

The Role of Interlanguage Practices in Feedback Mechanisms: A Case Study with Saudi EFL Learners

Arif Ahmed Mohammed Hassan Al-Ahdal¹, & Fahad Saleh Aljabr²

¹ Department of English and Translation, College of Sciences and Arts in Mithnab, Qassim University, Mithnab, Saudi Arabia

² English Language Department, College of Arts, University of Ha'il, Ha'il, Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Arif Ahmed Mohammed Hassan Al-Ahdal, Department of English and Translation, College of Sciences and Arts in Mithnab, Qassim University, Mithnab, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: aa.alahdal@qu.edu.sa

Received: September 27, 2023

Accepted: October 27, 2023

Online Published: November 3, 2023

doi:10.5430/wjel.v13n8p638

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n8p638>

Abstract

This study explored the efficacy and role of interlanguage feedback practices to and from EFL learners' perspective at Qassim University which is a large university with a diverse Arabic speaker learner group. It also gauged the correlation between using interlanguage feedback practise, tolerance of language ambiguity and motivation to learn among the participants. A convenience sample of 48 EFL undergraduates at Qassim University were encouraged to judiciously adopt interlanguage in giving and receiving feedback in the EFL class for a period of eight weeks. Thereafter, a questionnaire was used to gather information on the predictors for interlanguage use in feedback and their outcomes on learning perceptions of the learners. Results indicated that students have moderate perceptions towards practicing interlanguage feedback. Results also reported positive and moderate direct correlation between practicing interlanguage feedback, tolerance of ambiguity and learning motivation. This was reflected in foreign language ambiguity tolerance, followed by learning motivation. Results also helped conclude that in the Saudi EFL context, an English-only classroom is not yet suitable to optimize learning, given the learners' learning style and prevalent pedagogical methods, and as far as interlanguage use in feedback mechanisms is concerned, learners are positive to the idea as it aids in achieving their learning goals.

Keywords: Adult, feedback mechanisms, EFL proficiency, interlanguage, learning, teaching

1. Introduction

That language is innate has been accepted as the most relevant fact in the process by which one learns the first language. It is an informal learning process which is not dependent on classroom, textbooks, or a teacher (Saville-Troike & Barto, 2017). On the contrary, language is learned naturally and spontaneously, even without the knowledge or awareness of the learner. Interestingly, the 'first' language can sometimes be more than one language, in which case, all of them are learnt simultaneously, by the same process. The problem arises when the learner enters a formal system of education and may be required to learn a second or a third language (Johnson, 2017). This learning is not part of an innate process as it is dependent on the closeness to 'natural' that the artificial situation is able to achieve. There is thus, a difference in the two processes as outlined by Krashen (1981, 1982) as "unconscious" imbibing of language in acquisition versus "learning" in the conscious learning of the rules of grammar. The hypothesis of the interlanguage development is an offshoot of the innate language acquisition hypothesis and was first proposed by Corder (1967), and later, developed by Selinker and Lamendella (1978). The basis of the interlanguage hypothesis is that the tendency of the language learner is to move in the direction of the target language, in stages of approximation to the ideal state of target language attainment. In other words, the learner passes through stages of learning, using the trial and error method in attaining the rules of the grammar of the target language (Nushi & Eqbali, 2017). Perfect mastery of a second or foreign language is a goal that cannot be achieved in the sense that one acquires the first language(s). However, continuous language use does help the user grow in developing the language and making errors, even learning the wrong structures is part of the growth of the language learner (Walqui, 2006), though this does not necessarily mean that the learner is acquiring wrong language habits. At the same time, using language replete with these errors or mistakes does afford the learner the opportunity for fluent language use, in turn, exposing them more to the target language (James, 2013).

