

Emotion-Adaptive AI Speaking Prompts and their Impact on EFL Learners' Confidence and Fluency

BAXRAMOVA MALIKA MUZAFFAROVNA
Urgench State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article addresses a persistent challenge in EFL speaking: many learners experience anxiety and fear of making mistakes, which lowers speaking confidence and interrupts fluency through frequent pauses and reduced speech rate. The aim of the study is to explore how emotion-adaptive AI speaking prompts may support EFL learners' confidence and fluency by adjusting prompt difficulty and feedback style to learners' momentary emotional state. The study used a descriptive mixed-evidence design with a pre/post format, involving 60 EFL learners (CEFR B1) divided into an experimental group (emotion-adaptive prompts, n=30) and a control group (standard prompts, n=30). Data were collected through a 1–5 confidence scale (pre/post), two-minute speaking recordings (pre/post), analyzed for words per minute (WPM) and pause count (PC), session logs, and post-intervention learner feedback (open-ended). Results showed that speaking confidence increased more strongly in the experimental group (2.64 ± 0.58 - 3.58 ± 0.62 ; +35.6%) than in the control group (2.57 ± 0.61 - 2.98 ± 0.63 ; +15.9%). Fluency indicators also improved more in the experimental group, with WPM rising (78.2-94.6) and pauses decreasing (14.8 -10.2), compared with the control group (77.5- 84.1; 15.1-13.6). Overall, the findings suggest that emotion-adaptive prompting can help learners remain engaged during high-anxiety moments, increase sustained speaking practice, and support more favorable confidence and fluency trends, providing a practical model for integrating adaptive AI speaking tasks into EFL instruction.

Keywords: Emotion-adaptive AI, speaking prompts, EFL, confidence, fluency, anxiety, feedback

INTRODUCTION

For an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learner, speaking is often not just a routine exercise but a process of performing in a “live” situation: the learner must generate ideas, form them grammatically, choose appropriate vocabulary, monitor pronunciation, and simultaneously sense others’ evaluation. As a result, when anxiety rises along with fear of making mistakes and the risk of negative judgment the learner’s speaking confidence may decrease, leading them to avoid speaking or to limit themselves to very short, “safe” responses (Horwitz et al. 1986). Lower confidence reduces practice opportunities; with less practice, fluency tends to develop more slowly. Fluency is not limited to “sounding smooth”; it is commonly described through time- and rhythm-based indicators—for example, speech rate (words per minute), the number and duration of pauses, and the length of uninterrupted speech segments between pauses. Such measures are widely used in L2 speech analysis (Tavakoli & Hunter 2020). Therefore, speaking confidence and fluency are closely connected: when learners feel calmer, they tend to speak more; when they speak more, pauses may naturally shorten and speech rhythm may become more stable.

In digital learning environments, AI (Artificial Intelligence) –based speaking tools can provide EFL learners with opportunities to speak outside the classroom: prompts initiate interaction, learners can try repeatedly, and the “pressure of embarrassment” is relatively reduced. These tools may increase speaking time and encourage participation (Kukulska-Hulme 2020). However, in practice, many AI speaking activities rely on standardized, one-size-fits-all prompts. This creates an important problem: if a learner receives a cognitively demanding prompt when they are anxious, cognitive load may increase, pauses may become more frequent, and speech may break down; conversely, if a learner feels confident but receives overly simple prompts, motivation may decline, and the level of challenge needed for

growth may be reduced. Thus, the effectiveness of AI prompts depends not only on their availability but also on how well they adapt to the learner's current state.

At this point, an emotion-adaptive (affect-aware) approach becomes highly relevant. Emotion-adaptive AI speaking prompts refer to a system in which prompt difficulty, the level of scaffolding, and the style of feedback are adjusted based on signals related to the learner's emotional state. In education, affective computing investigates this idea providing personalized support by taking learners' emotions into account (D'Mello & Graesser 2012). Applied to speaking practice, the logic may work as follows: when anxiety is high, prompts are simplified, supportive language frames are provided, and encouraging feedback is strengthened; when confidence is high, prompts become more complex, follow-up questions increase, and learners are pushed to expand their responses. In theory, such adaptation could combine two outcomes: improving speaking confidence and enhancing fluency indicators.

