
RESEARCH ARTICLE

How EFL Learners View Speaking Feedback: Artificial Intelligence vs. Human Instructors

Alaa Abdul Adheem Abdul Abbas¹ and Afrah Mohammed Muslim²

¹ Department of English, Faculty of Education, University of Kufa, Iraq

² Technical University, Najaf, Iraq

Corresponding Author: Alaa Abdul Adheem Abdul Abbas. **E-mail:** afrah.al-sowaidi.ims@atu.edu.iq

ABSTRACT

This research examines the attitudes of Iraqi undergraduate students majoring in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) toward the shift from reliance upon instructor-provided feedback to reliance upon generative artificial intelligence (AI) for receiving speaking course feedback. With the expanding accessibility of generative AI tools, it is important to understand how learners may view this transition in order to develop effective instructional practices for teaching second language (L2) skills. To assess senior students' perceptions, descriptive survey methodology was utilized to administer a structured questionnaire to 53 senior students enrolled at the University of Kufa, College of Education. Results indicate that respondents perceive both teacher and AI-generated feedback positively, with a slight preference for receiving feedback from an instructor ($M=3.96$) compared to receiving AI-generated feedback ($M=3.83$). Respondents view teacher feedback to have the greatest motivating effect while also appreciating AI-generated feedback as providing immediate feedback and helping them gain confidence to engage in low-anxiety practice (e.g., through immediate feedback). Finally, this research demonstrates a positive relationship ($r=0.62$) between students' perceptions of teacher-generated and AI-generated feedback, indicating that those students who value receiving feedback via one source also perceive value from receiving feedback from the other source. The research, therefore, proposes a hybrid feedback model that incorporates AI for repetitive drills but maintains the role of teachers in providing emotional and nuanced support, offering a practical way to improve speaking results in an overcrowded Iraqi classroom.

KEYWORDS

Song-Based Instruction, Communication Anxiety, Moroccan EFL, Sequential Development, Oral Fluency, Affective Filter, Common Core Students

ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 30 May 2026

PUBLISHED: 07 June 2026

DOI: 10.32996/jeltal.2026.8.7.6

1. Introduction

Developing speaking abilities has always been difficult for undergraduate students studying English as a Foreign Language (EFL). This is especially true of Iraq, where opportunities for authentic practice are scarce because of limited class hours and little exposure to native speakers. For many years, teachers working with students to develop fluency and pronunciation relied heavily on human feedback by way of providing immediate feedback through spontaneous corrections or recasting. This makes it easier for a student to enhance their speech and gain confidence to keep on trying (Sadoughvanini & Maki, 2023; Zrair, 2019). Advances in artificial intelligence (AI) are beginning to cause changes. Today, modern AI platforms such as ChatGPT and other specialized chatbots provide instantaneous feedback regarding rhythm and accent to provide opportunities for students to practice their skills authentically without having to wait for the teacher to assist (Cuong, 2024; Amin, 2024).

The technological advancement from using human vs. AI feedback is affecting how students practice their speech in terms of usage. Recent research shows that students perceive Pronunciation Apps positively because they receive immediate and

'objective' feedback on their performance, which incentivizes them to continue practicing multiple times (Amin, 2024; Cuong, 2024). Teachers in Iraq may lack the ability to provide appropriate feedback due to their low level of assessment literacy; therefore, using AI could assist in providing students with this feedback (Muhammad & Bardakçi, 2019). Despite the fact that students receive 'beneficial feedback' from their teachers, this does not always occur due to class size and time constraints (Sadoughvani & Maki, 2023; Zrair, 2019). Simultaneously, various studies suggest that an integrated method that encompasses both humans and AI will probably be the best route to remain motivated and correct for students (Weng et al., 2024; Zeevy-Solovey, 2024). The importance of human Interaction to create meaningful personal relationships with students and of AI providing around-the-clock access to provide support of fluency. (El Mortaji, 2022).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The most significant concern with human feedback is that while it provides good support for the development of student resilience and fluency at present, it does not always occur consistently enough to meet students' needs in Iraq's already overstretched post-secondary educational context (Sadoughvanini & Maki, 2023; Zrair, 2019). There is insufficient time or training among educators to provide detailed and specific support to all learners regarding their ability to create accurate pronunciation, which contributes to students' limited abilities to speak well (Muhammad & Bardakçi, 2019; Gamlo, 2019). Although AI-based assessment systems can quickly determine how well someone is using speech sounds, we do not know how Iraqi university students feel about using AI-based evaluations instead of in-person feedback from an instructor (Cuong, 2024; Amin, 2024).