With regard to corrective feedback, helpful interactional processes and provision of recast, which is a subcategory to Corrective Feedback, are claimed to be helpful in language learning (Mackey, 2006). In foreign language classrooms especially, these emerging concepts can be effectively leveraged by teachers to give their learners a more effective and personalized learning environment and experience (Hlas & Hlas, 2012). Armed with an understanding of interlanguage as a healthy stage in second language development, teachers can anticipate and address common errors that may arise from language interference. A proactive approach steered by the teachers can help students navigate the complexities of language learning more effectively. Allowing interlanguage as a feedback mechanism is an acknowledgement that each learner's interlanguage is a valid stage in their language learning journey, using which teachers can promote a more positive and less judgmental attitude towards errors, leading to a more supportive classroom atmosphere where students feel

comfortable taking risks and making mistakes, which are essential for language learning. Feedback is a mechanism dependent on several other variables such as learners' proficiency in the subject matter, their learning motivation, and their ability to fine tune their learning to the content being taught. Moreover, feedback is a two-way process as learners and teachers are both agencies of it and also affect the each other in the process. Though there have been earlier studies on feedback in EFL classrooms as well as on the same in the Saudi context, review of literature established that there has been no study that investigated learners' perceptions of the need or efficacy of interlanguage feedback with respect to learning in the Saudi EFL classroom, nor its predictors.

Research questions

This study aims to fill this perceptible gap in knowledge by answering the following questions:

1. How do EFL learners perceive interlanguage in the feedback mechanism in the classroom?
2. What is the level of correlation between Saudi EFL students' perception on interlanguage, motivation and tolerance of foreign language ambiguity?

2. Literature review

Interlanguage

The *Interlanguage Hypothesis* takes into account the actual spoken language in use by the second/ foreign language learners. In attempting to understand the relationship between the first and second language, interlanguage aims to identify a pattern or structure in development (Ipek, 2009). Also implicit is the idea of stages of development in linguistic terms, and a natural order of acquisition. In any classroom, there are numerous forms of interaction, especially between students and teachers. Oral feedback is one of many communication forms where students receive feedback from their teacher who either corrects them implicitly or explicitly or asks them to clarify what they say. According to various researchers, oral feedback has proven to be an effective tool in second language acquisition (SLA) classrooms (Long, 1996). Moreover, Long's interaction hypothesis proposes that interactional process facilitates second language learning (Mackey, 2006).

In order to further the field of interlanguage pragmatic research, Dakhs et al. (2019) conducted a study on the complaining behavior of Saudi EFL students in order to achieve this, 60 Saudi EFL students at two distinct stages of linguistic experience as well as 60 Arabic and English native speakers participated in simulated situations that made them grumble. Comparative analyses of statistical data revealed that Saudi EFL students preferred passive and diplomatic complaint techniques and used a range of catalysts and adjusters to lessen the negative impact of criticisms. The comparisons also revealed a beneficial effect of more linguistic engagement on the growth of practical proficiency in a second language. The EFL students showed considerable sensitivity to the elements of social distance and dominance, comparable to native English speakers, despite a minor impact for gender on the complaint behavior. The findings are explored in relation to the body of research and current norms of civility and pragmatic ability. There are suggested educational consequences.

The interlanguage created by Kurdish EFL learners was the focus of research conducted by Qadir and Hussein (2020). As they progress through the phases of language acquisition, language learners construct this novel language. Because interlanguage is characterized by mistakes and deviations, which serve as a gauge of learners' advancement, it differentiates from source and target language. The study of interlanguage is vitally significant since it analyses how well second and foreign-language learners succeed in their studies while also diagnosing mistakes and non-errors. The study's results were acquired from two groups of freshmen and juniors at two separate colleges utilizing spoken and written assessments of two distinct types. The study's primary concern is looking at mistakes which was common in EFL students' mistakes related to grammar and syntactic mistakes. Thus, the research attempted to give a general description of the difference between languages and identify the types of mistakes made by students of Kurdish. The investigation came to the conclusion that almost all of Kurdish English as a Foreign Language students commonly made morphological and syntactical mistakes as a result of a number of reasons, most notably Kurdish's influence on their interlanguage.