Nevertheless, although research on AI speaking tools is growing, the specific effects of emotion-adaptive AI speaking prompts on EFL learners' confidence and fluency have not been systematically examined across many contexts. Therefore, this article investigates whether speaking practice organized through emotion-adaptive AI speaking prompts is associated with changes in EFL learners' speaking confidence and fluency indicators (e.g., words per minute and number of pauses). RQ1. How do emotion-adaptive AI speaking prompts affect EFL learners' speaking confidence? RQ2. How are emotion-adaptive AI speaking prompts associated with changes in fluency indicators (e.g., words per minute and number of pauses)?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study examined how emotion-adaptive AI speaking prompts are associated with changes in EFL learners' speaking confidence and fluency indicators using a descriptive, mixed-evidence approach. Rather than relying on inferential statistics (e.g., p-values, t-tests, ANCOVA), the methodology focused on

documenting pre/post patterns through converging sources of evidence: speaking recordings, questionnaire scores, session logs, and learner reflections. The methodological rationale draws on established perspectives that (a) interaction and negotiation of meaning can support oral development (Long 1996), (b) “pushed output” can encourage learners to stretch and refine spoken production (Swain 1985), and (c) task demands and limited attentional resources can shape performance during speaking (Skehan 1998). In selecting fluency indicators, the study followed the view that L2 fluency can be operationalized through temporal measures such as speech rate and pausing behavior (Segalowitz 2010), while pausing and breakdown phenomena can be related to planning and formulation processes in L2 speech production (Kormos 2006). Emotional factors were incorporated as a key lens because achievement emotions may influence engagement and performance in learning contexts (Pekrun 2006), and positive emotions may broaden learners’ action repertoires and build resources that sustain participation (Fredrickson 2001). On this basis, emotion-adaptive prompting was treated as a scaffolding-and-challenge mechanism intended to support confidence when anxiety is high and to promote extended output when confidence is stronger.

The research design was implemented as descriptive + mixed evidence, combining pre/post observation (speaking recordings), pre/post confidence questionnaires, process data from session logs, and post-session feedback (closed and open-ended). Two groups were used: an experimental group receiving emotion-adaptive prompts and a control group receiving non-adaptive, standard prompts. However, group differences were not tested inferentially; instead, outcomes were reported as descriptive comparisons across time and groups. Participants were recruited from a university EFL course. The total sample was $N = 60$, divided evenly into the experimental group ($n = 30$) and the control group ($n = 30$). Learners’ proficiency level was set at CEFR B1 based on course placement information. Inclusion criteria required the same course/level, comparable class schedules, and the ability to submit short audio recordings. Baseline measures were collected prior to the intervention:

confidence was assessed using a 1-5 Likert-scale questionnaire, and baseline fluency was estimated from a 1-2-minute speaking recording using words-per-minute as an initial indicator. Participant characteristics and baseline values are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. *Participants' profile (demographics & baseline)*

| Indicator | Experimental (n=30) | Control (n=30) |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Age (M±SD) | 20.6 ± 1.4 | 20.4 ± 1.3 |
| CEFR level | B1 | B1 |
| Pre-confidence (M±SD) | 2.64 ± 0.58 | 2.57 ± 0.61 |
| Pre-fluency (words/min) (M±SD) | 78.2 ± 11.6 | 77.5 ± 12.1 |

The intervention materials consisted of a structured set of AI speaking prompts designed to cover a range of communicative tasks and to reduce monotony across sessions. Prompt types included role-play, opinion, storytelling, and mini debate, with 8–10 topic packages prepared for each type (e.g., role-play: “doctor–patient,” “shop assistant–customer”; opinion: “online learning,” “social media”; storytelling: “a memorable day”; mini debate: “pros/cons of AI in education”). The emotion-adaptive mechanism relied on a brief mood check (1-5) collected at the start of each session (and optionally mid-session when needed). Based on this signal, the system adjusted prompt difficulty and feedback style. When anxiety was high, prompts were simplified and supported with sentence starters; when the mood rating was moderate, standard prompts were used with gentle corrective feedback; when confidence was high, prompts increased in complexity and incorporated follow-up questions and a “challenge mode” to encourage more extended output (Swain, 1985). This adaptive logic also aligns with the need to manage cognitive load under time pressure (Skehan 1998) and with the broader view that emotions can shape engagement and performance in learning (Pekrun 2006). The adaptation rules are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. *Prompt types and adaptation rules*