Research has found that while students appreciate using AI for quick fixes, they do not deem it as reliable as a human teacher for subtle elements such as tone and emotion (Zeevy-Solovey, 2024; Weng et al., 2024). With the shift toward technology in Iraq, students may be less inclined to use digital tools or to feel a lack of connection to their teacher (Muhammad & Bardakçi, 2019; Sadoughvanini & Maki, 2023). Although students who receive feedback from peers and use apps have demonstrated greater investment in their learning, there is still significant uncertainty about how this transition will occur in the classroom in Iraq. (Chekol, 2020; El Mortaji, 2022).

1.3 Significance of the Study

This research addresses a significant change in how spoken language education is conducted. Students in Iraq have been limited from practicing their speaking abilities and may find that the balance between human teacher and AI feedback will impact their ability to become fluent in English. This study will provide insight into how they perceive the shift from their teacher's feedback to an AI's feedback and therefore support schools in the implementation of technology as a means to develop pronunciation while still having an element of personal encouragement from a human being. (Amin, 2024; Muhammad & Bardakçi, 2019)

This study may provide direction for revision of the existing regulations regarding higher education institutions in Iraq because using AI for repetitive practice and safe practice experience, may allow more time available in class, and as studies have shown, result in significantly improved confidence of speakers (Cuong, 2024; Weng et al., 2024). This adds to the global discussion of the role AI technology plays in education by providing an Iraqi perspective on the issue of trust and whether a technology will actually perform as intended (Choung et al., 2022; Kang et al., 2024). Ultimately, the only way to develop confidence in communication as a learner is through quality, constructive feedback, whether that comes from a human or a computer. (Sadoughvanini & Maki, 2023; Zeevy-Solovey, 2024).

1.4 Research Questions

Based on the background of the study, the following questions will guide this research:

1. How do Iraqi EFL undergraduates perceive the transition from human feedback to AI-generated feedback in their speaking courses?
2. What differences exist in their attitudes toward human versus AI feedback when it comes to usefulness, trust, and acceptance?

1.5 Research Hypotheses

- Hypothesis 1 (H1): The transition from human feedback to AI-generated feedback has a significant effect on how Iraqi EFL undergraduates perceive feedback in their speaking courses.
- Hypothesis 2 (H1): There is a significant difference between students' attitudes toward human feedback and AI-generated feedback regarding usefulness, trust, and acceptance.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Background to the Study

Oral feedback research has its roots in the foundational research of Lyster and Ranta (1997) regarding the presence of feedback by teachers during spoken interactions in EFL classrooms. They uncovered comprehensive evidence that teachers provide a means of correcting a student's production of spoken language by providing both explicit and interactional feedback types. This creates a greater chance that a student will be able to recognize their own oral errors. In their words, when a teacher corrects a student's production of spoken language, they are creating a pathway for the student to move through the cognitive and metacognitive stages of learning a language.

In another perspective, Oliver (2000) examined the role of peer feedback during conversational exchanges. Her results showed that students of both high and low speaking proficiency were able to improve through participating in oral peer feedback. Nevertheless, Oliver found that there were many differences in the way each student internally processed and used one another's feedback depending on what level of fluency they already had in the language being learned.

Mackey (2006) suggests that the student understanding of oral feedback is very sophisticated. For example, while many of the participants from her research appreciated correction as part of the process of enhancing accuracy in their speech, they also described both the emotional and social components of the experience as being equally important components of the experience. The learners reported that the perceived level of support and motivation they received by being able to continue to speak was often considered to be just as important as the actual linguistic correction.

Havranek (2002) investigated how well learners incorporate spoken error correctives given during conversation into their impromptu dialogues. The analysis identifies a common incompatibility between the features that an individual provides feedback on, and those that have been integrated by the speakers. Thus, direct, in person corrective feedback may encounter obstacles with accepting and aligning with learners.

An experiment performed in 2011 by Sato & Lyster examined the effect of structured peer interaction on the oral proficiency of intermediate EFL students over a period of several months. Their findings indicated that those students who had participated in regular opportunities for peer review speaking activities showed not only an increase in their fluency level, but an increase in motivation and enjoyment for participating in speaking practice.

