p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/IEFLJ/index

p-ISSN 2252-7427 e-ISSN 2541-3635
Indonesian EFL Journal
AISEE
The Association of Indonesia Scholars of English Education

# TEACHER-MEDIATED EMOTION REGULATION IN GENAI-ASSISTED EFL LEARNING: A MULTI-PERSPECTIVAL IPA STUDY IN INDONESIA

**Nirwanto Maruf[*1], Dahlia Husain[2], Ummi Khaerati Syam[3]**
[1]*Master's Program in English Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Gresik, Gresik, Indonesia*
[2]*English Literature, Faculty of Social Sciences, Universitas Muhammadiyah Gorontalo, Indonesia*
[3]*Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia*

**Corresponding author's email:** nirwanto.maruf@umg.ac.id

APA Citation: Maruf, N., Husain, D., & Syam, U. K. (2026). Teacher-mediated emotion regulation in GenAI-assisted EFL learning: A multi-perspectival IPA study in Indonesia. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, *12*(3), 869-880. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v12i3.190

Received: 05-03-2026 Accepted: 12-05-2026 Published: 20-09-2026

**Abstract:** Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is increasingly embedded in English as a foreign language (EFL) learning, creating new forms of support as well as emotional uncertainty. Although learner emotions during GenAI use are increasingly documented, how teachers interpret and mediate these emotions remains underexplored, particularly in Indonesian EFL higher education. This study examines students' GenAI-related emotional experiences, lecturers' mediation practices, and points of convergence or divergence across the two perspectives. Employing a multi-perspectival interpretative phenomenological analysis, data were gathered through critical-incident interviews with three lecturers and six undergraduate students across three Indonesian universities. The analysis indicates that GenAI could shift rather than simply reduce anxiety: students described authenticity-related guilt, imposter-like feelings, frustration, and algorithmic helplessness when AI output exceeded their confidence or contradicted classroom knowledge. Lecturer accounts showed extrinsic regulation through permission-giving, demonstrations of AI fallibility, reassurance, and cognitive reframing. Cross-perspectival comparison further showed that these forms of support were weakened when institutional guidance on acceptable GenAI use was experienced as ambiguous. Responsible GenAI integration therefore depends on teacher-mediated emotional scaffolding, critical AI evaluation, and clear institutional guidance that supports learner agency and academic integrity.
**Keywords:** *Generative artificial intelligence; emotion regulation; interpretative phenomenological analysis; teacher mediation; English as a foreign language.*

## INTRODUCTION

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has moved rapidly from a peripheral innovation to a routine resource in language education, supporting dialogue, feedback, idea generation, translation, and text development. Recent systematic reviews show a sharp expansion of empirical work, concentrated especially in higher education and EFL contexts, while also identifying persistent concerns about inaccurate output, overreliance, academic integrity, and uneven pedagogical guidance (Escalante et al., 2023; Kohnke et al., 2023; Li et al., 2025; Lee et al., 2026; Lo et al., 2024; Qian, 2025). Global evidence likewise indicates that students value GenAI for brainstorming, summarizing, and academic support but remain uncertain about reliability, plagiarism, and appropriate use (Ravšelj et al., 2025). These tensions suggest that GenAI integration is not only a technical or cognitive issue; it also reorganizes the emotional conditions under which language learning occurs.

Emotion is central to second-language learning because learners' affective experiences shape attention, motivation, participation, persistence, and performance (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014, 2024; Shao et al., 2019). Pekrun's control-value theory (CVT) explains such emotions through learners' appraisals of control over a task and the value attached to it (Pekrun, 2024). GenAI can alter both appraisals: immediate assistance may increase perceived control, whereas opaque,

contradictory, or hallucinated output can reduce it. Empirical studies consequently report mixed affective effects, including enjoyment, confidence, engagement, anxiety reduction, uncertainty, frustration, and dependence (Hady et al., 2024; Kohnke & Moorhouse, 2025; Rezai et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024; Yang & Zhao, 2024; Zhang et al., 2024; Zhou & Hou, 2024; Zheng, 2024). A recent systematic review confirms that learner emotions and emotion regulation are becoming central concerns in AI-assisted ESL/EFL research (Zhang & Liu, 2025).

Emotion regulation therefore offers an important lens for understanding how learners respond to GenAI-related uncertainty. Gross's process model locates regulation across situation selection, situation modification, attentional deployment, cognitive change, and response modulation (Gross, 1998). Yet regulation in classrooms is not exclusively intrapersonal. Teachers can modify learning situations, direct attention, normalize uncertainty, reframe errors, model critical evaluation, and help students select more constructive responses. Research on teacher emotion regulation and emotional scaffolding shows that such interpersonal processes are consequential for classroom interaction and learner engagement (Aldrup et al., 2024; Rafidi & Wagner, 2024; Shahidzade et al., 2022).

This interpersonal dimension remains insufficiently specified in GenAI-assisted language education. Much recent teacher-focused research has examined AI literacy, competence, acceptance, preparedness, professional identity, or teachers' own emotions (Abdullatif, 2024; Ding et al., 2024; Moorhouse et al., 2024; Seyri & Ghiasvand, 2025; Sperling et al., 2024; Yuan et al., 2026). By contrast, less is known about the pedagogical work through which teachers recognize students' AI-induced emotions, interpret their sources, and co-regulate those emotions during language-learning activity. This distinction is theoretically important because GenAI can become an object of epistemic trust and perceived authority; learners may experience emotional consequences not simply from task difficulty but from uncertainty over whether, when, and how the machine should be trusted (Pandey et al., 2025).