The goal of an experiment conducted by Alshammri (2023) was to learn more about the variables that can affect Saudi EFL the willingness of learners to communicate (WTC) in an extramural digital environment (ED). For this reason, 50 Saudi EFL students from various Saudi secondary schools were questioned. The collected data were examined using thematic analysis. The study's conclusions indicated that three variables—educational factors (such as teacher-centered English pedagogy and the use of L1 in the classroom), cultural factors (such as familiarity with collaborators and virtual groups), and personal factors (such as L2 self-assurance and L2 anxiety)—influenced second language (L2) WTC among Saudi learners in the ED context. The findings of this inquiry study offered a better understanding of Saudi EFL learners' L2 WTC in the educational setting. The results of the research also highlighted a number of elements that Saudi Arabian instructors and officials may use to encourage L2 WTC among their country's EFL students in the classroom.

Furthermore, Hafez and Memari (2022) looked at how constructive criticism affected the cross-linguistic conceptual learning of Iranian EFL learners in the context of accepting and declining invitations. In order to achieve this, convenience sampling was used to choose three complete groups for experimentation from an English-speaking institute: the one with a recast group (N = 13), the metalinguistic group (N = 17), and the request for clarification group (N = 12). Three distinct groups engaged in a conversational deeper discussion as an introduction before the therapy. The invitation dialogues for acceptance and decline were drawn from the books *Top Notch*, *American English File*, *English Result*, and *Four Corners*. The teacher employed two checklists of sociopragmatic and practical expertise based on a 5-item Likert scale to evaluate the performance of the students. Each therapy session lasted 60 minutes and was scheduled three times per

week for a month. The findings show that providing constructive criticism had a substantial impact on the growth of ILPs. In addition, the metalinguistic group outscored the revised and explanation request groups. Therefore, when it comes to the interlanguage pragmatic growth of Iranian EFL learners in the context of invitation acceptance and declination, metalinguistic corrective feedback is more successful than recast and clarification corrective feedback.

Written corrective feedback

Corrective constructive criticism serves the purpose of allowing teachers and students to evaluate productivity and consider personal growth. Its type, volume, and point of attention might vary, but its importance in the classroom cannot be understated. However, how it is delivered is what makes it successful. The importance of written corrective feedback (WCF) as a remedial measure and a durable resource for subsequent use cannot be overstated. Given that most correction is multiple and multidimensional, foreign language classes are a focus for feedback procedures. However, in the lack of clear classroom feedback methods, instructors are left to their own devices to develop standards of excellence.

The study conducted by Ismail et al. (2023) focused on students' engagement with instructors' constructive criticism on their written pieces in the Saudi EFL setting and its impact on the students' growth of writing talent, is still one of the few. As a result, the study aimed to empirically investigate how Saudi EFL students reacted to written corrections on their writing tasks. To enhance students' writing skills, it is necessary to address how EFL students interact with professors' written remarks. The study attempted to analyze Saudi students' intake, emotional engagement, cognitive engagement, meta-cognitive engagement, and behavioral engagement with their students' feedback from a multidimensional perspective as a result. The research examined how students reacted to input from their teachers.

Albelihi (2022) assessed Saudi English as EFL and educators' actual methods for providing constructive criticism to their students. The study also ascertained the students' perceptions of the feedback they get from their teachers. With reference to the writing produced by 92 EFL students from Qassim University in Saudi Arabia and the type of WCF offered to them by three university instructors who were free to choose their criticism strategies during two phases of writing and correction, the study concluded that a number of issues regarding the scope of feedback needed to be researched. Though direct WCF is the most popular form, Saudi EFL students choose indirect coded input for content improvement rather than direct corrective feedback when it comes to grammar problems in their writing projects. The research advises EFL instructors to concentrate on the various WCF while speaking with their students. Furthermore, while administering the WCF, teachers should start with the assumption that students appreciate feedback.

