Affective Computing in Language Education: An Interdisciplinary Review of AI's Role in Mediating Learner Anxiety and Motivation

Mengqi Shuai *

School of Education, University of New South Wales, Sydney NSW 2052, Australia

* Corresponding Author Email: Z5569661@ad.unsw.edu.au

Abstract. Language learning is not just a cognitive task; it is a deeply emotional one. When learners feel anxious or unmotivated, a barrier can form that blocks learning, a phenomenon Stephen Krashen famously called the "Affective Filter Hypothesis" (AFH). Today, Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools like chatbots and adaptive apps are common in language education, raising a critical question: can these technologies help lower that filter? This review tackles this question by first establishing an analytical framework grounded in Krashen's original theory and enriched by a modern psychological perspective on motivation, Self-Determination Theory (SDT). It then examines the existing research on how AI performs in practice, looking at its role in creating "low-stakes" practice environments and boosting motivation through features like personalization and gamification. The findings are not always consistent, which pushes us to look deeper into the nuances of AI design. The review then explores the frontier of "affective computing" and confronts the unavoidable ethical challenges of AI, including data privacy and algorithmic bias. It ultimately argues that the best use of AI is not to replace teachers, but to serve as a powerful, emotion-aware tool that supports them.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Second Language Acquisition, Affective Filter Hypothesis, Self-Determination Theory, Learner Anxiety, Affective Computing, Educational Technology.

1. Introduction

Why is it that some students can study a foreign language for years and make little progress? Decades ago, the linguist Stephen Krashen offered an explanation that remains powerful today: negative feelings like anxiety and self-consciousness can create an invisible "affective filter" [1, 2]. This is something nearly every language teacher recognizes. When a student is afraid to speak up and make a mistake in class, even the clearest instruction may not be fully absorbed [2]. At its core, learning a language is a deeply emotional journey, not just a mental exercise of memorizing rules and vocabulary [3].

The recent rise of Artificial Intelligence (AI) seems to offer a new way to address this old problem. Nowadays, a wave of AI-powered learning tools, from conversational chatbots to adaptive apps, is promising a highly personalized learning experience [4]. This development leads directly to the central question of this paper: can these technologies actually help students lower their affective filters? The primary contention of this paper is that AI systems can facilitate a new style of learning environment—one that is inherently designed to be safer and more responsive to a learner's emotional state, which will lead to more effective language learning [4, 5].

2. The Theoretical Toolkit: Understanding the Emotional Side of Learning

2.1. What Exactly Is the "Affective Filter"?

In order to begin to think about how AI might mediate a learner's affect, we would need a solid foundation. A very powerful one is Stephen Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis (AFH) [1]. His metaphor was straightforward enough: picture in your mind, a filter, an invisible filter that sits in the student's mind. When a student is feeling confident or encouraged, this filter is low and allows the linguistic input to get in and allows the student to acquire language [1, 2].

But when this same student is feeling anxious - maybe they are stressed about making a mistake in front of the class or trying to speak the second language when they are not proficient - the affective filter goes up and becomes a barrier to the students' psychological functions. At that point, it does not matter how expertly the educator explains a grammar point, or makes poses a lesson, it won't matter if it doesn't 'sink in' [1].

Thus, the idea provides an example of the complex challenges created in any learning environment, in any context be it a brick and mortar school or a digital app. Simply because the linguistic input is comprehensible (what Krashen famously referred to as "i+1") [1] does not indicate the student is at a place to provide the input, absent of an environment that allows the student to feel secure enough to allow the input to come in [1]. While the AFH was introduced decades ago, it also begs an important question of our current technology: can an algorithm provide to what extent, a student would feel safe enough to let the input in? and will it build new walls, as we as educators can only begin to examine?

2.2. The Three Components of the Filter: Anxiety, Motivation, and Self-Confidence

According to Krashen, three fundamental emotions serve as variables that raise and lower this filter: anxiety, self-confidence, and motivation [1]. From Krashen's perspective, anxiety can often serve as the most powerful barrier to communication. Occasions where one learns a language are often more public than occasions where one solves a math problem in private [3]. A spoken sentence can feel like a performance, creating a natural anxiety about being judged for your speaking. When a student is worried about questions like, "How do I sound?" or "What will they think of my accent?" there is not much are to process language [1].

