

Interactivity in Arabic Language Teaching Materials: A Literature Review of Its Forms, Functions, and Implications for Learning

Muhammad Farist Fatahillah ^(1*) Ita Tryas Nur Rochbani ⁽²⁾ Muhammad Juni Beddu ⁽³⁾

^(1,2,3) Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Ibnu Sina Batam, Indonesia

Received: 2026, 05,27 Accepted: 2026, 06,02
Available online: 2026, 08,31

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: muhammadfaristfatahillah@gmail.com

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
Keywords: Interactivity; Arabic language teaching materials; Arabic language learning; interactive multimedia; communication Conflict of Interest Statement: The author(s) declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest. Copyright © 2026 EDU. All rights reserved.	The development of digital teaching materials in Arabic language learning has broadened the use of the term <i>interactive</i>, yet the term does not always refer to the same quality of interaction. This study examines the forms of interactivity found in Arabic language teaching materials, their pedagogical functions, and their implications for material development. The study employs a descriptive-analytical qualitative approach grounded in library research. Literature was selected from publications addressing Arabic language teaching materials, media, and learning activities, and was subsequently analyzed through identification, classification, comparison, and thematic synthesis. The findings reveal three tendencies of interactivity: technical, pedagogical, and communicative. Technical interactivity primarily occurs through learners' responses to features and content; pedagogical interactivity encourages learners to construct and produce responses; whereas communicative interactivity creates space for Arabic to be used in constructing meaning with others. These three forms may support one another and are not intended as rigid levels. Interactivity also serves to enhance engagement, broaden language processing and production, provide feedback, and create opportunities for communication. This study underscores that digital is not always interactive, and interactive is not always communicative. Accordingly, the development of teaching materials should place pedagogical function above technological sophistication by connecting input, response, feedback, language production, and communication within a coherent sequence of meaningful learning activities.

1. Introduction

Arabic language teaching materials are no longer confined to printed textbooks. Over the past decade, learning spaces have increasingly been populated by e-modules, multimedia resources, applications, online platforms, and audio- and video-based materials; technology has gradually reshaped the ways in which learning materials are presented to and accessed by learners (Azhar et al., 2023; Haq et al., 2024). This shift is more than a simple change of medium. Infographics and interactive videos, for instance, allow vocabulary or grammar materials to be organized in more varied ways while creating opportunities for learners to respond directly to the content (Mahmudah et al., 2026). It is amid these developments that the term *interactive* has become increasingly attached to Arabic language teaching materials. The label seems to signal that a teaching material has moved away from a static mode of delivery toward a learning experience that involves learners more actively.

The problem is that the term *interactive* is used to describe remarkably diverse forms of teaching materials and learning activities. Ilmiani et al. (2020), for example, discuss interactive multimedia as a means of addressing problems in Arabic language learning, whereas Fitriani et al. (2020) position madrasah e-learning as a space encompassing learning materials, video conferencing, assessment, and the monitoring of student activity. In another study, interactivity is embodied in multimedia designed to support vocabulary acquisition (El Hanif, 2022). Syarifah (2024) identifies an even broader range of

interactive multimedia used in Arabic language learning, from Android-based applications to animated videos and digital quizzes. This variety points to one important issue: the same label does not necessarily denote the same learning experience. Students may interact with devices and content, while in other situations the interaction takes place with teachers or fellow students through the language being learned.

At this point, a conceptual problem begins to emerge. Teaching materials in PDF format are clearly digital, yet learners may still do little more than read them page by page. A video may likewise combine images and sound without requiring any response from its viewers. Moreno and Mayer (2007) show that an interactive multimodal learning environment requires more than the presentation of multiple media; guided activity, reflection, feedback, and learner control are also important components. Mayer (2020) similarly emphasizes that multimedia should be designed in accordance with how learners process information, rather than merely multiplying channels of presentation. Even activities that appear “active” do not necessarily involve the same level of interaction, as distinguished in the ICAP framework (Chi & Wylie, 2014). The findings of Pakaya et al. (2025) reinforce the need for such caution: students’ high acceptance of Canva-based worksheets does not automatically correspond to improved comprehension. Digitality, multimedia, activity, interactivity, and communicativeness therefore need to be distinguished from the outset.