Due to a lack of peer support, particularly in solitary engagement activities, and learners' weak feedback literacy, it may be difficult for students to interact with instructor criticism in an effective way. In order to address these issues, Saeed's (2023) investigation involved 15 Saudi EFL student dyads in technology-mediated group discussions on instructor input throughout the evaluation phase of collaboratively drafting persuasive papers over the course of a term. In the course of the research, argumentative writings in Google Docs, screencast recordings of dyads' immediate peer interaction, and subsequent conversations were all examined. The team-building method encouraged students to interact intellectually, socio-emotionally, and behaviorally with their teachers' Google Docs-based writing input. The learners' reflection on the activities showed that cooperative technology-mediated engagement sustained the opportunities for learners to value feedback, form evaluative judgements, and managed their negative effects despite the dyads' varying levels of collaborative engagement depending on the interaction of feedback style and nature of errors as well as the interaction of cognitive processing and socio-affective relations. The study provided helpful instructional suggestions for EFL writing teachers on how to utilize educational technology as an effective facilitator to increase student participation and review literacy.

In order to better understand how Saudi female EFL students feel about the present methods and difficulties of instructor feedback, Aldossary (2021) performed a study. 87 female Saudi EFL students responded to a questionnaire on their experiences with instructor feedback and any issues they had with it during the course of study using a quantitative method. The research project set out to investigate two key areas: students' attitudes regarding the present input from educators practices and the difficulties they faced, as well as learners' recommendations for enhancing such techniques. The results of the investigation showed that learners want to get honest and encouraging comments and thought the professors' input was valuable and of high calibre. The results also showed that students preferred thorough feedback on their written assignments. However, those who participated voiced some concerns about the promptness of instructor input and offered recommendations to enhance such procedures.

Qutob (2020) looked at Saudi EFL students' preferences for corrective feedback on written assignments. In this mixed-method study, a closed-ended Likert scale questionnaire was used, and it was tailored to the participants. An open-ended inquiry was also used to gather further information. 114 Saudi female EFL seventh-graders in a Jeddah-based private school, whose ages ranged from 12 to 13, completed both assessments. The learners got the instruments after using three different types of feedback on written work for six weeks. The quantitative part of the study was descriptively evaluated with SPSS to ascertain the learners' preferences for corrective feedback. The next step was to conduct a one-way ANOVA to identify any changes in learners' preferences between groups. After being topically classified, the qualitative section of the survey was manually evaluated in Excel. The outcomes showed that the preferences of the learners did not change depending on the kind of remedial feedback. However, the overwhelming majority of students preferred receiving helpful criticism on how to fix their errors. Additionally, students valued receiving corrective feedback via technological gadgets. According to this study, teachers should take into account students' preferences for corrective feedback while developing their lesson plans.

In the Omani context, Fouad (2022) investigated how EFL instructors in Oman's post-basic schools felt about using oral corrective

feedback (OCF) approaches. The study included a number of OCF-related topics, including its significance, different forms, the best times to offer it, and how well it increases students' intake. 42 instructors from 7 areas of Oman completed an online survey for the present research, while five professional Salalah post-basic school teachers participated in informal conversations. The results demonstrated that instructors had good views towards implementing OCF in their classes and highly evaluated the tool's effectiveness. It's interesting to note that their opinions favored implicit feedback kinds like elicitation and repetition that were not given much weight in studies of OCF in various circumstances. Recasts and explicit corrections, two explicit OCF procedures that are highly regarded and often employed in observational studies, were also thought to be among the least liked by instructors in Oman. Due to their extensive teaching backgrounds and ability to adapt their OCF strategies to their students' various competency levels, Omani instructors' preference for implicit OCF may be explained. These results can also be a useful resource for Omani instructors as they consider their own beliefs and routines and assess how they apply OCF strategies in the classroom. They may also be useful to new teachers in Oman who are trying to adapt their methods to the varying competence levels of their students but have no experience with OCF approaches. These teachers may thus pick from the vast variety of OCF employed in this study to discover the most appropriate ones that might help their learners in diverse educational circumstances with varying learning competency rather of relying on one or two OCF strategies.

Interlanguage is a tool often used in foreign language classrooms though mostly it is not recognized as such, however, it helps create a more inclusive and responsive learning environment, informs teaching practices, and enhances students' language proficiency and error awareness in an EFL setting such as QU or University of Ha'il. Moreover, interlanguage practices boost and facilitate students' feedback literacy, and make it more accessible, which, in turn, has positive learning outcomes.

