This recommendation aligns with Tarigan et al. (2023) advocacy for culturally and individually sensitive feedback practices in the Indonesian language education context.

Fourth, the study provides evidence that OCF contributes to multiple dimensions of Arabic speaking development beyond mere error correction, including the cultivation of self-monitoring skills, enhanced speaking confidence, and increased preparedness for future oral performance. These multifaceted benefits suggest that the pedagogical value of OCF extends beyond its immediate corrective function to encompass broader processes of learner development, a conclusion that reinforces the theoretical positions articulated by Nassaji (2016) and Lyster et al. (2013).

Finally, it is important to acknowledge the limitations inherent in the present study. The qualitative design, while affording depth and nuance, necessarily limits the generalizability of the findings to other institutional and linguistic contexts. However, this limitation also highlights the context-specific nature of OCF, suggesting that learners' perceptions are shaped by localized pedagogical and linguistic conditions rather than universal patterns. The sample of twelve interviewees, though appropriate for qualitative inquiry, represents only a subset of the broader student population and may not capture the full range of views among the class of 70 students. Nevertheless, the consistency observed across participants' responses challenges previous assumptions that learner perceptions of OCF are highly fragmented or unique to each individual. That said, relying on self-reported views can introduce biases like social desirability or memory reconstruction. However, these self-reports still provide valuable insights into how learners consciously interpret and internalize feedback practices something observational methods often fail to capture.

Conclusion

This qualitative study investigated university students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback in Arabic speaking classes through semi-structured interviews with twelve purposively selected participants. The findings addressed four research objectives and yielded the following conclusions.

First, students unanimously perceived OCF as essential for their Arabic speaking development, with high-achieving students emphasizing its role in preventing fossilization, average-achieving students valuing its contribution to error awareness, and lower-achieving

students regarding it as indispensable guidance for basic accuracy. Second, explicit correction was the most preferred feedback type, particularly among lower-achieving students, while high-achieving students favored clarification requests that promote self-repair and deeper cognitive processing. Third, affective responses were shaped primarily by the timing and manner of delivery rather than by correction itself; post-performance and collective feedback were strongly preferred, as mid-performance correction triggered anxiety and embarrassment, especially among lower-achieving students. Fourth, OCF was perceived to improve phonological accuracy, morphosyntactic precision, self-monitoring capability, and speaking confidence.

These findings carry clear pedagogical implications. Instructors should provide OCF consistently, diversify feedback strategies according to learners' proficiency levels, prioritize post-performance delivery, and employ collective error analysis to minimize face-threatening effects. The study is limited by its qualitative design, small sample size, and reliance on self-reported data. Future research should employ mixed-methods designs incorporating classroom observation and stimulated recall across multiple institutional contexts to triangulate and extend these findings.

References

- Abd Hamid, M. A. A., Sahrir, M. S., & Razali, K. A. (2021). A preference analysis and justification of Arabic written corrective feedback among instructors and undergraduates. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(3), 697–706. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i3.31756>
- Amin, I., Ritonga, M., Sobhan, S., & Kumar, T. (2022). Implementation of activity-based language week program in improving Arabic communication skills at Ma'had al-Jami'ah. *Izdiyar: Journal of Arabic Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature*, 5(1), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jiz.v5i1.19911>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brown, D. (2016). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 436–458. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814563200>
- Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Fu, M., & Li, S. (2022). The effects of immediate and delayed corrective feedback on L2 development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 44(1), 2–34. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263120000388>
- Ha, X. V., & Nguyen, L. T. (2021). Targets and sources of oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: Are students' and teachers' beliefs aligned? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 697160. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697160>
- Han, Z.-H. (2004). Fossilization: Five central issues. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 212–242. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2004.00060.x>