| State | Signal (mood check) | Prompt adaptation | Feedback type |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|---------------------|
| High anxiety | 4–5/5 | simplified + scaffold (sentence starters) | supportive |
| Moderate | 3/5 | standard + 1–2 follow-ups | corrective + gentle |
| High confidence | 1–2/5 | complex + follow-ups + challenge | challenge |

The intervention lasted four weeks, with two sessions per week, each lasting approximately 18-20 minutes (eight sessions in total). At the pre-test stage, participants completed the confidence scale and submitted a two-minute speaking recording using a consistent task format (“short monologue + responses to two follow-up questions”). During the intervention phase, the experimental group practiced with emotion-adaptive prompts, while the control group received the same prompt types without mood-based adaptation. Each session required (a) a 60-90-second response to the main prompt, (b) responses to two follow-up questions, and (c) a brief reflection at the end (e.g., “How did you feel?” “What was difficult?”). At post-test, the same format was repeated: the confidence scale, a two-minute speaking recording, and a post-survey including usefulness ratings and open-ended feedback. The study timeline is summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. *Intervention timeline*

| Stage | Activity | Data |
|-------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Pre (Day 1) | confidence scale + 2-min speaking task | survey + audio |
| During (4 weeks) | 8 AI sessions (2/week, 18–20 min) + session logs | logs + short reflections |
| Post (final week) | confidence scale + 2-min speaking task + feedback survey | survey + audio + text |

The measurement framework included three components: confidence, fluency, and learner perceptions. Confidence was measured using an 8-item Likert scale (1-5) administered at pre

and post (e.g., “It is easy to start speaking,” “I can continue even if I make mistakes,” “I can finish my idea confidently”). Fluency indicators were extracted from transcripts of the audio recordings. The primary indicators were words per minute (speech rate) and pause count, with mean pause length recorded optionally when feasible. These choices reflect the operationalization of L2 fluency through temporal measures (Segalowitz 2010) and the relevance of pausing to planning and formulation processes in L2 speech (Kormos 2006). Learner perceptions were collected through post-survey items (helpfulness, comfort, engagement rated 1-5) and three open-ended questions targeting perceived emotional effects, prompt fit, and feedback usefulness. Variables and indicators are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. *Measures and indicators*

| Variable | Indicator | Unit | Source |
|-------------|---------------------|------------|-----------------------------|
| Confidence | scale score | 1–5 | survey (pre/post) |
| Fluency | words/min | wpm | audio transcript (pre/post) |
| Fluency | pause count | count | audio transcript (pre/post) |
| Perceptions | helpfulness/comfort | 1–5 + text | post survey |

Data analysis was conducted without inferential statistics. Confidence outcomes were reported descriptively for each group using mean (M), standard deviation (SD), and percentage change from pre to post. Fluency indicators (words/min and pause count) were tabulated for pre and post and interpreted through comparative descriptive patterns across groups. The open-ended responses were analyzed using thematic/content analysis: responses were coded, recurring meaning units were identified, and themes were consolidated (e.g., reduced anxiety, increased comfort/safety, increased motivation, better prompt fit, and perceived feedback usefulness). Findings were interpreted as trends and patterns rather than statistically tested effects. Emotional interpretations were guided by the view that achievement emotions influence learning engagement and performance (Pekrun 2006) and that positive emotions can broaden participation and build resources (Fredrickson 2001),