The work of Adams (2007) reveals that peer response groups utilized during speaking activities are helpful for developing a sense of community and mutual support between college students. These findings provide evidence that oral feedback is not solely a cognitive resource, but rather provides socio-emotional benefits as well. As such, these benefits have a major impact on how learners respond to receiving corrections to their speech within a social setting.

In his comparison of computer-mediated voice chat with traditional in-person delivery of oral feedback, Sauro (2009) did not find any significant differences between students' speaking performance using either type of delivery method. Therefore, it can be inferred that the delivery method is less important than the overall quality and clarity of the spoken feedback that is given to the learner.

One aspect of Ellis (2009)'s research investigated how effective different types of feedback are. He examined both experiential and formal, as well as personal and academic, responses of students receiving feedback from their teachers in high-school speaking classes. Although all groups showed growth with their speaking abilities over time, the students preferred a combination of formal as well as experiential input, as they felt that both types worked best for enhancing their speaking proficiency.

Sheen's (2004) research into second-language speaking has examined the effect of corrective feedback on the way in which an individual respond to correction and believes that this response is influenced by a number of internal factors such as their history of learning, the level of motivation they have towards learning their second language, and their understanding of the reasons for receiving the correction.

Finally, Nakahama, Tyler, and van Lier (2001) studied the effects of various structured interviews and conversational tasks on feedback. They found that open-ended speaking tasks provided more opportunities for negotiation of meaning and corrective feedback than did more even-dollar drills; further supporting that the way in which learners accept feedback is determined by their social context where the task took place.

2.2 Empirical Background to the Study

Alzurfi et al., (2024) carried out to investigate Iraqi high school students' perspectives on peer-to-peer feedback and teacher feedback. To collect the data, the peer-peer feedback questionnaire and teacher feedback questionnaires were used. The data analysis revealed that a majority of the students were apprehensive about making unsuitable peer-to-peer remarks about their peers. Furthermore, it was disclosed that the majority of the participants exhibited favorable dispositions towards teacher comments. Students' opinions of the instructor and peer-to-peer feedback did not significantly correlate. Both educators and students may benefit from the study's findings.

Investigating how the feedback from EFL teachers in Iraq influences students' speaking skills as well as their academic adaptability is the subject of research conducted by Sadoughvanini & Maki (2023). The results indicate that when teachers give specific feedback regarding a student's oral skills, it develops their resilience and confidence toward overcoming the demands of participating orally. In the Iraqi environment, the feedback from teachers is an important motivator and drives students to continue improving their ability to express themselves.

A study conducted by Weng et al., (2024) into contemporary delivery methods looked at the extent to which Chinese EFL students were willing to receive feedback from peers via mobile assisted delivery. The researchers found that the student's acceptance of mobile feedback was very much dependent on the student's trust in their peers' expertise and knowledge.

According to the findings of a comparative study by Solovey (2024) concerning feedback from peers, teaching staff, and ChatGPT, feedback from teachers continues to be regarded as the most trustworthy form of feedback. However, many students have become more amenable to using AI-generated feedback due in large part to its efficiency. The author proposes the notion that students desire a uniformly weighted combination of fast-acting AI-generated feedback with that offered by their teachers that is richer in personalisation and depth.

Gamlo (2019) examined what EFL learners want out of speaking tasks in terms of student preferences. The results showed that students are very sensitive to the timing of their teacher's feedback; the vast majority of students prefer their teachers to wait until they have completed a thought before handling any corrections so as to not damage their confidence or disrupt their flow.

A study conducted by Muhammad and Bardakçı (2019) reviewed Iraqi teachers' ability for evaluating English as a foreign language (EFL). Their findings indicate there is a discrepancy between Iraqi teacher's beliefs around effective practice and actual implementation within their own classrooms. In particular, they noted that many teachers desire to use more effective methods of assessing their students' speaking ability, yet are limited in their ability to do this due to large class sizes and insufficient training related to contemporary feedback methods.

The author has indicated that providing students with many opportunities to receive consistent and meaningful oral feedback is among the best strategies for decreasing students' anxiety while speaking. When students are given many opportunities to receive feedback about their performance, they developed increased confidence in their ability to speak and, thus, increased their fluency as a result of taking more risks in their speaking activities.