The Indonesian context makes this question especially significant. National guidance on GenAI in higher education calls for ethical, transparent, responsible, and pedagogically purposeful use while protecting academic integrity and data privacy (Kusumawardani et al., 2024). Emerging Indonesian evidence nevertheless shows that students and educators continue to negotiate the boundaries between productive assistance, overreliance, plagiarism, and critical scholarly practice (Barus et al., 2025; Ilma & Rohmah, 2025; Pratiwi et al., 2025). This policy-practice gap matters for EFL teacher education because language learners often use GenAI directly for drafting, reformulation, feedback, and linguistic correction, activities in which authorship, competence, and identity are especially visible. Clear governance and teacher preparation are therefore likely to shape not only ethical behaviour but also learners' emotional security.

Methodologically, the field remains dominated by surveys, short-term interventions, and variable-centred accounts, even as recent reviews call for more context-sensitive and longitudinal investigation (Abdallah et al., 2025; Lem et al., 2026; Lee et al., 2026; Li et al., 2025). Such designs are valuable for identifying broad tendencies, but they provide less access to how emotionally consequential episodes unfold and how teachers and students make sense of the same pedagogical process from different positions. Interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) is therefore appropriate because it prioritizes idiographic depth and participants' meaning-making while acknowledging the researcher's interpretative role (Smith, 2004; Smith et al., 2022).

The study integrates three theoretical traditions in a functional sequence rather than as parallel labels. CVT is used to interpret the control and value appraisals from which GenAI-related emotions emerge (Pekrun, 2024); Gross's model identifies where and how regulation is attempted (Gross, 1998); and Vygotskian sociocultural theory explains how regulation can be mediated interpersonally through contingent support, modelling, and scaffolded participation (Lantolf et al., 2021). Together, these perspectives conceptualize teacher-mediated emotion regulation as a relational process through which teachers can reshape learners' appraisals of GenAI, support cognitive reappraisal, and gradually strengthen critical agency rather than simply manage emotional reactions after they occur.

Accordingly, this multi-perspectival IPA study addresses three questions: (1) How do Indonesian EFL students experience and make sense of emotions arising during GenAI-assisted English language learning? (2) How do Indonesian EFL teachers experience and interpret their role in mediating and scaffolding students' regulation of GenAI-related emotions? and (3) Where do

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/IEFLJ/index

student and lecturer accounts converge or diverge regarding the functions and limits of teacher-mediated emotion regulation in GenAI-assisted EFL learning? The study's novelty lies in connecting AI-induced control-value appraisals with socially mediated emotion regulation and in showing how that relational process is conditioned by institutional rules. It contributes theoretically by extending emotion-regulation inquiry beyond predominantly intrapersonal accounts; methodologically by offering an idiographic, cross-perspectival analysis; and contextually by explaining how Indonesian EFL learners and lecturers negotiate affect, agency, and academic-integrity uncertainty within an evolving national GenAI policy environment.

## METHOD

This study employed a multi-perspectival interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) to investigate teacher-mediated emotion regulation in GenAI-assisted EFL learning. IPA was selected because the study sought to understand how participants interpreted emotionally and pedagogically consequential experiences rather than to estimate their frequency or prevalence (Smith, 2004; Smith et al., 2022). To examine the relational dynamics of emotional mediation, lecturer and student perspectives were recruited and analyzed independently. The design did not use matched lecturer-student dyads, which reduced the risk that hierarchical relationships would constrain disclosure. Each case was analyzed ideographically before patterns of convergence, divergence, and tension were examined across the two participant groups.

The study was conducted across three higher-education institutions in East Java, South Sulawesi, and Gorontalo provinces, Indonesia. The settings are characterized by a mix of public and private universities offering undergraduate English Education and English Literature programs. At the time of data collection, these institutions were navigating evolving academic integrity guidelines that permitted GenAI for brainstorming and language refinement but strictly prohibited automated text generation for final submissions. Additionally, all sites provided robust technological infrastructure, including campus-wide high-speed Wi-Fi and access to digital learning platforms.

Using purposive criterion sampling, the study recruited three EFL lecturers and six undergraduate students (N = 9). This sample size is consistent with IPA's idiographic commitment to intensive case-by-case analysis rather than statistical representativeness. Lecturer inclusion criteria were: (a) active tertiary-level EFL teaching with at least five years of experience; (b) direct pedagogical engagement with GenAI; and (c) experience responding to students' emotional reactions during GenAI-assisted learning. Student criteria were: (a) enrolment in a university EFL course; (b) active use of GenAI tools such as ChatGPT or Gemini for language learning; and (c) experience of lecturer mediation related to GenAI use. Demographic and experiential information was collected to contextualise each account; Table 1 summarises the participant profile fields required for reporting.