In language learning, interactivity matters because language competence cannot be reduced to mastery of its constituent elements. *Mufradat*, *nahwu*, and *sharaf* remain necessary, but language ability develops when learners are given opportunities to comprehend input, respond to it, and then use language to convey meaning. Richards (2006) places communication at the heart of language learning, while Long (1996) demonstrates that interaction and the negotiation of meaning can help learners understand input that they have not yet fully mastered. Opportunities for language production are equally important; through *output*, learners can become aware of limitations in their linguistic resources and attempt to address them (Swain, 2005). Learning tasks should therefore create space for response, feedback, and meaningful language use, rather than merely providing form-focused exercises detached from communicative purposes (Ellis, 2003). It is within this framework that interactivity in Arabic language teaching materials needs to be understood.

Research on Arabic language teaching materials has, in fact, developed in quite diverse directions. Some studies have developed multimedia resources and applications that allow students to access materials while completing exercises independently, including Android applications for vocabulary learning (Robi’ah et al., 2023). Other studies have focused on particular language skills: the use of interactive media to enhance listening skills (Nestia et al., 2025), the need for multimedia teaching materials integrating text, audio, video, and independent exercises (Al Husna et al., 2025), and application-based media designed to support *mufradat* acquisition (Hermiwati et al., 2026). Beyond digital devices, interactivity is also created through language activities such as *role play*, which gives students opportunities to use the language in situations resembling real communication (Zakaria & Muhammad Nawawi, 2024). Nevertheless, much of this research remains oriented toward product development, media feasibility, learner responses, motivation, or the effectiveness of particular media.

Although the number of studies on Arabic language teaching materials and interactive media continues to grow, the concept of *interactive* has not always been used in the same sense. Syarifah (2024), for instance, demonstrates the wide variety of interactive multimedia employed in Arabic language learning, whereas Haq et al. (2024) place greater emphasis on the effectiveness of e-learning and mobile applications. Such tendencies suggest that research attention remains largely focused on media types, features, user responses, or outcomes of use. Yet two media products that are both described as interactive may produce very different learning experiences: one may merely require students to select an answer, while another encourages them to construct utterances, receive feedback, and then communicate. The forms of interactivity, their pedagogical functions, the relationship between technical interaction and learning activity, and their connection to the communicative use of Arabic therefore still need to be examined in a more integrated manner.

Building on these concerns, this study addresses three questions: what forms of interactivity have developed in Arabic language teaching materials, what pedagogical functions do they serve in the

learning process, and what implications do they have for the development and use of teaching materials? Unlike studies that primarily classify media according to technological type, this article locates interactivity in the quality of the relationships and activities created by teaching materials. Through a synthesis of the literature, interactivity is examined through three analytical tendencies: technical interactivity, pedagogical interactivity, and communicative interactivity. This typology is not intended as a rigid hierarchy, but rather as a way of examining the extent to which teaching materials move from merely eliciting responses to media toward fostering learning activities and more meaningful uses of Arabic.

2. Research Design and Methodology

This study employs *library research* using a descriptive-analytical qualitative approach. In library research, searching for and reading sources does not end with the mere collection of references; rather, it forms part of the process through which research problems are constructed and addressed (George, 2008). The literature examined in this study is therefore treated as data and read to identify patterns, differences, and tendencies concerning interactivity in Arabic language teaching materials. The use of documents as data sources allows researchers to examine, organize, and interpret information relevant to the focus of the study (Bowen, 2009). This research is not directed toward bibliometric analysis or a *systematic literature review*, but instead toward identifying, comparing, classifying, and synthesizing patterns of interactivity that emerge from the selected literature.

Sources were identified through Google Scholar, GARUDA, DOAJ, as well as academic journal portals that specifically or consistently publish studies on Arabic language education and learning. The search employed several combinations of keywords, including “Arabic language teaching materials,” “interactive Arabic language teaching materials,” “interactive Arabic multimedia,” “interactive Arabic language media,” *interactive Arabic learning*, and *interactive Arabic teaching materials*. Publications from 2020 to 2026 were prioritized so that the study could capture relatively recent developments in teaching materials and learning technologies. Nevertheless, this time frame was not applied as an absolute restriction. Earlier sources were retained when they held particular theoretical significance, especially for explaining the concepts of interaction, multimedia, learner engagement, and language learning.