In Krashen's teaching, motivation serves as the main antidote. Motivation is the internal force that not only makes learners more open to receiving understandable input, but causes them to actively look for communicative opportunities to risk using the language [1]. The engine of motivation doesn't exist on its own. A teacher can fuel it directly by not just demanding students put energy into being excited about language learning, but by making the language meaningful. For example, helping students argue about a topic they actually care about, or allowing them to analyze the lyrics of a song they actually enjoy, provides choice and fuels their interest for a pedagogical segment that a grammar worksheet just doesn't [1].

Lastly, self-confidence is also related to the strength of the filter. Low self-esteem increases the filter because the students do not want to expose their weaknesses [2]. On the other hand, a positive educational environment that considers making mistakes an opportunity for learning can foster self-confidence needed for students to take risks in their language learning, which is key in language development [1,2].

2.3. A Deeper Look at Motivation: Self-Determination Theory (SDT)

While Krashen indicated that motivation was important, his definition was quite broad. A more specific concept can be found in a more recent and significantly influential psychological theory: Self-Determination Theory, or SDT [6]. The essence of SDT is that the quality of motivation matters more than the quantity [6]. SDT proposes that all human beings have three fundamental psychological needs: Autonomy (the experience of having choice and that one's actions are self-endorsed), Competence (the experience of being effective and able to achieve goals), and Relatedness (the experience of being connected to and cared for by others) [6, 7].

Though Krashen told us that motivation was important, his definition was rather vague. This is where a more recent psychological framework, Self-Determination Theory (SDT), is incredibly useful [6]. SDT argues that the quality of the motivation for learning matters much more than the quantity of the motivation to learn. SDT asserts that a student can only develop high-quality, self-determined motivation if their educational context meets three innate psychological needs: Autonomy (a sense of choice and control), Competence (feeling effective and capable), and Relatedness (feeling connected to others) [6, 7].

3. Can AI Tame Language Learning Anxiety?

3.1. Creating a "Safe Space" for Practice

Classroom anxiety is a result of the spotlight effect - fear of making a mistake in public. AI tools such as chatbots or virtual tutors present a powerful alternative - privacy. AI tools to allow students to have a safe space to practice speaking when the only audience is the AI - removing fear of social judgment [5].

An AI is not going to laugh at a student's incorrect pronunciation. An AI is not going to tap their feet at a student after their 5th attempt at conjugating a verb correctly. It has no social pressure.

This feeling of safety and security is important here, because it fosters what researchers' term "linguistic risk-taking," - the willingness to try a complex sentence or use that new word they just learned, without mental paralysis or anxiety. The AI tutor is available at all times especially after a student feels they have reclaimed control over their own learning process, by practicing word phrases off of the bus, or preparing for a presentation at midnight. That feeling of control, in itself, is a direct counter to anxiety [5].

3.2. Feedback Without the Fear

The way a teacher provides error correction can greatly affect how confident a learner feels. If feedback is too blunt or public, it can easily raise the learner's affective filter [1]. AI can circumvent some of these issues by providing immediate, personalized, and private feedback [4]. When a learner produces an error, the AI can point it out immediately, helping the learner correct it while the information is still fresh. Since this is an interaction between the learner and the AI system, the learner can eliminate fears of public embarrassment [4]. More sophisticated AI systems can also provide feedback in a gentle manner. Instead of just signaling an error, they can provide a correct model or use indirect strategies (e.g., "recasting," similar to how a teacher might correctly rephrase a student's sentence) to maintain the learner's confidence [8].

3.3. What the Evidence Says: A Complicated Picture

There are already some studies supporting the notion that AI can alleviate anxiety associated with language learning. Many studies have found that students report feeling less anxious when using AI tools, often attributing this to the private, non-judgmental nature of the interaction [4, 5]. However, the evidence isn't entirely one-sided. One notable study by El Shazly found that interacting with an AI chatbot actually led to a slight increase in anxiety for some learners, even though their speaking skills improved [9].