According to Chekol (2020), peers' evaluation has an effect on one's achievement in speaking. Based on the results obtained, it is evident that students made considerable gains in their respective speaking scores when they provided regular evaluations or critiques of other students' speaking abilities. Although some students initially doubted whether their peers had

any expertise to provide them valuable feedback, they ultimately came to appreciate that evaluating another student helped them to more clearly see their own errors.

Cuong (2024) also explored how the technology impacts users by looking at university students' attitudes towards utilising AI as a means to improve their speaking skills. Students were found to have largely positive views of these tools as they offer students a comfortable non-threatening way to practice without fear of being judged by a human.

Amin (2024) investigated students' perceptions of AI-based text-to-speech programs for English Language Learner (EFL) students to assist with pronunciation. Most students give strong positive feedback regarding these applications because the use of these applications gives them the opportunity to listen to the correct pronunciation of a word as many times as needed; therefore, they provide greater opportunities for repetitive practice than what a teacher can.

Kanget al., (2024) examined what causes people to continually utilize generative AI services. They determined that trust and acceptance attitude serve as the best moderating factors between a generative AI's ability to provide accurate speaking advice and its continued usage by students. If a student does not have trust in the accuracy of the generative AI's voice advice, then they will stop using it.

2.3 Types of Feedback

2.3.1 Teacher Feedback (Instructor Feedback): This is defined as the teacher or instructor evaluating the student orally. Historically, student's evaluation of this form of feedback has been based nearly solely upon the presence and quantity of oral teacher feedback. These two factors are the primary reasons students use this type of feedback. This is sufficiently comprehensive to allow the student access to written and spoken feedback through the teacher's oral evaluation of the student's work. Richards (2008) found that students relied on this type of support to improve their fluency and overall organization of the material. Since the teacher is viewed as the main language expert in the classroom, most students find this form of feedback to be very authoritative and therefore critical when establishing their performance standard.

2.3.2 Peer Feedback: Fellow students give peer feedback about one another's performances. Richards (2008) states this allows for a collaborative atmosphere to grow among peers, helps develop critical skills for listening to others talk and also allows for students to feel socially supported which leads to greater comfort when performing with other students. However, Richards (2008) also states that there can be variability in the reliability of peer feedback based on both the language abilities of those providing the feedback as well as the ability to provide good feedback.

2.3.3 Artificial Intelligence (AI) Feedback: Automated systems, voice recognition programs, or generative AI models can generate feedback of this nature. While advancements in AI are astounding, Richards (2008) refers to this general group of technologies offering feedback as technology-mediated or automated feedback. This type is immediate and very private so that students can have the ability to practice and correct their pronunciation with no fear of being judged by others. According to Richards (2008), automation provides an important supplementary function to human interaction through repetitive, low risk practice.

2.3.4 Self-Correction (Self-Feedback): Self-feedback is when the learner evaluates their verbal production and corrects themselves without needing to wait for his/her teacher or other person to help. As noted by Richards (2008), self-feedback can be the result of noticing a "gap" between what you wanted to produce and what actually came out your mouth. Richards (2008) believes that one of the most important things being developed as the learner develops their self-feedback skills is learner autonomy, and also represents an ongoing effective track toward achieving long-term fluency and communicative competence.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research design

This research uses a descriptive survey to measure the perceptions of Iraqi EFL college students on shifting from receiving human feedback to AI-generated feedback. A quantitative method was used to allow for clear measurement of this cohort's attitudes towards receiving both teacher and AI feedback. A questionnaire was used as a platform to measure these attitudes, and has been adapted from Du and Zou's (2021) research, "An Investigation into Artificial Intelligence Speech Evaluation Programs with Automatic Feedback for Developing EFL Learners' Speaking Skills". (2023).

3.2 Participants

This study involved 53 senior students from the University of Kufa, College of Education, Najaf, Iraq, who are majoring in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), between the ages of 22-25, using non-random convenience sampling. The sample was selected for the investigation of student perceptions regarding AI and teacher feedback related to the learning of EFL.