Table 1. *Participant demographic and GenAI-use profile*

| Participant | Role | Age | Gender | English Proficiency | Main GenAI Tool(s) | GenAI Experience | Frequency of GenAI Use |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| L1 | EFL Lecturer | 42 | Male | Advanced (C1) | ChatGPT, Gemini | Approx. 2 years | Several times a week |
| L2 | EFL Lecturer | 38 | Female | Advanced (C1) | ChatGPT, Gemini | Approx. 2 years | Several times a week |
| L3 | EFL Lecturer | 45 | Male | Advanced (C1) | ChatGPT, Gemini | Approx. 2.5 years | Almost daily |
| S1 | Undergraduate Student | 21 | Female | Upper-intermediate (B2) | ChatGPT | Approx. 2 years | Almost daily |
| S2 | Undergraduate Student | 20 | Male | Intermediate (B1) | ChatGPT, Gemini | Approx. 1.5 years | Several times a week |
| S3 | Undergraduate Student | 21 | Female | Upper-intermediate (B2) | ChatGPT | Approx. 2 years | Almost daily |
| S4 | Undergraduate | 20 | Female | Intermediate (B1) | ChatGPT, Gemini | Approx. 1 year | Several times a week |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Student | | | | | | |
| S5 | Undergraduate Student | 22 | Male | Upper-intermediate (B2) | Gemini, ChatGPT | Approx. 2 years | Several times a week |
| S6 | Undergraduate Student | 21 | Female | Intermediate (B1) | ChatGPT | Approx. 1.5 years | Almost daily |

Table 1 presents the participants' demographic characteristics and their prior engagement with GenAI tools. The lecturer participants were experienced tertiary-level EFL educators with advanced English proficiency and regular experience using GenAI for pedagogical purposes. The student participants were undergraduate EFL learners aged approximately 20–22 years, with English proficiency ranging from intermediate to upper-intermediate levels. All participants reported prior experience using GenAI tools, particularly ChatGPT and Gemini, for language-learning or academic purposes.

Data were generated through individual semi-structured, in-depth interviews using critical-incident prompts. The prompts elicited specific episodes of GenAI use, the emotions associated with those episodes (e.g., anxiety, uncertainty, relief, enjoyment, or dependency), and any pedagogical intervention that followed. Focusing on concrete incidents helped participants describe temporally situated experiences rather than only general attitudes toward GenAI.

Student interviews explored emotional experiences during GenAI use and the perceived influence of lecturer mediation, including reassurance, restriction, critical questioning, and clarification of acceptable use. Lecturer interviews focused on how they recognized student emotions and interpreted their pedagogical responsibilities. The interview protocols were refined through expert review and pilot testing with two lecturers and three students who were not included in the final sample. Interviews lasted 60-90 minutes and were conducted in Bahasa Indonesia, English, or a mixture of both according to participants' communicative preferences. Online interviews were conducted via Zoom because participants were geographically dispersed. Sessions were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and checked against the recordings. Field notes and a reflexive journal were maintained throughout data generation.

Data were analyzed independently for each participant following the idiographic logic of IPA. Each transcript was read repeatedly alongside the audio recording, followed by descriptive, linguistic, and conceptual noting. These exploratory comments were developed into personal experiential themes for each case. Only after the individual cases had been analyzed were patterns considered within the lecturer group and within the student group, thereby preserving case-level nuance before moving to group-level interpretation.

A cross-perspectival analysis then compared lecturer and student experiential themes to identify convergence, complementarity, divergence, and tension in accounts of teacher-mediated emotion regulation. NVivo 14 (QSR International) was used for data management and thematic organization. The theoretical frameworks were applied only after the idiographic themes had been developed; they functioned as sensitizing interpretative lenses rather than as a priori coding categories.

The three frameworks addressed different interpretative questions. CVT was used to examine how participants described changes in perceived control and task value when GenAI helped, contradicted, or exceeded their own linguistic judgement (Pekrun, 2024). Gross's model was used to interpret the locus and form of regulation, such as situation modification, attentional deployment, and cognitive change (Gross, 1998). Sociocultural theory was used to interpret how teacher talk, modelling, reassurance, and guided evaluation operated as mediated support that could be internalized as more autonomous critical judgement (Lantolf et al., 2021). Using the frameworks sequentially in this way allowed theory to deepen interpretation without replacing participants' experiential meanings.

Methodological rigor was supported through several complementary procedures. Credibility was strengthened by criterion-based sampling, critical-incident interviewing, repeated engagement with each transcript, and retention of divergent accounts rather than forcing thematic uniformity. A reflexive journal, field notes, and analytic memos provided an audit trail for interpretative decisions. Peer debriefing with a qualitative research colleague examined the fit between data excerpts and experiential themes and

prompted reconsideration of alternative interpretations. Thick description of participants and institutional contexts was used to support readers' judgements of transferability rather than claims of statistical generalizability.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

*RQ#1: How do Indonesian EFL students experience and make sense of the emotions arising during GenAI-assisted English language learning?*

To address the first research question, the analysis explored how students made sense of the emotions arising during GenAI-mediated tasks. Drawing on control-value theory (CVT), the data revealed a striking affective duality: rapid technical empowerment frequently precipitated a secondary emotional response characterized by imposter-like feelings and academic guilt. When GenAI outputs surpassed their actual linguistic proficiency, students struggled to reconcile the text with their authentic academic voice.

Excerpt 1:

> "When I pasted my draft into ChatGPT, the grammar corrections were instant, which was a huge relief. But reading the polished text, I felt a sudden wave of guilt. It sounded so professional that it no longer felt like my own work. I was constantly worried the lecturer would think I cheated." (Student #1')

Student #1 account phenomenologically captures the affective shift from language-based anxiety to identity-based guilt. This guilt often triggered maladaptive intrapersonal emotion regulation, where students would intentionally sabotage their own work to avoid detection.