3. Methods

Research design

This study took a purely quantitative approach by using a questionnaire that collected perceptions data on certain feedback parameters. The study took place in Saudi Arabia. It recruited EFL first-year learners in the third semester of the academic year 2022/2023 at Qassim University.

Participants

A convenience sample of 48 EFL undergraduates at Qassim University were encouraged to judiciously adopt interlanguage in giving and receiving feedback in the EFL class for a period of eight weeks. These male students were enrolled in the Semester 443 of the the Skill course, Reading and Writing. The intervention planned involves explicit encouragement to use healthy interlanguage behaviour in the feedback mechanism, that is, its use by both the teachers and participants. In this case study spread over eight weeks data will be collected from EFL learners, and their perceptions about interlanguage practices and experiences of its efficacy in giving and receiving feedback will be analysed.

Instruments

A questionnaire was used to collect the data in this study. It has the following dimensions: i. tolerance for English language ambiguity based on Ely's (1995) Second Language Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale (SLTAS) consisting of twelve items; ii. learning motivation based on the socio-educational model of Gardner and Lambert (1959) consisting of five items; iii. learning perceptions in the presence of the interlanguage feedback mechanism consisting of six items. The total number of survey items was 23. The reasons for opting for these instruments was their proven successful use in several previous studies. All responses were sought on a five-point Likert Scale. Cronbach's Alpha is used to calculate the consistency of the scale. Table 1 indicates acceptable consistency level, P=0703.

Table 1. Cronbach's Alpha reliability scale

N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
23	.703

4. Results

Response means for each item on the questionnaire were computed to identify how far the three predictors under consideration affected participants' interlanguage preference in feedback mechanisms. The results are summarized in Table 2.

RQ1: How do EFL learners perceive interlanguage in the feedback mechanism in the classroom?

Table 2 shows that students reported a moderate mean score toward getting their feedback in their interlanguage, M=3.44, Std=.309. Six items were used to assess this research question. The scores ranged between items 1 as a high score of 4.58 that there teachers should use Arabic while giving the feedback. On the contrary, the lowest mean score was recorded for item 4, M=1.22 and Std=.928 which states the necessity to include Arabic feedback in the coursebook.

Table 2. Learning perceptions of interlanguage use in feedback

Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. The teacher should use some Arabic with English in every lesson to clear my doubts in English language use	48	4.58	.498
2. My teacher should be able to give explanations in Arabic also every time I make a mistake in English as that helps me correct myself	48	3.56	.769
3. I believe that an English only classroom is the best way to learn English	48	4.18	.704
4. I would like my English textbook to contain Arabic support as that will be a passive feedback for me	48	1.22	.928
5. I think it is very important that my English teacher can let us speak Arabic during exchange of feedback	48	3.25	.812
6. The use of Arabic with my partner and/or group helps me learn English when we do tasks together or express our opinions	48	3.87	.672
Average	48	3.44	.309

RQ2: What is the level of correlation between Saudi EFL students' perception on interlanguaging, motivation and tolerance of ambiguity?

The correlation between the variable is calculated. Person correlation coefficient is used. As shown in Table 3, all the correlation values are positive and moderate. The correlation between tolerance of ambiguity and motivation reached .319* at the significant level of .027. This correlation is moderate and positive. Furthermore, the correlation between tolerance of ambiguity and interlanguaging mounted .428** with a probability value of .002; like the correlation between tolerance of ambiguity and motivation, the correlation between tolerance of ambiguity and translanguaging is moderate. Finally, the correlation between motivation and interlanguaging happened to be moderate and scored .311* at the significant level, Sig. =.032.