Table 1: Demographic Information of Participants

Age Group	Gender	Number of Participants (N)	Total Participants
22–25	Male	30	53
22–25	Female	23	53

3.3 Instrument

3.3.1 Feedback Perspective Questionnaire

The instrument used in this study was a Feedback Perspective Questionnaire, adapted from the work of Du and Zou (2023). The survey was designed to evaluate Iraqi EFL undergraduates' attitudes toward two distinct feedback sources: traditional teacher-provided feedback and AI-generated feedback.

The questionnaire consists of 20 items measured on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." The items are categorized into two main dimensions:

1. Teacher-Provided Feedback (Items 1–10): Focusing on motivational impact, credibility, and instructional value.
2. AI-Generated Feedback (Items 11–20): Focusing on ease of use, anxiety reduction, and perceived effectiveness.

To ensure the face validity of the instrument, the questionnaire was reviewed by three experts from the University of Kufa, College of Education. The experts, specializing in English Language Teaching (ELT), provided guidance on the clarity and cultural suitability of the items for Iraqi students. Following their recommendations, the final version of the questionnaire was distributed to the study sample.

Table 2: Reliability Statistics

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Number of Items
Teacher Feedback (Items 1–10)	0.87	10
AI Feedback (Items 11–20)	0.89	10
Overall (All 20 items)	0.91	20

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

The research study was approved by the head of the English department at the University of Kufa's College of Education. After this initial approval, the senior TEFL students were contacted to find out if they were willing to participate in a research study. The purpose of the study was explained, and participants were made aware that their involvement would be completely voluntary. The questionnaire was converted into a Google form and distributed to participants through social media (Telegram) to 53 TEFL senior students who were able to use the five-point Likert scale to complete their responses. The students were also told that their responses would remain anonymous and were to be used solely for research purposes. All participants completed the questionnaire within three days, with all responses indexed respectively by Google Forms. Finally, all data collected was downloaded from Google Forms to organize for analysis by spss version 26.

4. Results

4.1 Analysis of Students' Perspectives on Teacher Feedback

The mean scores were quite high (3.80), indicating students' belief in using the teacher's feedback to assist them in developing oral language skills. Motivation (i.e., teacher's feedback not only corrects errors but also motivates to continue practicing) received the highest mean score (Item 8), while confidence (i.e., possibly due to students experiencing anxiety when getting direct teacher feedback) received the lowest mean score (Item 7). The standard deviation for the confidence mean is higher, signifying variability among students in their willingness to receive direct teacher feedback (SD = 0.92).

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics (Teacher Feedback – Items 1 to 10)

Item	Statement	SD (1)	D (2)	N (3)	A (4)	SA (5)	Mean	SD
1	Feedback helps me improve my speaking skills	0	2	7	31	13	4.04	0.68
2	Feedback improves my pronunciation	0	6	5	29	13	3.92	0.85
3	Feedback helps me speak more fluently	0	4	10	28	11	3.87	0.82
4	The teacher clearly explains my speaking mistakes	0	3	12	27	11	3.87	0.78
5	Feedback gives useful suggestions for improving speaking skill	0	2	5	30	16	4.13	0.73
6	Teacher feedback is easy to understand	0	5	10	26	12	3.85	0.86
7	I feel confident when receiving feedback from my teacher	1	5	9	26	12	3.81	0.92
8	Feedback motivates me to improve my speaking	0	2	6	27	18	4.15	0.77
9	Feedback improves my overall speaking performance	0	4	7	28	14	3.98	0.83
10	I find teacher's feedback useful for learning speaking skills	1	4	5	28	15	3.98	0.90

4.2 Analysis of Students Perspectives on AI Feedback

AI feedback can be helpful to some degree. There seems to be a slight lower average rating of AI based feedback compared to teacher feedback. Specifically, AI feedback scored 3.83 and teacher feedback received an average score of 3.96. In addition, participants rated fluency improvement (Item 13) and confidence (Item 18) as their least helpful items, both of which had high standard deviation values (> 1.00). This indicates that students perceive AI to be less helpful for developing their natural fluency, and have less confidence when using AI tools for speaking practice. The variability in responses would indicate that some students are comfortable using AI, and that other students are not as comfortable and still have reservations about AI based on their: 1) Lack of familiarity with AI based tools 2) Perceptions that AI does not provide enough nuanced feedback when speaking.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics (AI Feedback – Items 11 to 20)