Excerpt 2:

> "I actually spent hours rewriting the AI's output to make the vocabulary sound 'worse'. I was so terrified my lecturer would flag it as plagiarism. The anxiety of being caught was heavier and more exhausting than doing the assignment manually." (Student #3)

Student #3 experience demonstrates how the technical affordance of GenAI creates an artificial inflation of control that ultimately undermines the task's subjective value. Furthermore, when GenAI produced ambiguous or hallucinated outputs, students experienced acute frustration and a sudden loss of control.

Excerpt 3:

> "There were times when Gemini suggested sentence structures that completely contradicted what we learned in grammar class. I felt stuck and intensely frustrated. I didn't know whether to trust the AI or my own notes." (Student #5)

Student #5 narrative illustrates the emotional burden of algorithmic ambiguity. Because learners often lacked the foundational meta-linguistic awareness to reappraise the AI's errors, this confusion frequently escalated into complete cognitive and emotional paralysis.

Excerpt 4:

> "When the AI gave me an explanation that made no sense, I just froze. I didn't have the grammar skills to correct the machine, so I felt completely helpless. I lost all my confidence and just stopped working on the assignment." (Student #6)

This phenomenon underscores a critical boundary in self-regulated learning within GenAI-assisted environments. From a control-value perspective, when the cognitive demands of evaluating algorithmic output exceed the learners' linguistic competence, their perceived control drops drastically. The resulting emotional paralysis reveals that GenAI is not an emotionally neutral affordance; its propensity for hallucination acts as a direct catalyst for affective destabilization, neutralizing the students' capacity for independent cognitive reappraisal.

Ultimately, the exclusive examination of the students' lived experiences suggests that while GenAI mitigates initial language barriers, it inadvertently generates a new spectrum of emotional burdens—ranging from academic guilt to algorithmic helplessness. These intrapersonal strains highlight that several students had difficulty to navigate the affective complexities of GenAI in isolation, highlighting the value of external scaffolding.

*RQ#2: How do Indonesian EFL teachers experience and interpret their role in mediating and scaffolding students' regulation of GenAI-related emotions?*

Addressing the second research question, the analysis examined how lecturers diagnosed and mediated these emerging emotional strains. Viewing emotion regulation as an extrinsic process (Gross, 1998), lecturers demonstrated acute affective attunement, recognizing that their pedagogical responsibility extended beyond linguistic instruction to managing the invisible affective barriers created by GenAI.

Excerpt 5:

> "I noticed that the anxiety hasn't disappeared; it has just shifted. Students are no longer just afraid of making grammar mistakes; they are paralyzed by the fear of overstepping academic integrity boundaries. My job is to diagnose that silent panic." (Lecturer 1)

Lecturer 1's diagnostic insight highlights a sociocultural understanding of the classroom ecology. To alleviate this silent panic, lecturers engaged in explicit 'situation modification' by granting emotional permission to use the tools safely.

Excerpt 6:

> "I have to explicitly tell them it is okay to use the tool for brainstorming. I must grant them the emotional permission to interact with the AI, otherwise, they treat it like contraband and feel like frauds just for logging in." (Lecturer 3)

Beyond granting permission, lecturers actively deployed 'cognitive change' strategies through relational modeling. They deliberately orchestrated flawed interactions with GenAI to demystify the technology and reduce its perceived algorithmic authority.

Excerpt 7:

> "To reduce their intimidation, I deliberately project ChatGPT on the whiteboard and enter a bad prompt. When the AI produces a silly response, we laugh at it together. It reframes the AI from an all-knowing judge to a flawed assistant." (Lecturer 2)

Lecturer 2's strategy of extrinsic attentional deployment actively dismantles the machine's absolute authority. Other lecturers similarly reinforced this cognitive reframing by explicitly shifting the locus of control back to the students.

Excerpt 8:

> "I explicitly tell them, 'The AI is your intern, you are the boss.' I have to constantly reframe their mindset so they don't treat the machine's output as an unquestionable truth. It's about building their pedagogical courage to challenge the algorithm." (Lecturer 4).

These pedagogical actions represent a profound manifestation of teacher-mediated emotion regulation. By deliberately orchestrating a public failure of the GenAI or metaphorically framing the AI as a subordinate 'intern', lecturers engage in robust situation modification and cognitive reframing. This pedagogical act transcends basic technical instruction; it serves as a vital Vygotskian affective scaffold that actively dismantles the algorithmic authority traditionally ascribed to artificial intelligence by novice learners.

Consequently, the lecturers' accounts illustrate that they do not merely teach students how to construct prompts; they actively curate the emotional climate necessary for critical engagement. By transforming an intimidating oracle into a fallible, manageable assistant, teachers facilitate a critical cognitive reappraisal that empowers students to reclaim their academic agency, suggesting that effective GenAI integration in these accounts depended substantially on extrinsic human mediation.

*RQ#3: Where do student and lecturer accounts converge or diverge regarding the functions and limits of teacher-mediated emotion regulation in GenAI-assisted EFL learning?*

The third research question synthesizes the relational dynamics between students and lecturers, highlighting areas of convergence and divergence. A significant convergence centered on the indispensable nature of human pedagogical judgment; both groups recognized that the emotional validation required to internalize learning cannot be automated.