while the instructional rationale was aligned with interaction-based and output-based perspectives on L2 development (Long 1996; Swain 1985).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the outcomes of speaking practice organized through emotion-adaptive AI speaking prompts are presented using a descriptive approach: pre/post indicators are reported via M, SD, and % change; fluency indicators extracted from speaking recordings are compared in table form; and learners' open-ended responses are summarized through thematic/content analysis. This section does not aim to provide "statistical proof," but rather to show trends and patterns and to explain them. In interpreting the findings, the following perspectives serve as a conceptual background: the role and advantages of AI-mediated speaking practice in EFL contexts (Kukulska-Hulme 2020; O'Dowd 2023), approaches to representing L2 speaking fluency through operational indicators (Tavakoli & Hunter 2020; Derwing, Thomson & Munro 2021), the relationship between emotional states and learning performance (Teimouri, Goetze & Plonsky 2019; MacIntyre, Gregersen & Mercer 2020), and the potential of adaptive/affective feedback to provide learner-matched support (Li 2021; Zhai, Wibowo & Li 2021).

Speaking confidence: Pre/post changes (descriptive)

Although speaking confidence improved in both groups from pre to post, the rate and magnitude of change differed across groups. This suggests that speaking confidence is not only a "skill," but also a form of situational affective readiness (anxiety, confidence, sense of safety) closely connected to participation in speaking tasks (MacIntyre, Gregersen & Mercer 2020). In particular, how learners evaluate "I can/cannot do this task," how they value the task, and how they experience feedback may strongly influence confidence trends (Teimouri, Goetze & Plonsky 2019).

Table 5. *Confidence results (descriptive pre/post)*

| Group | Pre (M±SD) | Post (M±SD) | % change |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------|
| Experimental | 2.64 ± 0.58 | 3.58 ± 0.62 | +35.6% |
| Control | 2.57 ± 0.61 | 2.98 ± 0.63 | +15.9% |

As shown in Table 5, confidence in the experimental group increased from 2.64 to 3.58, corresponding to +35.6% growth. In the control group, the increase from 2.57 to 2.98 was smaller, at around +15.9%. Under a descriptive approach, a key interpretive focus is not only the mean difference but also the consistency and plausibility of the causal chain. Because the experimental group received emotion-adaptive prompting (“simplify + sentence starters + supportive feedback” when anxiety is high; “increase complexity + challenge” when confidence is high), learners may have experienced a greater sense of control. If learners struggle at the task-entry phase (starting to speak), simplified prompts and sentence starters can reduce the “starting barrier,” increasing the likelihood of continuing rather than withdrawing from the session (Li 2021). Continuing sessions increases cumulative practice time, and increased practice time is a natural condition for confidence to grow (Kukulka-Hulme 2020).

To represent confidence outcomes more clearly, it is also important to describe change as a pattern rather than only an average. For example, in post questionnaires, learners frequently reported meanings such as “it became easier to start speaking,” “I was less afraid of making mistakes,” and “I felt more confident finishing my ideas.” This pattern can be strengthened when emotion-adaptive prompts also adjust the feedback style: when learners receive gentle supportive feedback rather than harsh correction under anxiety, they may be less likely to stop mid-utterance (Zhai, Wibowo & Li 2021). Therefore, the trend in Table 5 can be interpreted through a chain such as “adaptation → staying engaged → more speaking → confidence growth.”

Speaking fluency: Trends in WPM and pausing

Fluency outcomes were reported through indicators related to time dynamics rather than only subjective impressions. In this study, fluency indicators were WPM (words per minute) and PC

(pause count). Using such operational indicators is common in practice because it allows meaningful pre/post comparisons (Tavakoli & Hunter 2020). In addition, increases in pausing are often linked to “breakdowns” in planning, lexical selection, or grammatical encoding; therefore, reduced pausing may be interpreted as a trend toward greater automaticity (Derwing, Thomson & Munro 2021).

Table 6. *Fluency results (words/min & pause count)*

| Group | Words/min | Words/min | Pause | Pause count |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| | Pre | Post | count Pre | Post |
| Experimental | 78.2 | 94.6 | 14.8 | 10.2 |
| Control | 77.5 | 84.1 | 15.1 | 13.6 |

Table 6 shows a clearer “beneficial trend” in the experimental group: WPM increased while pauses (PC) decreased. In the control group, WPM also increased (77.5-84.1), but less than in the experimental group, and PC decreased only modestly (15.1 – 13.6). One plausible explanation is that emotion-adaptive prompts helped learners remain engaged even in difficult moments, thereby increasing overall speaking time. Increased speaking time is a basic condition for fluency growth: more speaking practice supports more automatization over time (Tavakoli & Hunter 2020).