Sources were selected according to their relevance to the research focus, rather than simply because they contained the term *interactive*. Literature was included when it addressed Arabic language learning, teaching materials or instructional media, and presented forms of activity or interaction that could be analyzed. The sources were also limited to academic publications whose texts were sufficiently accessible for analysis. Conversely, popular writings, studies of educational technology without a relevant connection to Arabic language learning, duplicate publications, and studies that merely applied the label *interactive* without explaining what learners actually did were excluded from the corpus. Through this process, approximately 20-25 principal sources were targeted, although the final number was determined only after all identified sources had been examined for relevance and suitability.

The analysis proceeded in stages through literature identification, close reading, information extraction, classification, comparison, and thematic synthesis. Such a process allows documents to be read not merely as repositories of information, but also as sources from which recurring patterns and categories can be identified across the studies analyzed (Bowen, 2009). The information recorded included the type of teaching material or medium, the forms of activity provided, the actors involved in the interaction, the Arabic language skills targeted, forms of feedback, pedagogical functions, and the benefits and limitations reported in each study. The findings were then compared and organized into broader themes. The categories of interactivity were not rigidly established from the outset; instead, they emerged through repeated readings of the literature and were brought into dialogue with theories of interaction and learner engagement, particularly those of Moore (1989) and Chi and Wylie (2014).

3. Findings and Discussion

3.1. Findings

Interactivity in Arabic Language Teaching Materials: Between Media and Activity

In the literature on Arabic language learning, the term *interactive* is readily attached to a wide range of media. Multimedia, applications, videos, digital quizzes, and even e-learning platforms are often described as interactive because they allow students to do something with the material presented to them (Ilmiani et al., 2020; El Hanif, 2022). Syarifah (2024) likewise shows that the term is applied to various media whose features and modes of operation are not always the same. The problem is that the label *interactive* often says more about the form or technology of the medium than about the quality of interaction that actually takes place. Students who open an application, watch a video, or select an answer are certainly active in a physical or technical sense, but such activity does not necessarily lead them into deeper pedagogical interaction.

The distinction becomes clearer when interactivity is viewed in terms of the actors involved. Moore (1989) divides instructional interaction into three basic forms: *learner-content*, *learner-instructor*, and *learner-learner interaction*. This framework makes clear that interactivity is not a property inherently attached to a particular device. An e-module, for instance, primarily establishes a relationship between learners and content; discussion or *role play* creates space for interaction among learners, while correction and feedback bring learners into interaction with the instructor. In practice, a single teaching material may combine more than one form of interaction at the same time. The more useful question, then, is not simply “is this teaching material interactive?”, but rather “what kind of interaction does this teaching material actually make possible?”

A further distinction lies in the depth of student engagement. Through the ICAP framework, Chi and Wylie (2014) differentiate learning activities into *passive*, *active*, *constructive*, and *interactive* modes. Reading or listening may still remain at the passive level, whereas highlighting, selecting, or manipulating information constitutes a more active form of engagement. When students begin to generate explanations, formulate new responses, or construct answers on the basis of the material, their engagement moves toward the constructive level. Interaction in a stronger sense, meanwhile, requires a process of mutual response and the co-construction of understanding. This distinction matters when examining Arabic language teaching materials. A multiple-choice quiz and a dialogue between students may both be described as “interactive,” even though they demand very different forms of activity. In other words, being active does not necessarily mean being interactive.

Media should therefore be understood as a means of creating possibilities for interaction, rather than as the determinant of interactivity itself. Moreno and Mayer (2007) emphasize that an interactive multimedia environment depends not only on combining text, images, sound, or animation, but also on how learners are engaged in the learning process. A video may remain passive if it is merely watched; a digital quiz elicits a response, yet the space for interaction may still be highly limited. By contrast, a task that asks students to formulate an answer may be constructive, while dialogue and the negotiation of meaning move closer to communicative interactivity. Digital, multimedia, active, interactive, and communicative are therefore related categories, but they are not interchangeable. On this basis, the present article examines interactivity primarily through what learners do with and through teaching materials, rather than through the technology used to deliver them.