Excerpt 9:

> "Even when the AI says my essay is perfect, I still feel anxious until the lecturer validates it. The AI doesn't know the classroom context. I need that human reassurance to feel truly secure in my submission." (Student 1)

Student 1's statement highlights the interpersonal dimension of emotional security in learning. Lecturer accounts converged on this point, noting that the AI's technical praise did not replace the students' need for authoritative human reassurance.

Excerpt 10:

> "They simply don't trust the AI's praise. They will get a perfect score from ChatGPT's feedback, but they still bring their laptops to my desk and ask, 'Sir, is this actually good?' They crave human approval to feel emotionally secure." (Lecturer 1)

Despite this shared reliance on human mediation, a critical divergence emerged regarding the boundaries of autonomy and authority. Lecturers aimed to scaffold students toward

p-ISSN 2252-7427, e-ISSN 2541-3635
https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/IEFLJ/index

autonomous critical evaluation of AI, yet students frequently interpreted institutional ambiguity as an ongoing affective threat, craving rigid, rule-based constraints.

Excerpt 11:

> "I try to push them toward autonomous evaluation of the AI's output, but there's a strong resistance. They constantly ask for black-and-white rules—like, 'what exact percentage of AI use is allowed?' My pedagogical scaffolding can only do so much when they are terrified of being penalized by the university." (Lecturer 3)

This tension reveals the limitations of teacher-mediated emotion regulation within a complex institutional ecology. While lecturers utilize cognitive reframing to encourage critical freedom, students remain anchored by the fear of punitive plagiarism policies.

Excerpt 12:

> "The lecturers tell us to be critical and use AI creatively, but the university policy strictly says 'no AI-generated text.' I just want a clear, black-and-white rule. Without it, I am too anxious to use the AI at all because I don't want to risk failing the course." (Student 6)

This divergence across the two sets of accounts exposes the inherent limitations of teacher-mediated emotion regulation when situated within a complex institutional ecology. Interpretatively, a distinct clash exists between the micro-level pedagogical goal of fostering intellectual autonomy and the macro-level student need for institutional safety. While lecturers successfully utilize relational scaffolding to encourage critical freedom in the classroom, students remain tethered to the fear of punitive, yet vaguely defined, academic integrity policies.

Ultimately, these cross-perspectival findings suggest that teacher-mediated regulation operates within meaningful structural constraints. When university guidelines regarding GenAI remain ambiguous or contradictory, the emotional security cultivated by the lecturer remains fragile and temporary. This continuous state of vulnerability forces students to perpetually seek authoritative, rule-based validation, indicating that responsible GenAI integration requires not only empathetic pedagogy but also clearer institutional alignment to support learners' affective security.

This study examined how students and lecturers made sense of teacher-mediated emotion regulation in GenAI-assisted EFL learning. Across the cases, GenAI was experienced as affectively ambivalent: rapid linguistic support could provide relief and confidence, yet polished output, uncertain authorship boundaries, and contradictory AI responses could generate authenticity-related guilt, imposter-like feelings, frustration, and helplessness. Lecturer accounts showed that mediation was not limited to teaching prompt techniques. Participants described permission-giving, demonstrations of fallible AI output, reassurance, and cognitive reframing as ways of reshaping the appraisals that made GenAI emotionally threatening. The cross-perspectival analysis also showed a limit to such classroom-level support: when institutional expectations were experienced as unclear, students continued to seek rule-based reassurance.

These findings extend rather than reject evidence that AI can reduce language anxiety and support engagement. Studies of AI-assisted speaking, writing, and self-directed learning report increased enjoyment, willingness to communicate, perceived support, and lower anxiety for many learners (Kohnke & Moorhouse, 2025; Tram et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024; Zheng, 2024). At the same time, qualitative and review evidence indicates that AI-mediated learning can produce uncertainty, emotional dysregulation, dependence, or weakened confidence when learners cannot evaluate output or determine appropriate use (Abdallah et al., 2025; Hady et al., 2024; Yang & Zhao, 2024; Zhang & Liu, 2025; Zhou & Hou, 2024; Zong & Yang, 2025). The present accounts suggest that GenAI may therefore shift the object of anxiety: linguistic difficulty can become less salient while concerns about authenticity, epistemic trust, and academic integrity become more salient.

A second contribution concerns the teacher's role in this affective transition. Existing work on GenAI has rightly emphasized teacher AI literacy and professional competence (Al-Abdullatif, 2024; Ding et al., 2024; Moorhouse et al., 2024; Sperling et al., 2024; Yuan et al., 2026). The present findings add a relational dimension: professional GenAI competence also involves noticing affective cues, clarifying the pedagogical status of AI use, modelling skeptical evaluation, and helping learners reappraise problematic output. This interpretation is consistent with research showing that teacher emotion regulation and emotional scaffolding operate through interaction, modelling, and task-related support (Aldrup et al., 2024; Rafidi & Wagner, 2024; Shahidzade et al., 2022). It also complements recent evidence that AI-

mediated language teaching produces emotional and regulatory work for teachers themselves (Seyri & Ghiasvand, 2025).