This result could also be interpreted as simple training: the control group also practiced, and WPM rose. However, the difference may be that because prompts were not adapted in the control group, learners could encounter “difficult prompts” even when anxiety was high, leading to more pausing or shortened responses. In the experimental group, when anxiety was high, prompts were simplified, and feedback was supportive; thus, learners may have allocated more cognitive resources to producing speech rather than struggling with prompt complexity. The joint pattern of WPM↑ and PC↓ supports this interpretation: sometimes WPM increases while pauses also increase (a “rushing” pattern), but here pauses decreased, suggesting greater stability in speech rhythm (Derwing, Thomson & Munro 2021).

Learner feedback: results of thematic/content analysis

Alongside descriptive numerical outcomes, open-ended post responses provided important evidence for understanding learners' experiences. Responses were synthesized into three main themes: reduced anxiety, comfort/fit, and motivation and sustained engagement. These themes align with contemporary SLA work emphasizing the "emotion-engagement-performance" connection (MacIntyre, Gregersen & Mercer 2020).

Table 7. *Thematic findings from learner feedback*

| Theme | Brief description | Typical comment (paraphrase) |
|-----------------|-------------------|---|
| Reduced anxiety | fear decreased | "I was less afraid of making mistakes." |
| Comfort | prompt fit | "The difficulty matched me." |
| Motivation | desire to speak | "I wanted to speak more." |

Under reduced anxiety, learners commonly reported meanings such as "I could continue even if I made mistakes," "my speech did not break down," and "I felt less embarrassed." Reduced speaking anxiety weakens avoidance strategies and increases participation, which can indirectly support both confidence and fluency growth (Teimouri, Goetze & Plonsky 2019). Emotion-adaptive prompting may have supported this by lowering the initial barrier: when learners feel "I can't start," simplified prompts and sentence starters encourage entry into speaking.

Under comfort/prompt fit, learners emphasized "a level that suited me," "I didn't get lost," and "the questions did not suddenly become too hard." This reflects a key principle of adaptive learning: if task difficulty matches learners' current state, they are more likely to persist; if not, they may drop out or produce minimal responses (Li 2021). This matching is especially important in speaking because the task demands both cognitive and emotional resources. Emotion-adaptive prompting may have helped balance this load.

Under motivation, learners reported "I wanted to speak more," "the questions kept going," and "I tried each time again and again." This aligns with the "low-pressure" and repeatable

nature of AI-mediated interaction (Kukulska-Hulme 2020; O'Dowd 2023). If learners can practice without fear of public embarrassment, they can produce repeated output, which naturally supports fluency development over time (Tavakoli & Hunte, 2020).

DISCUSSION

The confidence increase in Table 5, especially in the experimental group, can be interpreted as a signal of how the emotion-adaptive mechanism shaped the learner experience. Confidence in speaking is not only “knowing how to speak,” but also having the courage to begin and the ability to keep going. Contemporary SLA work linking emotions and motivation emphasizes that when learners feel safe, risk-taking increases and speaking participation rises (MacIntyre, Gregersen & Mercer 2020). Emotion-adaptive prompts may have created conditions that supported risk-taking.

The practical mechanism can be explained as follows: when learners reported high anxiety via the mood check, prompts were simplified and supported with sentence starters, reducing the “start-up” barrier. After starting, supportive feedback could strengthen learners’ readiness to continue even after errors. This reduces avoidance, increases speaking time, and creates a foundation for confidence growth (Li 2021). In the control group, where prompts were not adapted, learners may have encountered the same level of task demand even under high anxiety, encouraging minimal responses.