Forms of Interactivity in Arabic Language Teaching Materials

A reading of the existing studies shows that interactivity in Arabic language teaching materials does not follow a single, uniform pattern. The differences can be seen in what learners are asked to do, with whom or with what they interact, and the extent to which Arabic is actually used in those activities. Drawing on Moore’s (1989) distinction among types of instructional relationships and on the synthesis of the literature, this study reads interactivity through three tendencies: technical, pedagogical, and communicative. These are interrelated analytical types rather than rigid, self-contained categories.

Technical Interactivity

Technical interactivity emerges when learners engage directly with digital features or materials that require a particular response. It may take the form of navigating menus, selecting answers, playing audio or video, completing *matching* exercises, taking quizzes, or receiving automated feedback. El Hanif (2022), for example, demonstrates the use of interactive multimedia that combines text, images, audio, and exercises within a single teaching material. Robi'ah et al. (2023) developed an Android application for vocabulary learning, while 'Azza and Djamilah (2024) employed Articulate Storyline as an interactive medium in Arabic language learning. A similar pattern appears in Hermiwati et al.'s (2026) development of *Learning Apps* for *mufradat* acquisition. Such features make teaching materials more responsive to learners' actions: materials can be accessed more flexibly, the pace and sequence of learning can be self-managed, exercises can be repeated, and corrections can be obtained more quickly. At this level, technology gives students greater control over the learning process, particularly in the direct relationship between learner and content, without always requiring the immediate presence of a teacher.

Technical interactivity remains important, but its limits need to be recognized. The interaction may stop at the learner-device or learner-content relationship: learners click through menus, match answers, select options, and then receive a response from the system. Such activities can make practice quicker and more focused, but they do not necessarily require students to produce Arabic. Automated feedback, moreover, generally operates on the basis of pre-programmed answers, leaving only limited room for variation in learners' responses. The number of features therefore cannot be taken as a direct measure of the depth of the learning process. An application may appear highly active on screen while the actual language work remains narrow. Learners can be extremely busy interacting with a screen, yet interact only minimally through the language they are learning.

Pedagogical Interactivity

The shift toward pedagogical interactivity occurs when teaching materials no longer merely ask learners to choose, but require them to produce something from what they have learned. Tasks such as constructing sentences, composing texts, completing open-ended dialogues, explaining information, responding to stimuli, or solving problems demand more substantial processing than simply recognizing the correct answer. Within the ICAP framework, such activities approach *constructive engagement* because learners generate outputs that go beyond the information directly provided to them (Chi & Wylie, 2014). In Arabic language learning, this means that students begin to retrieve *mufradat*, process grammatical structures, combine linguistic elements, and then reproduce them in new forms. The need for teaching materials that integrate text, audio, video, exercises, and independent activities is also evident in the study by Al Husna et al. (2025). At this stage, interactivity carries a clearer pedagogical weight because the teaching material encourages the construction and production of language, even though communication with other people may not yet take place.

Communicative Interactivity

Communicative interactivity emerges when learners' responses do not stop at completing exercises, but move toward using Arabic to convey and understand meaning with others. It can take the form of dialogue, question-and-answer activities, discussion, presentation, simulation, *role play*, *collaborative tasks*, or assignments that require information exchange. Zakaria and Muhammad Nawawi (2024) show that *role play* provides learners with opportunities to use the language in situations resembling real communication, while Murtadho et al. (2025) emphasize the importance of a communicative approach in extending learner interaction and competence. Theoretically, this orientation is consistent with Richards (2006), who places the use of language for communicative purposes at the core of language learning. Long (1996) likewise stresses the importance of interaction and negotiation of meaning, whereas Swain (2005) demonstrates that language production, or *output*, helps learners recognize what they are not yet able to express. Writing five sentences independently is therefore productive, but not necessarily communicative. When those sentences are used to ask questions, respond, discuss, or complete a task with others, language begins to function as a tool for

social action rather than merely as material for practice (Ellis, 2003). At this point, interactivity comes closest to the actual practice of language use.