Theoretically, the findings refine the relationship among CVT, emotion regulation, and sociocultural mediation in human-AI interaction. CVT explains why contradictory or unexpectedly sophisticated AI output can alter perceived control and task value (Pekrun, 2024), while Gross's model specifies the regulatory moves through which those appraisals can be changed (Gross, 1998). Sociocultural theory locates that change within mediated interaction rather than treating regulation as solely individual (Lantolf et al., 2021). Within this integrated account, 'algorithmic authority' is best understood as an empirically generated sensitizing concept: participants sometimes positioned GenAI output as epistemically superior to their own knowledge, increasing uncertainty when the machine conflicted with classroom learning. This interpretation resonates with broader work on epistemic trust in AI (Pandey et al., 2025) and on critical thinking as a protection against unreflective GenAI reliance (Hou et al., 2025). The theoretical contribution is therefore not that the machine independently 'causes' emotion, but that learners' appraisals of machine authority become part of the emotion-generative situation that teachers may help to reframe.

The Indonesian findings also need to be read within an evolving policy ecology. National higher-education guidance encourages responsible and transparent GenAI use while foregrounding academic integrity, data protection, and pedagogical judgement (Kusumawardani et al., 2024). Indonesian studies similarly report a demand for clearer governance, ethical literacy, and verification of AI-assisted academic work (Barus et al., 2025; Ilma & Rohmah, 2025; Pratiwi et al., 2025). The present study adds an affective explanation for why policy clarity matters: ambiguous boundaries were experienced not simply as a compliance problem but as a source of anxiety that could weaken classroom-level attempts to foster autonomous judgement. This is a specifically useful contribution to Indonesian EFL research because GenAI is frequently used at the point where linguistic assistance, authorship, and assessment overlap.

The findings also align with broader reviews warning that benefits from GenAI depend on balanced pedagogical integration, institutional guidance, and opportunities to preserve independent reasoning (Bittle & El-Gayar, 2025; Daniel, 2025; Kangwa, 2025; Memarian & Doleck, 2026; Qian, 2025). In language education, questions of equity and access further complicate such integration because students differ in digital literacy, infrastructure, linguistic resources, and ability to evaluate AI output (Cong-Lem et al., 2026; Lee et al., 2025; Lo et al., 2024). The emotional scaffolding identified here should therefore be treated as one component of a wider institutional approach rather than as a substitute for clear policy, assessment redesign, or equitable AI literacy provision.

*Implications for Indonesian teacher education and institutional policy*

Three actionable implications follow. First, pre-service and in-service EFL teacher education should integrate affective diagnosis and critical AI evaluation into GenAI literacy, so that teachers learn not only prompting but also how to recognize anxiety, authenticity concerns, dependency, and loss of epistemic confidence. Scenario-based and case-based professional development can be used to rehearse these judgements (Ding et al., 2024; Moorhouse et al., 2024). Second, microteaching and practicum activities should require teachers to model AI fallibility, compare AI output with disciplinary criteria, articulate task-level permissions, and use critical incidents to practice cognitive reframing and co-regulation. Third, universities and faculties should translate national guidance into assessment-specific rules that distinguish permitted, conditionally permitted, and prohibited GenAI uses and specify disclosure expectations. Consistency across lecturers is particularly important because contradictory messages can reproduce the uncertainty that participants described (Barus et al., 2025; Kusumawardani et al., 2024).

These recommendations position teacher-mediated emotion regulation as a professional competence that links AI literacy, ethical judgement, and relational pedagogy. They also clarify the study's contribution to Indonesian EFL scholarship: responsible GenAI integration is not only a question of technological competence or academic-integrity enforcement, but also of how teachers and institutions create the emotional conditions in which learners can question AI output, retain authorship, and develop progressively more autonomous judgement.

Several limitations delimit these interpretations. The small, purposively selected IPA sample provides idiographic depth but is not intended for statistical generalization. The study also relied on cross-sectional interview accounts rather than

longitudinal observation of teacher-student interaction, and the lecturer and student participants were not matched dyads; convergence and divergence therefore refer to group-level experiential patterns rather than to two accounts of the same classroom episode. In addition, Indonesian institutional policies were evolving during data collection. Future research should combine longitudinal qualitative observation with mixed-method or survey work to examine how emotion regulation and perceptions of algorithmic authority change as institutional rules stabilize. Large-sample validation would also be needed before 'algorithmic authority' could be treated as a formal measurable construct.

## CONCLUSION

This multi-perspectival IPA study shows that GenAI-assisted EFL learning can be emotionally double-edged. Students described relief and increased linguistic support, but also authenticity-related guilt, imposter-like feelings, frustration, and helplessness when AI output exceeded their confidence or contradicted classroom knowledge. Lecturer accounts indicated that permission-giving, modelling AI fallibility, reassurance, and cognitive reframing could help students reinterpret these experiences and recover a sense of agency.

The study's theoretical contribution is to connect control-value appraisals with extrinsic emotion regulation and sociocultural mediation in human-AI interaction. The findings suggest that perceived 'algorithmic authority' can become part of the emotional situation when learners assign greater epistemic credibility to AI than to their own judgement. Teacher mediation can reshape that appraisal, but the process should not be treated as universally effective or sufficient; its influence is contingent on learners' linguistic resources, classroom relationships, and institutional expectations.