Table 3. Correlation between interlanguage, tolerance of ambiguity and motivation

Variables	Tolerance	Motivation	Interlanguaging
Tolerance	Pearson Correlation	.319*	.428**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.027	.002
Motivation	Pearson Correlation		.311*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.032

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

5. Discussion

This study reported moderate perception of Saudi EFL students toward receiving feedback in interlanguage. This finding reflects the maturity level of the students' perceptions. They are not too supportive of the communicative approach which makes it necessary to use the second language in the classroom nor to the traditional call of using mother tongue in communication and clarification inside the classroom. This finding may transform the use of translanguaging in the Saudi classroom. This finding agrees with Alasmari et al. (2022) who found that teachers in Saudi Arabia have positive perception on using translanguaging in the classroom. On the contrary, it diverges from Alzabidi and Al-Ahdal (2022) who found that Saudi students still favored only English in the English classroom. These views stem from Corder (1967) who suggested though many errors in L2 are due to the learner's use of structures from their native language, yet that knowledge or proficiency in L1 is not an inhibitor in L2 learning, rather the former facilitates by transferred use of learning strategies.

Furthermore, the study found moderate and positive correlation between students' perception toward using interlanguaging in the feedback, tolerance of foreign language ambiguity and motivation to learn the foreign language. These findings also suggest that learners have multiple issues with learning of English as reflected in their responses to the language ambiguity tolerance scale with challenges being perceived in grasping the meaning of the text, comprehending the teacher's output, expression of ideas, pronunciation in English, grammar, coherence and cohesion, vocabulary, and finding words in English to express what they think in Arabic. Compared to tolerance for English language ambiguity, participants' motivation scale showed better mean values, indicating that motivation is not as big a challenge in their learning process as the former. This finding is consistent with Dewaele and Wei (2014) who found positive correlation between students' perception in using code-switch and mono- and multilingual language use by of adults. As indicated earlier, the interlanguage feedback mechanisms were welcomed for a period of eight weeks before the learning perceptions data were gathered. These scores show high perceptions for the use of interlanguage in the feedback mechanisms as that sets the stage for the learners to better understand the areas where they make mistakes in English because their L1 proficiency supports L2 acquisition by clarifying these.

6. Conclusions

Interlanguaging or the use of the mother tongue (Arabic in this case) is not encouraged in EFL classrooms in Saudi universities which follow an ardent English only policy. However, poor learning outcomes necessitate exploration of the possible role of new feedback mechanisms such as interlanguage use in the classroom process to lead to a better learning perception. The current study reported a

transformative finding in which students show positive disposition to adopt interlanguage in the feedback mechanisms which is not favored by many modern approaches. The predictors for interlanguage use were identified using two scales whose efficacy had already been proven in other studies prior to this. Findings established that the biggest predictor for interlanguage feedback mechanisms was the poor proficiency of the learners in English which made them wary of an English only classroom where their learning was adversely affected due to global lack of comprehension. Motivation to learn, however, was not a factor in poor learning perceptions. Moreover, the use of interlanguage feedback mechanisms was perceived positively indicating that an immersive approach is not effective in the Saudi EFL context where learners' proficiency was low intermediate, but interlanguage feedback greatly helped ease the learning process.

7. Recommendations

Based on the conclusion of the study, which focuses on the importance of feedback and the use of interlanguage in the EFL (English as a Foreign Language) feedback context, here are some recommendations:

1. **Promote Interlanguage Use:** Encourage and facilitate learners to use interlanguage as a tool for critical examination of teacher feedback. Provide guidance on how to effectively incorporate interlanguage into their learning process.
2. **Proficiency-Based Support:** Recognize that learners' proficiency levels significantly impact their receptiveness to feedback. Tailor teaching methods and materials to address the specific needs of learners with lower English proficiency. Consider using bilingual resources where necessary.
3. **Diverse Feedback Strategies:** Implement a variety of feedback mechanisms to cater to the diverse needs of learners. Explore approaches such as peer feedback, self-assessment, and technology-assisted feedback in addition to traditional teacher feedback.
4. **Identity Formation:** Acknowledge the role of identity formation in the learning process. Create a supportive and inclusive classroom environment where learners feel comfortable receiving and acting upon feedback, even when it is challenging.
5. **Motivation Enhancement:** While motivation may not have been identified as a significant factor in poor learning perceptions in your study, it's still essential to foster motivation. Use motivational strategies, such as setting clear goals, linking learning to real-world applications, and highlighting the benefits of English proficiency.
6. **Feedback Literacy:** Educate learners on how to interpret and utilize feedback effectively to improve their language literacy. Offer workshops or resources that help them understand the constructive nature of feedback.
7. **Context-Specific Approaches:** Recognize that the effectiveness of language teaching methods may vary across contexts. In the Saudi EFL context with low intermediate proficiency, consider adopting interlanguage feedback mechanisms as a more effective approach compared to an immersive one.
8. **Longer Feedback Periods:** Extend the duration of feedback periods when possible. Your study suggests that an 8-week feedback period was beneficial; consider maintaining this or even lengthening it to further enhance the learning process.
9. **Continuous Assessment:** Implement continuous assessment methods that allow for ongoing feedback and adjustment of teaching strategies throughout the course, rather than relying solely on periodic evaluations.