These three forms are best understood as mutually supportive rather than mutually exclusive. Technical interactivity allows learners to respond to features or materials; pedagogical interactivity encourages them to construct and produce responses; communicative interactivity, meanwhile, brings Arabic into exchanges of meaning with others. An application, for instance, may provide audio and automated feedback, then assign a task that requires learners to formulate a response, and finally direct them to engage in dialogue with a partner. This *continuum* is therefore better understood as an expansion in the quality of interaction, rather than as a ladder on which one form must be abandoned in order to reach another. Technical interactivity creates the possibility, pedagogical interactivity turns that possibility into learning activity, and communicative interactivity carries it further into the use of language as a means of constructing meaning.

Pedagogical Functions of Interactivity in Arabic Language Learning

One of the functions most frequently associated with interactive teaching materials is increased learner engagement. When materials are not merely read or listened to but also require a response, students' attention tends to be sustained more effectively, and participation becomes easier to elicit. A number of studies on Arabic language learning report that interactive media can strengthen students' motivation, interest, and involvement in learning activities (Nestia et al., 2025; Hermiwati et al., 2026). Engagement, however, should not be equated directly with learning success. Pakaya et al. (2025), for example, show that students may respond very positively to Canva-based digital worksheets, while gains in comprehension do not necessarily move in the same direction. This distinction matters because enjoyable media can make students feel active without automatically deepening their mastery of the material. Engagement, then, is a condition that can support learning, not evidence that learning has actually occurred.

The pedagogical value of interactivity becomes stronger when teaching materials create space for learners to process and produce language. Activities such as repeating, recognizing, selecting, grouping, arranging, pronouncing, writing, and responding prevent students from remaining at the level of information reception alone. In *mufradat* learning, for instance, word recognition becomes more meaningful when followed by repetition and reuse in different contexts; the development of *Learning Apps*-based media illustrates the potential of this pattern in supporting vocabulary acquisition (Hermiwati et al., 2026). In *mahārah al-istimā'*, interactive media can connect audio input directly with student responses, as seen in the use of Lumio for developing listening skills (Nestia et al., 2025). The same pattern can be extended to *kalām*, *qirā'ah*, and *kitābah* through oral production, text comprehension, or the construction of written responses. Swain (2005) emphasizes the importance of *output* because, in attempting to produce language, learners may become aware of the gap between what they wish to communicate and what they are actually able to express. Interactivity therefore expands opportunities for language practice, but its value ultimately depends on the kind of language processing that truly takes place.

Learners' responses become more pedagogically meaningful when they are followed by information about the quality of those responses. In multimedia environments, feedback plays an important role because it helps students determine whether their choices, answers, or actions are appropriate and identify what still needs improvement (Moreno & Mayer, 2007). Feedback may take the form of automated system responses, teacher correction, peer comments, or *self-checking* mechanisms. The need for practice and self-checking features also appears in Al Husna et al.'s (2025) analysis of multimedia-based Arabic teaching materials. Without feedback, students may repeat an activity many times while remaining unaware of where their errors lie. In this sense, *feedback* connects response, correction, revision, and learning. Put differently, response makes the teaching material move, but feedback helps the learner move forward.

A further pedagogical function emerges when interactivity creates space for learners to use Arabic in a genuine sense. At this stage, students are no longer merely working on language; they are doing things with language: asking questions, responding, requesting information, expressing opinions, discussing, negotiating, completing tasks collaboratively, or presenting ideas. Such an orientation is

consistent with *communicative language teaching*, which places the ability to use language for communicative purposes at the center of learning (Richards, 2006). Long (1996) likewise emphasizes the importance of interaction and negotiation of meaning, since through these processes learners can adjust both their understanding and their responses. In the context of Arabic language education, Murtadho et al. (2025) show that a communicative approach provides broader space for learner interaction and the development of language competence. This should be distinguished from individual production. Writing five sentences or composing a paragraph remains important, but such activity is not necessarily communicative if it is not directed toward another person and does not require a response in return. Teaching materials should therefore function as triggers for interaction, rather than as the center of learning itself. Taken together, interactivity can draw learners into the activity, broaden language processing and production, provide feedback, and then—at its more communicative end—create space for Arabic to be genuinely used.