For Indonesian EFL higher education, the central implication is that GenAI literacy should combine technical competence with affective scaffolding, critical evaluation, and explicit ethical guidance. Teacher education programs can prepare lecturers to recognize and mediate AI-related emotional difficulties, while institutions can reduce avoidable uncertainty by translating national GenAI principles into clear assessment-level expectations. Responsible GenAI integration therefore depends on the interaction of learner agency, teacher judgement, and coherent institutional governance rather than on technological capability alone.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the students and lecturers from the three participating universities who generously shared their time, experiences, and perspectives as respondents in this study. Their openness and thoughtful reflections provided valuable insights that significantly enriched the development of this article. The author also extends appreciation to colleagues who offered constructive suggestions, critical feedback, and guidance throughout the process of preparing and completing this manuscript.

## REFERENCES

Abdallah, N., Katmah, R., Khalaf, K., & Jelinek, H. F. (2025). Systematic review of ChatGPT in higher education: Navigating impact on learning, wellbeing, and collaboration. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *12*, 101866. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101866

Al-Abdullatif, A. M. (2024). Modeling teachers' acceptance of generative artificial intelligence use in higher education: The role of AI literacy, intelligent TPACK, and perceived trust. *Education Sciences*, *14*(11), 1209. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14111209

Aldrup, K., Carstensen, B., & Klusmann, U. (2024). The role of teachers' emotion regulation in teaching effectiveness: A systematic review integrating four lines of research. *Educational Psychologist*, *59*(2), 89-110. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2023.2282446

Barus, O. P., Hidayanto, A. N., Handri, E. Y., Sensuse, D. I., & Yaiprasert, C. (2025). Shaping generative AI governance in higher education: Insights from student perception. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, *8*, 100452. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2025.100452

Bin-Hady, W. R. A., Ali, J. K. M., & Al-humari, M. A. (2024). The effect of ChatGPT on EFL students' social and emotional learning. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, *17*(2), 243-255. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-02-2024-0036

Bittle, K., & El-Gayar, O. (2025). Generative AI and academic integrity in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. *Information*, *16*(4), 296. https://doi.org/10.3390/info16040296

Cong-Lem, N., Van Bui, C. N., Nguyen, N. P. N., & Huynh, M. Q. (2026). Bridging or breaking? A systematic review of how generative AI shapes equity in foreign language education. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.70052

Daniel, K. (2025). Can generative AI revolutionise academic skills development in higher education? A systematic literature review. *European Journal of Education*, *60*(1), e70036. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70036

Dewaele, J.-M., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2014). The two faces of Janus? Anxiety and enjoyment in the foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *4*(2), 237-274. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2014.4.2.5

Dewaele, J.-M., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2024). You can't start a fire without a spark: Enjoyment, anxiety, and the emergence of flow in foreign language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *15*(2). https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2021-0123

Ding, A. C. E., Shi, L., Yang, H., & Choi, I. (2024). Enhancing teacher AI literacy and integration through different types of cases in teacher professional development. *Computers and Education Open*, *6*, 100178. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100178

Escalante, J., Pack, A., & Barrett, A. (2023). AI-generated feedback on writing: Insights into efficacy and ENL student preference. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00425-2

Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology*, *2*(3), 271-299. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.271

Hou, C., Zhu, G., & Sudarshan, V. (2025). The role of critical thinking on undergraduates' reliance behaviours on generative AI in problem-solving. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *56*, 1919-1941. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13613

Ilma, A., & Rohmah, Z. (2025). AI in EFL education: Teachers' competence and the roadblocks to teaching material development. *Cogent Education*, *12*(1), 2588471. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2588471

Jaber Rafidi, T., & Wagner, B. (2024). The impact of emotional scaffolding on online teaching and learning in Palestinian English language classrooms during COVID-19. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *18*(2), 155-168. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2023.2245810

Kangwa, D. (2025). Exploring the factors that promote a balance between academic integrity and the effective use of GenAI tools in higher education: A systematic review. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *41*(5), e70109. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.70109

Kohnke, L., & Moorhouse, B. L. (2025). Enhancing the emotional aspects of language education through generative artificial intelligence (GenAI): A qualitative investigation. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *167*, 108600. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2025.108600

Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal*, *54*(2), 537-550. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868

Kusumawardani, S. S., Wulandari, D., Pannen, P., Ekadiyanto, F. A., Wiryana, I. M., Purwarianti, A., & Alfarozi, S. A. I. (2024). *Panduan penggunaan generative artificial intelligence pada pembelajaran di perguruan tinggi*. Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan.

Lantolf, J. P., Xi, J., & Minakova, V. (2021). Sociocultural theory and concept-based language instruction. *Language Teaching*, *54*(3), 327-342. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000348

Lee, S., Choe, H., Zou, D., & Jeon, J. (2026). Generative AI (GenAI) in the language classroom: A systematic review. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *34*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2025.2498537

Lee, S., Jeon, J., McKinley, J., & Rose, H. (2025). Generative AI and English language teaching: A global Englishes perspective. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *45*, 85-108. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190525100184

Li, B., Tan, Y. L., Wang, C., & Lowell, V. (2025). Two years of innovation: A systematic review of empirical generative AI research in language learning and teaching. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *9*, 100445. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100445

Lo, C. K., Yu, P. L. H., Xu, S., Ng, D. T. K., & Jong, M. S.-Y. (2024). Exploring the application of ChatGPT in ESL/EFL education and related research issues: A systematic review of empirical studies. *Smart Learning Environments*, *11*, 50. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00342-5

Liu, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2025). Examining language learners' GenAI-assisted writing self-efficacy profiles and the relationship with their writing self-regulated learning strategies. *System*, *134*, 103826. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103826