This contradiction suggests that the effect of AI on anxiety is not automatic. The impact depends heavily on the tool's design and implementation. A poorly designed AI with bad speech recognition or overly harsh feedback can simply trade social anxiety for technical frustration. This shifts the key research question from if AI reduces anxiety to how AI must be designed to do so effectively. It's a clear sign that principles from educational psychology must be integrated more deeply into the architecture of these systems.

4. AI as a Motivation Engine

4.1. Supporting Autonomy and Competence Through AI

As SDT suggests, high-quality motivation is built on feelings of autonomy and competence, and this is where AI technology shows significant promise. AI platforms can enhance learner autonomy by offering a level of personalization that is difficult to achieve in a traditional classroom [4]. Students can often choose topics they are interested in, set their own pace, and follow learning paths that are tailored to their individual needs [10]. This sense of ownership is crucial for internalizing motivation.

At the same time, AI's ability to create adaptive learning experiences directly supports a learner's sense of competence. AI systems, by examining performance, can also facilitate adjusting the level of challenge in a task to keep it challenging but not overly so, following Krashen's 'i+1' principle [1]. In doing so, learners are always making positive strides, building confidence, and having many successful experiences while avoiding boredom with tasks that are too easy and frustration with tasks that are too hard [4, 6].

4.2. The Power of Gamification

Gamification—the use of game-like elements in non-game contexts—is one of the most popular motivational strategies in modern language-learning apps [10, 11]. Features like points, badges, and leaderboards provide immediate positive reinforcement, while progress bars and level-ups give a clear sense of achievement [10]. Other elements, like daily "streaks," use principles of habit formation to encourage consistent practice.

While these features are effective at boosting engagement, a closer look through the lens of SDT reveals a more complex picture. Many of these gamified elements, especially those based on external rewards and social comparison, tap into extrinsic motivation [10]. According to a sub-theory of SDT, if learners perceive these external rewards as controlling rather than informational, it can actually undermine their intrinsic motivation [6]. For example, if a student's focus shifts from the joy of learning a language to the anxiety of not breaking their digital streak, the quality of their motivation may have decreased.

4.3. How AI Tools Really Measure Up: An SDT Analysis

When analyzing popular AI language tools using the SDT framework, it can be seen that how their design choices either support or hinder the core psychological needs. Duolingo, for instance, is a master of gamification and does an excellent job of supporting initial autonomy (choosing a language) and competence (completing tasks) [10]. However, its heavy emphasis on leaderboards could create anxiety and undermine relatedness for some users, while the pressure to maintain streaks might shift motivation from autonomous to more controlled forms [11].

Conversely, an application like ELSA Speak, which offers extensive feedback on pronunciation, strongly emphasizes the need for competence by providing students with an explicit pathway for development [4].

General-purpose conversational agents, such as ChatGPT, are a transformation in learner autonomy. Learners can ask to role-play ordering coffee in French, with AI as the café owner in Paris; they can ask to co-write a scene for a sci-fi movie in English; they can even ask to explain how to play baseball in Japanese. This freedom provides learners with boundless opportunities; it fulfills their autonomy, and it enables them to direct their own learning. Simultaneously, the AI can provide and instantaneously and engagingly explicate corrections, as well as a range of sophisticated vocabulary during the engagements, which also fulfills a strong sense of competence.

5. The Next Frontier: Can AI Understand Our Feelings?

5.1. From Correcting Answers to Responding to Emotions

Traditional adaptive learning technologies direct their attention to cognitive performance only. They adjust the content provided to the learner based on their level of accuracy and/or speed [12]. This type of approach does not account for the and emotions students experience while learning, even though emotions are linked to motivation and achievement in learning according to Pekrun's Control-Value Theory [13]. Recent developments in a new field known as Affective Computing, or Emotion AI, are trying to address this lack of attention to emotions by developing systems that can recognize, interpret, and respond to human emotions [14]. Affective Computing frameworks, signified by Emotionally Adaptive AI Systems, represent a sizeable shift because they pay attention to what a learner knows, but also to how a learner feels. Emotionally Adaptive AI Systems embed an ability to

infer a learner's emotional state through their interactions in real-time, and adjust the instructional strategies that have been proposed in the system accordingly, all to provide a more supportive, humanized, learning environment [12].