8. Limitations

Feedback mechanisms may work differently in different contexts. Gender can also be an affective factor. Due to limited scope, these could not be considered in the current study.

Authors' biographies:

Dr. Arif Ahmed Al-Ahdal is a Professor of Applied Linguistics in the Department of English and Translation, College of Sciences and Arts, Methnab, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia. Though his vocation is teaching, Dr. Al-Ahdal is an established poet and writer. He has to his credit two bi-lingual poetry collections, *To Yemen with Love and Joys and Sorrows*, published in Yemen in 2010 and a reference book, *Preparing EFL Teachers for Tomorrow: Opening New Vistas in Teacher Development with INSET*, published in Germany in 2015. He is also credited with nearly 60 research papers published in internationally indexed journals. Apart from this contribution to research, he has examined many PhD theses for many American, Malaysian, Indian, Saudi and Yemeni Universities, and is presently writing two books on Literary Translation and Applied Linguistics. With a vast cross-cultural teaching experience and diverse exposure gained across three countries: Yemen, India and Saudi Arabia, he is now Editor-in-Chief of both, *Journal of Translation and Language Studies*, Kuwait, and *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, Italy; Monograph Editor, *Sage Open Journals*, America; Distinguished and Honoured Advisor, *Middle East Journal of TEFL*, Philippines; Board Member of *ELT Journal*, Canada; *Arab World English Journal*, Malaysia; *International Journal of English and Literary Studies*, Australia, among others. He is also a freelance language trainer and an IELTS Examiner, certified by Cambridge University, UK.

Dr. Fahad Aljabr is an Assistant Professor in the English department at the University of Ha'il, Saudi Arabia. Dr. Aljabr has a master's degree in Applied Linguistics from the University of Adelaide 2011 and a PhD in Applied Linguistics from the University of Birmingham, 2018. His research interests include (written) discourse analysis, evaluative language, ESL/EFL teaching and learning.

References

Alasmari, M., Qasem, F., Ahmed, R., & Alrayes, M. (2022). Bilingual teachers' interlinguaging practices and ideologies in online