Memarian, B., & Doleck, T. (2026). A systematic review of academic integrity and misconduct with artificial intelligence in higher education. *SN Computer Science*, *7*, 49. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42979-025-04569-y

Moorhouse, B. L., Wan, Y., Wu, C., Kohnke, L., Ho, T. Y., & Kwong, T. (2024). Developing language teachers' professional generative AI competence: An intervention study in an initial language teacher education course. *System*, *125*, 103399. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103399

Pandey, S. R., Pandey, C. S., Mishra, P., Pandey, S., & Kumar, M. (2025). Mapping the evolution of epistemic trust in artificial intelligence: A bibliometric analysis of key themes, influences,

and global trends. *Aslib Journal of Information Management*. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-11-2024-0898

Pekrun, R. (2024). Control-value theory: From achievement emotion to a general theory of human emotions. *Educational Psychology Review*, *36*, 83. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09909-7

Pratiwi, H., Suherman, Hasruddin, & Ridha, M. (2025). Between shortcut and ethics: Navigating the use of artificial intelligence in academic writing among Indonesian doctoral students. *European Journal of Education*, *60*(2), e70083. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70083

Qian, Y. (2025). Pedagogical applications of generative AI in higher education: A systematic review of the field. *TechTrends*, *69*, 1105-1120. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-025-01100-1

Ravšelj, D., Keržič, D., Tomaževič, N., Umek, L., Brezovar, N., Iahad, N. A., Abdulla, A. A., Akopyan, A., Segura, M. W. A., AlHumaid, J., Allam, M. F., Alló, M., Andoh, R. P. K., Andronic, O., Arthur, Y. D., Aydin, F., Badran, A., Balbontín-Alvarado, J., Saad, H. B., ... Aristovnik, A. (2025). Higher education students' perceptions of ChatGPT: A global study of early reactions. *PLOS ONE*, *20*(2), e0315011. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0315011

Rezai, A., Soyoof, A., & Reynolds, B. L. (2024). Disclosing the correlation between using ChatGPT and well-being in EFL learners: Considering the mediating role of emotion regulation. *European Journal of Education*, *59*(4), e12752. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12752

Seyri, H., & Ghiasvand, F. (2025). Teaching is basically feeling: Unpacking EFL teachers' perceived emotions and regulatory strategies in AI-powered L2 speaking and writing skills instruction. *Computers and Education Open*, *8*, 100264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2025.100264

Shahidzade, F., Fazilatfar, A. M., & Razmi, M. H. (2022). The correspondence between students' and teachers' views on teachers' emotional scaffolding strategies in English classes in Iran. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 874747. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.874747

Shao, K., Pekrun, R., & Nicholson, L. J. (2019). Emotions in classroom language learning: What can we learn from achievement emotion research? System, 86, 102121. *https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102121*

Smith, J. A. (2004). Reflecting on the development of interpretative phenomenological analysis and its contribution to qualitative research in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *1*(1), 39-54. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088704qp004oa

Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2022). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research (2nd ed.)*. SAGE.

Sperling, K., Stenberg, C. J., McGrath, C., Åkerfeldt, A., Heintz, F., & Stenliden, L. (2024). In search of artificial intelligence (AI) literacy in teacher education: A scoping review. *Computers and Education Open*, *6*, 100169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100169

Tram, N. H. M., Nguyen, T. T., & Tran, C. D. (2024). ChatGPT as a tool for self-learning English among EFL learners: A multi-methods study. *System*, *127*, 103528. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103528

Wang, C., Zou, B., Du, Y., & Wang, Z. (2024). The impact of different conversational generative AI chatbots on EFL learners: An analysis of willingness to communicate, foreign language speaking anxiety, and self-perceived communicative competence. *System*, *127*, 103533. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103533

Yang, L., & Zhao, S. (2024). AI-induced emotions in L2 education: Exploring EFL students' perceived emotions and regulation strategies. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *159*, 108337. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2024.108337

Yuan, L., Abdul Razak, R., Kamsin, A., & Abdul-Rahman, S.-S. (2026). Generative AI in teacher education: A systematic review. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *15*(2). https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v15i2.37225

Zhang, C., Meng, Y., & Ma, X. (2024). Artificial intelligence in EFL speaking: Impact on enjoyment, anxiety, and willingness to communicate. *System*, *121*, 103259. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103259

Zhang, R., Zou, D., Cheng, G., & Xie, H. (2025). Flow in ChatGPT-based logic learning and its influences on logic and self-efficacy in English argumentative writing. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *162*, 108457. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2024.108457

Zhang, S., & Liu, X. (2025). Learner emotions in AI-assisted English as a second/foreign language learning: A systematic review of empirical studies. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *16*, 1652806. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1652806

Zheng, S. (2024). The effects of chatbot use on foreign language reading anxiety and reading performance among Chinese secondary school students. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *7*, 100271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100271

Zhou, C., & Hou, F. (2024). Can AI empower L2 education? Exploring its influence on the behavioural, cognitive and emotional

engagement of EFL teachers and language learners. *European Journal of Education*, *59*(4), e12750. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12750

Zong, Y., & Yang, L. (2025). How AI-enhanced social-emotional learning framework transforms EFL students' engagement and emotional well-being. *European Journal of Education*, *60*, e12925. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12925