3.2. Discussion

From Technical Interactivity to Communicative Interactivity

The shift from printed to digital teaching materials is often taken as a sign that learning has become more interactive. This assumption, however, needs to be qualified. Technology essentially provides only the possibility, or *affordance*, for interaction to occur; the quality of learning still depends on how that possibility is translated into learner activity. A video, for example, may present sound and images simultaneously, yet students may still remain in the position of spectators. An application may likewise appear attractive and feature-rich, while the activity pattern it offers is still limited to following instructions or selecting from predetermined answers. Moreno and Mayer (2007) show that a multimedia environment becomes pedagogically meaningful only when learners are genuinely engaged in the learning process, while Mayer (2020) places activity design as an important element in the use of multimedia. Digitalization, therefore, may change the way teaching materials are presented, but it does not necessarily change the learner's position within the learning process.

The same qualification applies to the term *interactive*. Quizzes, *matching*, *drag-and-drop* activities, navigation, or answer selection clearly involve interaction, but the dominant relationship still takes place between the learner and the device or content (Moore, 1989). Such activities remain useful for recognition, repetition, checking, and practice of linguistic forms. Yet they are different from situations in which students are required to use language in order to respond to other people. The ICAP framework likewise reminds us that activities that appear active do not necessarily reach deeper forms of interaction (Chi & Wylie, 2014). It is here that the boundary between technically interactive teaching materials and communicative learning begins to come into view: responding to media is not the same as using language to build an exchange of meaning.

In Arabic language learning, a stronger direction emerges when teaching materials connect input, response, feedback, language production, and communicative interaction within a single sequence of activities. Learners first receive a text, audio, video, or another form of stimulus; they then respond, receive correction, and are subsequently asked to produce spoken or written language. This process matters because *output* encourages learners to become aware of the limitations that still exist in their linguistic resources (Swain, 2005). When that production is directed toward other people—for example, through dialogue, discussion, or collaborative tasks—opportunities arise to negotiate meaning and adjust responses in relation to an interlocutor (Long, 1996). Such an orientation is also consistent with communicative language learning, which places language use, rather than the mere mastery of forms, as the goal of learning (Richards, 2006). On this basis, interactivity in teaching materials can be understood through three tendencies: *technical interaction*, in which students interact with features or materials; *pedagogical interaction*, in which they construct and produce responses; and *communicative interaction*, in which Arabic is used to exchange and construct meaning. This typology is not a rigid ladder. Technical interaction remains valuable when it serves as a foundation for pedagogical activity and communication. The distinction lies not in the sophistication of the medium, but in the extent to which learners move from responding to teaching materials toward processing, producing, and using Arabic in meaningful exchanges.

Implications for the Development of Arabic Language Teaching Materials

The first implication of this discussion is the need to place pedagogical function before technological choice. Digital features certainly open up many possibilities, but not all of them need to be incorporated into teaching materials. Mayer (2020) reminds us that multimedia becomes effective when it is designed in accordance with how learners process information, rather than simply because it offers visually rich presentation. The development of Arabic language teaching materials should therefore begin with learning objectives and only then move to the selection of appropriate technology. The central question is not “what features can be added?”, but rather “what language activity does this feature make possible?”

Teaching materials also need to move from a pattern of consumption toward one of response. Reading texts, listening to audio, and watching videos remain important because they provide the input required for language learning. Yet such input should not end as something learners merely receive passively. Students need to be asked to answer, make reasoned choices, organize, construct, or restate the information they have acquired. The distinction among passive, active, and constructive modes of engagement proposed by Chi and Wylie (2014) helps illuminate this need. Interactive teaching materials, therefore, should give students something to do with language, not merely something to see or read.

Feedback is another element that should not be treated as an optional addition. Learners’ responses should ideally be followed by information indicating whether an answer is correct or incorrect, the quality of the response, or which aspects still require improvement. Such feedback may take the form of automated correction, teacher responses, peer responses, or *self-checking*, reflecting the needs identified by Al Husna et al. (2025). Without feedback, activities may continue to be repeated without a clear direction for improvement and can easily become mechanical exercises (Moreno & Mayer, 2007).