5.2. How AI Tries to Read Emotions

To enable emotional adaptability in AI, the initial requirement is an appropriate interpretation of the effect of the learner. Because human affect is multi-faceted, this typically requires a multimodal strategy that combines data from multiple sources [15]. In terms of education, these sources include the visual channel (using computer vision to identify and interpret facial expression and posture from a webcam [12]), the auditory channel (expressed through vocal cues like pitch and volume, to percept emotions) [15], physiological channels (wearable devices to measure signals, such as heart rate or skin response, to objectively measure arousal) [15], and the textual channel (Natural Language Processing to identify and analyze sentiment in a learner's written inputs) [15]. By integrating all of these sources, the system can identify a more reliable indicator of learner emotion and intervene accordingly [15].

5.3. Why the Human Teacher is Irreplaceable

Although these advances in technology are promising, an emerging body of research suggests that Affective AI is most useful not as a substitute for human teachers, but as a technology that supports their role [8]. Research has demonstrated that learning gains are significantly greater and more lasting when Affective AI is integrated with teacher scaffolding, as opposed to when Affective AI is used alone [8]. In this model, the teacher acts as a crucial mediator. They can contextualize the AI's feedback, help build appropriate trust in the technology, and, most importantly, fulfill the fundamental human need for relatedness by creating a supportive classroom community—something an AI simply cannot replicate [6, 8]. This points to a future where the most effective educational model is not a simple human-computer interaction, but a collaborative "human-AI-human" structure.

6. A Critical Look: The Risks and the Road Ahead

6.1. The "Double-Edged Sword": Is AI Making Us Lazy?

The simplicity of AI could be both beneficial and challenging-- pedagogically and technically. A pedagogically grave risk lexicon is “cognitive offloading” [16]. Why would a student need to spend 30 minutes working through a difficult text to arrive at the answer when an AI can summarize the original text in less than 30 seconds? Why would they need to struggle with creating a compound sentence that is grammatically correct when an AI can provide an instant response that is also grammatically correct? This type of experience comes with no friction--and provides learners with no friction with what educational researchers describe as “desirable difficulties” when cognitive offloading creates substantive and lasting learning [17].

Besides pedagogical shifts with learners, there are also limitations and constraints provided by the technology itself. In spite of their fluency, the AI systems created today are often impaired in tone and a constant misunderstanding when it comes to sarcasm, irony, and the social and cultural dynamics that accompany some conversations [5]. Moreover, the built-in bias of our language systems continues to be of concern. Given that the standardized language systems are trained in majority on standardized language, they are similarly biased against learners communicating in a regionalized accent or a dialectically nonstandard form of English, inherently marking these individual’s language choices as "errors".

6.2. The Ethical Minefield: Data, Bias, and Autonomy

First, the issue of privacy. When an ed-tech measures students’ frowns, or detects a difference in heart rate, or registers a slight quaver in their voice, who owns the data? What guarantees can we at

least start with to provide meaningful informed consent when the users of these technologies are kids, and it's more than clicking a legal checkbox [18]?

The second problem is one of algorithmic bias. If AI is trained on how one culture displays emotions, it will misinterpret the behaviours into other cultural expressions. The result could be a dangerous form of automated discrimination - "affective redlining" - where a system, not using the appropriate cultural data, flags a student's silence, or even reflective state, as confusion, or their frustration a lack of engagement, and they may miss out on opportunities as a result [19].

And our final dilemma, and possibly more fundamentally, is the issue of affective sovereignty: who gets to dictate the appropriate state of mind a student should be in? When AI designs nudge a learner away from what it deems a "nonproductive" state of boredom or frustration, is it supporting optimal learning, or is it conditioning the user, taking away a right to a given learning experience in all its vulnerability?

6.3. An Agenda for Future Research

First, we need more incisive and granular research methods. Longitudinal studies study the connection between AI and long-term impacts on factors like student motivation, anxiety, and lasting learning. Along that line, we simply need more experiments on AI features, for example to study when those features are effective, and the identities of relevant learners, which can sometimes address mixed results in the literature.

Second, researchers should be engaged partners in making connections across code, the classroom, and education policymaking. Coders, researchers, and educational practitioners ought to together establish ethical principles concerning affective computing before we create technology too quickly to informatively think about it.