- Han, Z.-H. (2013). Forty years later: Updating the fossilization hypothesis. *Language Teaching*, 46(2), 133–171. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000511>
- Hartono, D., Basthomi, Y., Widiastuti, O., & Prastiyowati, S. (2022). The impacts of teacher's oral corrective feedback to students' psychological domain: A study on EFL speech production. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 2152619. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2152619>
- Irfani, B., & O'Boyle, A. (2024). Teacher practices and student preferences of oral corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL classrooms: A Vygotskian perspective. *Training, Language and Culture*, 8(1), 101–114. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2521-442X-2024-8-1-101-114>
- Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 309–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x>
- Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System. *System*, 84, 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.05.006>
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 265–302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520>
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365>
- Marlius, Y., Bambang, & Wirman, M. (2021). The efforts to improve students' Arabic speaking skills through language environment activation: A study of phenomenology. *Al-Ta'rib: Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Arab IAIN Palangka Raya*, 9(1), 35–48. <https://doi.org/10.23971/altarib.v9i1.2585>
- Mubaligh, A., Sari, R. R., & Novitasari, E. D. (2023). Improving Arabic speaking skills strategies for Islamic boarding school students. *Izdihar: Journal of Arabic Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature*, 5(3), 251–264. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jiz.v5i3.21716>
- Muslem, A., Zulfikar, T., Astilla, I., Heriansyah, H., & Marhaban, S. (2021). Students' perception toward oral corrective feedback in speaking classes: A case at English education department students. *International Journal of Language Education*, 5(4), 244–259. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v5i4.19010>
- Nassaji, H. (2016). Anniversary article: Interactional feedback in second language teaching and learning: A synthesis and analysis of current research. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 535–562. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816644940>
- Nassaji, H., Bozorgian, H., & Golbabazadeh, E. (2023). Teachers' stated cognition and its relationship with oral corrective feedback practices in EFL classrooms. *System*, 113, 102993. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.102993>
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>

- Papi, M., Wolff, D., Nakatsukasa, K., & Bellwoar, E. (2021). Motivational factors underlying learner preferences for corrective feedback: Language mindsets and achievement goals. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211018808>
- Rachmawati, M., Nugrahaeni, F., & Mauludiyah, L. (2020). Improving Arabic speaking skill through mind mapping strategy. *Izdiyar: Journal of Arabic Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature*, 3(1), 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jiz.v3i1.10967>
- Rassaei, E. (2015). Oral corrective feedback, foreign language anxiety and L2 development. *System*, 49, 98–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.01.002>
- Rassaei, E. (2015). The effects of foreign language anxiety on EFL learners' perceptions of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 9(2), 87–101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2013.837912>
- Rassaei, E. (2023). The interplay between corrective feedback timing and foreign language anxiety in L2 development. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231195141>
- Roothoof, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness*, 25(4), 318–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1235580>
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(3), 263–300. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168804lr146oa>
- Sutaman, S., & Febriani, S. R. (2021). Optimizing Arabic speaking skills based on integration of learning theory framework in higher education. *Arabiyat: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab dan Kebahasaaraban*, 8(1), 60–74. <https://doi.org/10.15408/a.v8i1.20423>
- Tarigan, K. E., Stevani, M., Ginting, F. Y. A., Prayuda, M. S., Sari, D. W., & Lumbanraja, B. (2023). Oral corrective feedback and error analysis: Indonesian teachers' beliefs to improve speaking skill. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(6), 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n6p140>
- Tavakoli, M., & Zarrinabadi, N. (2018). Differential effects of explicit and implicit corrective feedback on EFL learners' willingness to communicate. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 12(3), 247–259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2016.1195391>
- Uddin, M. N. (2024). Translingual oral corrective feedback in an Arabic as a heritage language classroom in the USA. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 40, 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2024.40.04>
- Zare, M., Shooshtari, Z. G., & Jalilifar, A. (2022). The interplay of oral corrective feedback and L2 willingness to communicate across proficiency levels. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(6), 1158–1178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820928967>
- Zhang, L. J., & Rahimi, M. (2014). EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective feedback in oral communication classes. *System*, 42, 429–439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.01.012>
- Zhao, Y., & Ellis, R. (2022). The relative effects of implicit and explicit corrective feedback on the acquisition of 3rd person -s by Chinese university students: A classroom-based study. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(3), 361–381. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820903343>

- Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: A large-scale survey. *Language Awareness, 28*(2), 139–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755>