Greater space should also be created for Arabic language production. Teaching materials should not keep learners for too long at the level of recognizing forms or selecting correct answers, but should instead provide opportunities for them to produce language using their own linguistic choices. These opportunities may take the form of *speaking prompts*, open-ended dialogues, writing tasks, presentations, problem-solving activities, or information-based tasks that require students to formulate responses. Swain (2005) emphasizes that *output* helps learners recognize the gap between what they want to communicate and the linguistic resources they currently possess. In this context, production tasks are not merely supplementary activities to be completed after the material has been learned. Rather, they constitute an important space in which students can experiment, make mistakes, refine linguistic forms, and gradually use Arabic with greater independence.

At the same time, digitalization should not reduce learning to a relationship between the student and the screen. Language develops through interaction, and teaching materials therefore need to continue opening spaces for student-student, student-teacher, and student-broader language-use contexts (Richards, 2006; Long, 1996). Dialogues, discussions, collaborative projects, and presentations can serve as bridges toward such interaction; communicative approaches to Arabic language learning likewise position interaction as an important component in developing learner competence (Murtadho et al., 2025). Interactive Arabic language teaching materials, then, are not those with the greatest number of features, but those capable of constructing a sequence of activities that moves from input, response, and feedback to language production and, ultimately, communication.

4. Conclusion

This study shows that interactivity in Arabic language teaching materials does not take a single, uniform form. The literature analyzed points to at least three tendencies: technical, pedagogical, and communicative interactivity. Technical interactivity occurs primarily when learners respond to features, materials, or devices; pedagogical interactivity emerges when teaching materials encourage students to construct and produce responses; while communicative interactivity takes place when Arabic is used to interact with others and to construct meaning together. These three forms serve different pedagogical functions, yet they can also support one another. Interactivity can help sustain

learner engagement, broaden language processing, provide feedback, encourage both spoken and written production, and create opportunities for Arabic to be used in communicative activities.

These findings reaffirm that digital is not always interactive, and interactive is not always communicative. A teaching material may contain numerous features, navigation tools, audio, video, and quizzes without automatically generating a deeper learning experience. The quality of Arabic language teaching materials, therefore, should not be assessed solely on the basis of technological sophistication or the number of features employed, but also on the kinds of language activity they make possible. The development of teaching materials needs to bring technology together with pedagogical purposes and opportunities for communication. Digital features become more meaningful when they are able to connect input, response, feedback, language production, and interaction. In this way, technology is not treated as the goal of development, but as a means of expanding possibilities for learning and for the use of Arabic.

This study is limited by its exclusive reliance on a literature-based analysis. The proposed typology of interactivity remains analytical in nature and has not yet been tested directly on a specific teaching material or within a particular learning context. Nor does this study empirically measure the effectiveness of each form of interactivity. Future research may therefore examine this typology in relation to e-modules, applications, digital books, interactive multimedia, or particular Arabic language teaching materials. Such empirical testing is important for understanding how technical, pedagogical, and communicative interactivity operate in practice, and the extent to which each contributes to both the processes and outcomes of Arabic language learning.