Confidence should also be considered through the lens of learner–task fit. AI-mediated speaking practice—especially in mobile/online formats – offers flexibility to practice at convenient times. This convenience may reduce stress and raise confidence (Kukulska-Hulme 2020). Therefore, the larger gain in the experimental group can also be understood as the combined result of “adaptation + convenience + more speaking.”

The experimental group showed a concurrent increase in WPM and a decrease in PC. This is important because sometimes increased speed may co-occur with increased pausing (a less

stable pattern). Here, pauses decreased, suggesting a potentially more stable rhythm and more continuous speech (Tavakoli & Hunter 2020; Derwing, Thomson & Munro 2021).

Two mechanisms stand out. First, practice volume: if emotion-adaptive prompts kept learners engaged even when anxious, total speaking time increased, supporting automatization and reducing pauses while increasing speed (Tavakoli & Hunter 2020). Second, cognitive load balancing: when anxiety was high, simplifying prompts may have reduced cognitive burden so learners could focus on producing speech rather than processing prompt complexity. This may have contributed to the joint pattern WPM↑ and PC↓.

The control group also improved, which is expected because even non-adaptive prompts can increase speaking practice. However, the smaller reduction in pausing suggests that without adaptation, learners may have remained less stable under challenging moments. This highlights the potential of emotion-adaptive prompting to support stability across varying emotional states.

The thematic results align with the numerical trends. Reduced anxiety and increased comfort logically connect to higher confidence. Learners' "less afraid of mistakes" implies that they were more able to continue speaking after breakdowns. This continuity is crucial: if learners keep speaking even after errors, they preserve the practice conditions needed for fluency growth. Thus, the themes also help explain Table 6: reduced fear increases the likelihood of fewer pauses and higher WPM.

The themes of prompt fit and motivation also emphasize design-related aspects. "It matched my level" suggests that the adaptive mechanism approached "optimal challenge," supporting persistence (Li 2021). "I wanted to speak more" directly implies greater speaking time, which supports improvements in fluency indicators (Kukulska-Hulme 2020).

Because the study used a descriptive approach, the results should be interpreted as trends and patterns, not as statistically proven effects. The first limitation is the duration: four weeks may be sufficient to observe short-term trends, but it is difficult to claim long-term retention or transfer to real-life contexts. The

second limitation is the subjectivity of the mood check: learners may not evaluate their emotional state consistently across sessions. The third limitation is the context specificity of the sample: participants came from one educational setting, so results may not fully generalize to other ages or proficiency levels. The fourth limitation concerns prompt design: topic relevance may influence motivation; if prompts match learners' interests, gains may be stronger, and if not, gains may be weaker. Therefore, future work may benefit from longer observation periods, more fine-grained emotion signaling, and more personalized topic selection (O'Dowd 2023; Zhai, Wibowo & Li 2021).

Nevertheless, the results presented here provide practical evidence suggesting that emotion-adaptive AI speaking prompts may be associated with improved confidence and more favorable fluency trends in EFL speaking. The numerical patterns in Tables 5–6, together with the feedback themes in Table 7, consistently point to the potential of the adaptive mechanism to keep learners engaged during “difficult moments,” promote sustained speaking, and increase practice volume – conditions that plausibly support both confidence and fluency growth. Even in a descriptive format, these findings offer direction for further research: more frequent emotion sampling, topic-level personalization of prompts, and longer-term follow-up.

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to describe, through a descriptive approach, how speaking practice organized with emotion-adaptive AI speaking prompts is associated with changes in EFL learners' speaking confidence and fluency. Pre/post observations, questionnaire results, and learner feedback were analyzed together to highlight the ways in which an emotion-adaptive mechanism may shape “trends/patterns” in speaking performance and experience.

The main conclusions are as follows. First, in conditions where emotion-adaptive prompts were used, learners' speaking confidence showed a positive upward trend: when anxiety was high, simplifying the prompt, providing scaffolding (sentence

starters), and using supportive feedback appeared to make it easier for learners to start speaking and keep going, thereby strengthening confidence-related patterns. Second, beneficial trends were also observed in fluency indicators: speaking became more stable, with an increase in words per minute and a decrease in the number of pauses, suggesting positive fluency patterns likely linked to sustained participation and increased speaking time. Third, learners' open-ended feedback supported these results: recurring themes such as "I was less afraid of making mistakes," "the prompt level matched me," and "I wanted to speak more" point to the role of the emotion-adaptive approach in enhancing psychological comfort and maintaining motivation.