- classrooms in Saudi Arabia. *Heliyon*, 8(9), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10537>
- Albelihi, H. (2022). Written corrective feedback: A comparative study of the preferences and beliefs of EFL teachers and learners in Saudi Arabia. *F1000 Research*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.108680.1>
- Aldossary, K. (2021). Attitudes of Saudi EFL female students towards current teacher feedback practices. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 11(6), 90. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v11n6p90>
- Alshammri, A. (2023). Perceptions of Saudi EFL learners' willingness to communicate in the extramural digital context. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 13, 1920-1930. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1308.07>
- Alzabidi, A. S., & Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H. (2022). Interlanguaging in Saudi classrooms: A study of upper secondary learner perceptions. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(3), 1680-1689.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 161-169. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161>
- Dewaele, J., & Wei, L. (2014). Attitudes towards code-switching among adult mono- and multilingual language users. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(3), 235-251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2013.859687>
- El-Dakhs, D., Rahman, M., Charlot-Muhammad, M., & Amroun, F. (2019). The Saudi EFL Learners' Complaint Behavior: A Study on Interlanguage Pragmatics. *Asian EFL Journal*, 24, 295-324.
- Ely, C. M. (1995). Tolerance of ambiguity and the teaching of ESL. In J. M. Reid (Ed.), *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom* (pp.85-95). Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Fouad, A. (2022). *Oral corrective feedback techniques: An investigation of EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in Sultanate of Oman in post-basic schools*. 74. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.11804.97925/1>
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13, 266-272. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0083787>
- Hafez, F., & Memari, M. (2022). *The effect of corrective feedbacks on Iranian EFL learners' interlanguage pragmatics development*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2310087/v1>
- Hlas, A. C., & Hlas, C. S. (2012). A review of high-leverage teaching practices: Making connections between mathematics and foreign languages. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(s1), 76-97. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01180.x>
- Ipek, H. (2009). Comparing and contrasting first and second language acquisition: implications for language teachers. *English Language Teaching*, 2(2), 155-163. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n2p155>
- Ismail, S., Nasri, M., & Salem, A. (2023). Revisiting Saudi university EFL learners' engagement to teachers written corrective feedback from a socio-cognitive perspective. *Conhecimento & Diversidade*, 15, 118-134. <https://doi.org/10.18316/rcd.v15i37.10915>
- James, C. (2013). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. Routledge.
- Johnson, K. (2017). *An introduction to foreign language learning and teaching*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315734675>
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- 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). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012589042-7/50015-3>
- Mackey, A. (2006). *Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami051>
- Nushi, M., & Eqbali, M. H. (2017). Duolingo: A mobile application to assist second language learning. *Teaching English with Technology*, 17(1), 89-98.
- Qadir, N., & Hussein, A. (2020). The Analysis of Kurdish EFL Learners' Interlanguage. *Interlanguage*, 7(3), 320-334. <https://doi.org/10.26750/paper>
- Qutob, M., & Madini, A. (2020). Saudi EFL learners' preferences of the corrective feedback on written assignment. *English Language Teaching*, 13, 16-27. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n2p16>
- Saeed, M. (2023). Towards fostering Saudi EFL learners' collaborative engagement and feedback literacy in writing. *Assessing Writing*, 56, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100721>
- Saville-Troike, M., & Barto, K. (2017). *Introducing second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316569832>
- Selinker, L., & Lamendella, J. T. (1978). Two perspectives on fossilization in interlanguage learning. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 3, 143-191.

Walqui, A. (2006). Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual framework. *International journal of bilingual education and bilingualism*, 9(2), 159-180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050608668639>

Appendix

Statement	Mean	
Tolerance for English language ambiguity		
1. During an English reading task if I get stuck with words that I don't know, I feel very	3.6875	.51183
2. I worry that I don't fully understand what the teacher says in English	3.2500	.81214
3. I feel bad when I am unable to express myself in English while writing a composition	4.0833	.76724
4. I get frustrated sometimes on not understanding some English grammar components	3.8750	.73296
5. I don't like that my English pronunciation has many mistakes	3.1458	1.18483
6. I only enjoy reading in English what I am able to understand quickly	4.2917	.54415
7. I am bothered that even with studying English grammar, I still find it difficult to use in speaking and writing	3.5417	1.18426
8. While writing in English, I fail to say directly my thoughts and this bothers me	3.5625	1.25319
9. It bothers me when the teacher uses an English word that I don't know	3.6875	.51183
10. While speaking in English I get uncomfortable when I cannot communicate my thoughts clearly	3.9792	.63546
11. Sometimes, I worry when I am unable to find English words that mean the same as some words in my own language	3.5833	1.06857
12. Most of the times, I need to guess meanings while reading in English and this is something I don't like	3.9792	.63546
Motivation		
13. In my school days I really enjoyed studying English	3.9792	.63546
14. Mastering English communication is very important for me to achieve my goals and make a career	3.9792	.56454
15. I enjoy making diverse friends and knowing English will help me do that	4.4792	.54537
16. Even though I make mistakes, I do not feel shy or anxious about communicating in English	2.6875	.80309
17. I devote a great deal of my leisure time to studying English even though I have many other activities	3.8958	.80529
Learning perceptions of interlanguage use in feedback		
18. These are displayed inside the paper, in Table 2.	----

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).