References

- 'Azza, F., & Djamilah, W. I. F. (2024). Effectiveness of interactive learning media based on Articulate Storyline in overcoming challenges in Arabic language learning. *Tarling: Journal of Language Education*, 8(2), 283-298. <https://doi.org/10.24090/tarling.v8i2.12472>
- Al Husna, L., Ulum, M. S., Rosyidi, A. W., & Hilmi, M. (2025). A mixed-methods needs analysis for interactive multimedia-based Arabic teaching materials for Grade 8 at State Islamic Junior High School (MTsN) 17 Tanah Datar. *Arabiyatuna: Jurnal Bahasa Arab*, 9(2), 786-801. <https://doi.org/10.29240/jba.v9i2.14430>
- Azhar, M., Wahyudi, H., Promadi, P., & Masrun, M. (2023). Penggunaan teknologi dalam pembelajaran Bahasa Arab di Indonesia. *Jurnal Review Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 6(4), 3160-3168. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jrpp.v6i4.20984>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Chi, M. T. H., & Wylie, R. (2014). The ICAP framework: Linking cognitive engagement to active learning outcomes. *Educational Psychologist*, 49(4), 219-243. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2014.965823>
- El Hanif, H. (2022). Pengembangan bahan ajar Bahasa Arab berbasis multimedia interaktif kelas V MTs Ta'Mirul Islam Masaran Sragen. *JUPE: Jurnal Pendidikan Mandala*, 7(2), 473-483. <https://doi.org/10.58258/jupe.v7i2.3548>
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Fitriani, S. N., Syarifah, S., & Susanto, A. (2020). Pembelajaran Bahasa Arab interaktif melalui media E-Learning Madrasah di MTsN 1 Kota Malang. *Tarbiyatuna: Jurnal Pendidikan Ilmiah*, 5(2), 159-182. <https://doi.org/10.55187/tarjpi.v5i2.4206>
- George, M. W. (2008). *The elements of library research: What every student needs to know*. Princeton University Press.
- Haq, A. Z., Akmansyah, M., Erlina, E., & Koderi, K. (2024). Technology integration in Arabic language learning: A literature review on the effectiveness of e-learning and mobile applications. *Journal of Research in Instructional*, 4(2), 481-494. <https://doi.org/10.30862/jri.v4i2.473>
- Hermiwati, H., Hasyib, M. T. J., Machmudah, U., & Wicaksono, M. A. (2026). Enhancing Arabic vocabulary acquisition: Development of Learning Apps based interactive learning media. *Lisanudhad: Jurnal Bahasa, Pembelajaran, dan Sastra Arab*, 12(2), 50-80. <https://doi.org/10.21111/lisanudhad.v12i2.14687>

- Ilmiani, A. M., Ahmadi, A., Rahman, N. F., & Rahmah, Y. (2020). Multimedia interaktif untuk mengatasi problematika pembelajaran Bahasa Arab. *Al-Ta'rib: Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Arab*, 8(1), 17-32. <https://doi.org/10.23971/altarib.v8i1.1902>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012589042-7/50015-3>
- Mahmudah, M., Mahliatussikah, H., Solehudin, M., Masnun, M., & Batrisya, N. A. (2026). A multimodal instructional design model: Integrating infographics and interactive videos in Arabic language learning. *International Journal of Arabic Language Teaching*, 8(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.32332/ijalt.v8i01.11671>
- Mayer, R. E. (2020). *Multimedia learning* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316941355>
- Moore, M. G. (1989). Editorial: Three types of interaction. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 3(2), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923648909526659>
- Murtadho, M. A. C., Taufiq, M. A., Huda, H., & Baihaqi, M. (2025). Bridging communication and competence: The communicative approach in Arabic language education as a guide for advancing learner interaction and proficiency. *Alsuna: Journal of Arabic and English Language*, 8(2), 359-373. <https://doi.org/10.31538/alsuna.v8i2.7556>
- Nestia, B., Bukhori, E. M., & Huda, M. M. (2025). Integration of interactive Lumio media for the development of Arabic listening skills in Islamic senior high schools. *Arabiyatuna: Jurnal Bahasa Arab*, 9(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.29240/jba.v9i1.12441>
- Pakaya, N. A. N., Jundi, M., Sarif, S., Doni, C. P., Hasaniyah, N., & Seyit, V. (2025). Bridging engagement and comprehension: Evaluating Canva's effectiveness as a digital worksheet in Arabic writing. *Izdiyar: Journal of Arabic Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature*, 8(3), 387-406. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jiz.v8i3.41012>
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.
- Robi'ah, S., Shodiq, M. J., Tukimin, T., & Astuti, H. (2023). Development of interactive multimedia for Arabic vocabulary learning through Android applications. *International Journal of Arabic Language Teaching*, 5(2), 301-316. <https://doi.org/10.32332/ijalt.v5i02.7957>
- Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471-484). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Syarifah, S. (2024). Interactive multimedia-based Arabic language learning: A systematic literature review. *Jurnal Sustainable*, 7(2), 247-259. <https://doi.org/10.32923/kjmp.v7i2.4922>
- Zakaria, M. F., & Muhammad Nawawi, M. A. A. (2024). Roleplay sebagai aktiviti bahasa dalam pengajaran dan pembelajaran bahasa Arab. *ATTARBAWIY: Malaysian Online Journal of Education*, 8(2), 110-119. <https://doi.org/10.53840/attarbawiy.v8i2.244>