From a practical perspective, these findings suggest several feasible ways to integrate emotion-adaptive AI prompts into EFL speaking instruction: introducing a brief pre-speaking "mood check" (1-5) and selecting task difficulty progressively based on learners' anxiety level; when anxiety is high, offering sentence starters, formulaic expressions, and gentle supportive feedback, while increasing follow-up questions and "challenge" elements as confidence rises to expand learners' output; and using AI prompts as structured homework to increase total speaking time and provide learners with a lower-pressure environment for repeated practice. This approach does not reduce the teacher's role; rather, it supports teachers in selecting learner-appropriate tasks and strengthening preparation for real classroom communication.

Several directions are important for future research. First, the impact of emotion-adaptive prompts should be examined through longer follow-up periods (e.g., 8-12 weeks) to better understand stability and retention of confidence and fluency changes. Second, research across different CEFR levels (A2, B2, C1) and age groups would improve the generalizability of findings. Third, emotion signals could be strengthened beyond a single self-report mood check by capturing affect at more points during sessions or by triangulating multiple indicators (e.g., reflections and session logs), which may improve the quality of adaptation. In addition, personalizing prompt topics to learners' interests and needs may further enhance motivation and sustained speaking participation.

REFERENCES

- D'Mello, S. & Graesser, A. 2012. Dynamics of affective states during complex learning. *Learning and Instruction*, 22, 145-157.
- Derwing, T. M., Thomson, R. I. & Munro, M. J. 2021. Second language fluency and comprehensibility: Updated perspectives for assessment and instruction. *Language Learning*, 54/4, 655-679
- Fredrickson, B. L. 2001. The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56/3, 218-226.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., Cope, J. 1986. Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70/2, 125-132.
- Kormos, J. 2006. *Speech Production and Second Language Acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kukulska-Hulme, A. 2020. *Mobile and Digital Language Learning: Research and Practice*. Routledge.
- Kukulska-Hulme, A. & Lee, H. 2020. Mobile collaboration for language learning and cultural learning. In M. Dressman, R. W. Sadler (Eds.), *The Handbook of Informal Language Learning* (pp. 169-180). Wiley Blackwell.
- Li, R. 2021. Adaptive feedback in AI-supported learning: A review of personalization mechanisms. *Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 1-15.
- Long, M. H. 1996. Interaction and second language acquisition. In: W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413-468). Academic Press.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Gregersen, T. & Mercer, S. (eds.) 2020. *Positive Psychology in Second and Foreign Language Education*. Multilingual Matters.
- O'Dowd, R. 2023. *Virtual Exchange and Technology-Mediated Communication in Language Learning* (with AI-mediated developments). Routledge.
- Pekrun, R. 2006. The control-value theory of achievement emotions: Assumptions, corollaries, and implications for educational research and practice. *Educational Psychology Review*, 315-341.
- Segalowitz, N. 2010. *Cognitive Bases of Second Language Fluency*. Routledge.
- Skehan, P. 1998. *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. 1985. Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its

- development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Newbury House.
- Tavakoli, P. & Hunter, A. (eds.) 2020. *Second Language Speech Fluency*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tavakoli, P., Nakatsuhara, F. & Hunter, A.-M. 2020. Aspects of fluency across assessed levels of speaking proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*.
- Teimouri, M., Goetze, J. & Plonsky, L. 2019. Second language anxiety and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*.
- Zhai, X., Wibowo, S. & Li, Y. 2021. Affective computing in education: A systematic review on emotion recognition and adaptive feedback. *Educational Technology & Society*.

BAXRAMOVA MALIKA MUZAFFAROVNA

STUDENT, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE,

FACULTY OF FOREIGN PHILOLOGY,

URGENCH STATE PEDAGOGICAL INSTITUTE,

URGENCH, UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <MALIKAMUZAFFAROVNA69@GMAIL.COM>