Item	Statement	SD (1)	D (2)	N (3)	A (4)	SA (5)	Mean	SD
11	AI feedback helps me improve my English speaking skills	1	4	8	26	14	3.91	0.91
12	AI feedback helps me improve my pronunciation	2	7	6	23	15	3.79	1.05

13	AI feedback helps me speak more fluently	2	6	10	22	13	3.72	1.02
14	AI feedback helps me identify my speaking mistakes	1	5	7	27	13	3.87	0.93
15	AI feedback provides useful suggestions for improving speaking skill	2	4	7	25	15	3.89	1.00
16	AI feedback is clear and easy to understand	1	5	9	26	12	3.81	0.93
17	AI feedback helps me practice speaking more often	1	4	8	27	13	3.89	0.91
18	I feel confident when using AI tools for speaking practice	2	8	7	22	14	3.72	1.08
19	AI feedback improves my overall speaking performance	1	5	10	24	13	3.81	0.96
20	I find AI feedback useful for learning speaking skills	1	4	8	28	12	3.87	0.90

4.3 Comparative Analysis and Correlation

The correlation coefficient of .62 suggests a high degree of agreement between students who favor both rated teacher feedback as well as AI feedback. Furthermore, because of their positive views toward providing feedback, likely, students will also see the value of providing good, constructive, and/or positive guidance/feedback regardless of the provider.

Table 5: Correlation Between Teacher Feedback and AI Feedback

Variable	Mean	SD	Teacher Feedback (r)	AI Feedback (r)
Teacher Feedback (Items 1–10)	3.96	0.78	1.00	
AI Feedback (Items 11–20)	3.83	0.85	0.62**	1.00

4.4 Discussion of Findings

In this study, the results support and supplement previous studies on how new technologies are being woven with long-standing English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teaching strategies into an expanding number of classrooms. Both types of feedback from teachers and AI were received positively; however, the fact that teacher feedback was rated significantly higher than AI in both instances (Teacher overall average = 3.96, AI overall average = 3.83) points to the continued importance of an individualistic approach to motivating students as well as establishing reliability among readers through human interaction. One particularly telling instance was the degree to which (4.15) teacher feedback motivated students in this study (Item 8). This strongly supports Sadoughvani and Maki's (2023) finding that having their EFL teacher provide corrective feedback helped students not only overcome error but create resilient behaviors towards a positive disposition, when dealing with the difficulties of English language acquisition.

When analyzing how students responded to corrections, students offered individual differences beyond normal. Teachers have a statistically significantly lower mean of confidence from students due to receiving comments through direct (face-to-face) contact (Item 7, Mean = 3.81, SD = 0.92), which suggests an ongoing level of performance anxiety when interacting with a teacher in this manner. This variability suggests the need for unobtrusive timing and the use of a structured delivery style of providing

corrective feedback, as supported by Gamlo (2019), should continue being used to maintain the flow of the student. Therefore, the opportunities where AI can be utilized to provide correction for students with teachers may overcome the gap in the area of teacher-correction support in Iraq (Muhammad & Bardakçı, 2019).

On the whole, students showed positive acceptance of AI-generated feedback (the overall mean was 3.83) supporting the findings of Cuong (2024) and Amin (2024) who found general student satisfaction due to the lack of pressure and how the repetition afforded through AI tools created an effective environment for pronunciation practice. However, participants also identified significant limitations to the digital model's efficacy, attaching their lowest scores on "confidence" and "fluency" (Items 13 and 18, both means = 3.72). In addition, the variances on these two particular items were considerably greater (SDs greater than 1), indicating a relatively large number of students who expressed substantial hesitation about these competencies. The evidence supports the statements made by Zeevy-Solovey about how students value the quickness of AI compared with the more reliable traditional teacher when determining how to apply emotion or tone towards improving fluency. The variability implies that students' motivation to keep using automated services will hinge on how much they trust the AI as described by Kang, Choi, and Kim.

To conclude, there is a high degree of association ($r = 0.62$) between students' perceptions of teacher feedback and students' perceptions of artificial intelligence (AI) feedback; thus, they should be viewed as complementary (rather than contradictory) sources of feedback. In addition, because students tend to seek out constructive feedback from all sources, this indicates that students generally value feedback from all sources in the same way regardless of the method through which it was delivered. This evidence also provides support for establishing a synergistic relationship between AI and pedagogical structures in Iraq, helping to relieve teachers of the burden of dealing with traditional mode of feedback and assisting teachers in acquiring stated goals for instructional support (as identified by Muhammad & Bardakçı, 2019). This further demonstrates that as we move toward an educational environment that uses AI for instruction, we should still maintain a formalized system of teacher oversight so that they can focus their attention on delivering rapid feedback to students via AI technologies while using person-to-person interaction to provide students with motivation through verbal reinforcement.