Finally, and perhaps the most significant, we need research to expand its lens. We need research to expand to not just think about AI as a tool, but as part of the "teacher-AI-learner" ecological system. The focus and proximity lack the pedagogical considerations of why or how to ethically engage with technology like and / or within AI. The emphasis should be on social and pedagogical justification, rather than whether the AI can or will teach - the question is how we optimize the purpose and power of these new technologies in service of teachers; meanwhile we spousal education should not be a matter of simply leveraging powerful AI technology.

7. Conclusion

The literature examined suggests AI has some potential to be enabling of the affective filter in language learning and multi-dimensional potential. Overall, the findings suggest that well-designed AI will decrease the filter through the reduction of anxiety and increase motivation in individualized, non-judgmental spaces.

AI will not automatically offer potential. The potential will be created through intentional pedagogical design and intentional ethical consideration. There are potential dangers as well, like cognitive over dependency; injustice through algorithmic reinforce bias; and far more personal ethical concerns, like possible family privacy invasion. All of these are ethically significant considerations from that perspective.

In conclusion, the future of AI in language education is not about the teacher, but about teacher enhancement. The most productive, human-centered pathway for linguistic development is to regard AI as a responsive emotional tool, through the lens of insight and teacher care. This will ensure better, fairer, and humane learning experiences.

References

[1] Krashen S. Principles and practice in second language acquisition. 1982.

[2] Dulay H, Burt M. Remarks on creativity in language acquisition. Viewpoints on English as a second language, 1977, 2 (2): 95 - 126.

[3] Horwitz E K, Horwitz M B, Cope J. Foreign language classroom anxiety. The Modern Language Journal, 1986, 70 (2): 125 - 132.

[4] Wei L. Artificial intelligence in language instruction: impact on English learning achievement, L2 motivation, and self-regulated learning. Frontiers in Psychology, 2023, 14: 1261955.

[5] Naseer F, Khalid U, Qammar M Z, et al. Chatbots as conversational partners: Their effectiveness in facilitating language acquisition and reducing foreign language anxiety. Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT), 2024, 7 (4): 238 - 255.

[6] Ryan R M, Deci E L. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American Psychologist, 2000, 55 (1): 68.

[7] Noels K A. New orientations in language learning motivation: Towards a model of intrinsic, extrinsic and integrative orientations. Motivation and second language acquisition, 2001: 43 - 68.

[8] Ma Y, Chen M. The human touch in AI: Optimizing language learning through self-determination. Frontiers in Psychology, 2025, 16: 1568239.

[9] El Shazly R. Effects of artificial intelligence on English speaking anxiety and speaking performance: A case study. Expert Systems, 2021, 38 (3): e12667.

[10] Shortt M, Tilak S, Kuznetcova I, et al. Gamification in mobile-assisted language learning: A systematic review of Duolingo literature from public release of 2012 to early 2020. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 2023, 36 (3): 517 - 554.

[11] Lahji S. Improving English learning motivation with the English app Duolingo. Morfologi: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, Bahasa, Sastra dan Budaya, 2024, 2 (5): 194 - 203.

[12] Olukayode David. From static instruction to emotionally adaptive AI a new paradigm for human-centered learning explanations in education. 2025.

[13] Pekrun R. The control-value theory of achievement emotions: Assumptions, corollaries, and implications for educational research and practice. Educational Psychology Review, 2006, 18 (4): 315 - 341.

[14] Picard R W. Affective computing. MIT press, 2000.

[15] D'Mello S K, Graesser A C. AutoTutor and affective AutoTutor: Learning by talking with cognitively and emotionally intelligent computers. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 2012, 22 (1 - 2): 3 - 39.

[16] Sparrow B, Liu J, Wegner D M. Google effects on memory: Cognitive consequences of having information at our fingertips. Science, 2011, 333 (6043): 776 - 778.

[17] Bjork R A. Memory and metamemory considerations in the training of human beings. Metacognition: Knowing about knowing, 1994: 185 - 205.

[18] Calvo R A, Peters D. Positive computing: technology for wellbeing and human potential. MIT press, 2014.

[19] Barocas S, Selbst A D. Big data's disparate impact. California Law Review, 2016, 104: 671.