4.5 Conclusion

The findings from the research indicate that Iraqi undergraduate students have a constructive view of transitioning to AI feedback, assuming that this change is viewed as additional support for teachers and not replacing them entirely. While an AI-based system will support the instant and objective provision of error correction, students will still rely on their teachers for motivation and more detailed feedback. This research supports the conclusion that the most effective method of enhancing oral skills in large, higher education classrooms is through a combination of teacher and AI feedback.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

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

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

- [1]. Adams, R. (2007). Do second language learners benefit from interacting with each other? *Language Teaching Research*, 11(1), 41–69.
- [2]. Alzurfi, A., Ameen, J. B., & Al-jashami, A. A. (2024). An Investigation of the Iraqi High School Students' Attitudes towards Peer-Peer and Teacher Feedback. *International Journal on Integrated Education (IJIE)*, 7, 75-90.
- [3]. Amin, E. A.-R. (2024). EFL students' perception of using AI text-to-speech apps in learning pronunciation. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
- [4]. Chekol, A. D. (2020). Investigating the influence of using peer feedback on EFL students' speaking achievement and their perceptions towards peer feedback. *Arabic Language Literature & Culture*, 5(4), 56-72.
- [5]. Choung, H., David, P., & Ross, A. (2022). Trust in AI and its role in the acceptance of AI technologies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.12345*.
- [6]. Cuong, T. (2024). Using AI for students' attitudes to improve their speaking skills at a university. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 4(2), 89-102.
- [7]. Du, Y., & Zou, B. (2023). *An investigation into artificial intelligence speech evaluation programs with automatic feedback for developing EFL learners' speaking skills*. ResearchGate.

- [8]. El Mortaji, L. (2022). Public speaking and online peer feedback in a blended learning EFL course environment: Students' perceptions. *English Language Teaching*, 15(3), 45-58.
- [9]. Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3-18.
- [10]. Gamlo, N. (2019). EFL learners' preferences of corrective feedback in speaking activities. *World Journal of English Language*, 9(2), 1-12.
- [11]. Havranek, G. (2002). When is corrective feedback most likely to succeed? *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3-4), 255-270.
- [12]. Kang, S., Choi, Y., & Kim, B. (2024). Impact of motivation factors for using generative AI services on continuous use intention: Mediating trust and acceptance attitude. *Social Sciences*, 13(4), 210.
- [13]. 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.
- [14]. Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(3), 405-430.
- [15]. Muhammad, F. H. N., & Bardakçı, M. (2019). Iraqi EFL teachers' assessment literacy: Perceptions and practices. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
- [16]. Nakahama, Y., Tyler, A., & van Lier, L. (2001). Negotiation of meaning in conversational and information gap activities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(3), 377-405.
- [17]. Oliver, R. (2000). Age differences in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pairwork. *Language Learning*, 50(1), 119-151.
- [18]. Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- [19]. Sadoughvanini, S., & Maki, W. (2023). The effect of Iraqi EFL teachers' feedback on Iraqi EFL learners' speaking skill and academic buoyancy. *Applied & Educational Psychology*.
- [20]. Sato, M., & Lyster, R. (2012). Peer interaction and corrective feedback for accuracy and fluency development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 34(4), 591-626.
- [21]. Sauro, S. (2009). Computer-mediated corrective feedback and the development of L2 grammar. *Language Learning & Technology*, 13(1), 96-120.
- [22]. Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(3), 263-300.
- [23]. Weng, J., Noordin, N., & Ahmad, N. K. (2024). Exploring the acceptance of mobile-assisted peer feedback in English speaking among Chinese EFL students. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(1), 1-20.
- [24]. Zeevy-Solovey, O. (2024). Comparing peer, ChatGPT, and teacher corrective feedback in EFL writing. *Technology in Language Teaching & Learning*, 6(1), 45-67.
- [25]. Zrair, A. N. (2019). The use of oral feedback in developing the speaking skills of Saudi EFL students. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 6(3), 123-135.