International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research (IJAMR)
ISSN: 2643-9670
Vol. 10 Issue 2 February - 2026, Pages: 166-174

The Impact of Linguistic Environments on Foreign Language Acquisition: Theories, Evidence, and Pedagogical Implications

Guohong Xu[1], Xiaoquan Pan[2]*

1. Xingzhi College, Zhejiang Normal University, Jinhua, China
angelxgh@zjnu.edu.cn
2. Xingzhi College, Zhejiang Normal University, Jinhua, China
pxq@zjnu.cn
* Corresponding author: Xiaoquan Pan, Xingzhi College, Zhejiang Normal University,
688 Yingbin Road, Jinhua, Zhejiang Province, China. E-mail: pxq@zjnu.cn

Abstract: *This study systematically investigates the theoretical connections, practical effectiveness, and pedagogical implications of linguistic environments for foreign language acquisition. Grounded in the Input Hypothesis, Interaction Hypothesis, Sociocultural Theory, and Output Hypothesis, this study elucidates the theoretical pathways through which linguistic environments systematically facilitate language internalization via four core mechanisms: providing comprehensible input, triggering meaning negotiation, enabling social mediation, and driving linguistic production. Empirical analyses reveal that immersive environments significantly enhance pragmatic fluency through high-frequency authentic input and obligatory output, while technology-enhanced environments optimize accessibility and processing depth of learning resources through spatio-temporal extensibility, intelligent feedback, and multimodal input. The research demonstrates that environmental efficacy hinges critically on the tripartite mediating roles of learner agency, motivation, and affective factors: agency drives deep processing of resources and environmental transformation; motivational orientation dynamically responds to environmental shifts; and affective filtering directly regulates cognitive resource allocation. Accordingly, optimizing foreign language pedagogy necessitates integrating three-dimensional approaches: constructing multi-dimensional environments harmonizing virtual and physical spaces to enhance cultural authenticity and technological affordances; deepening metacognitive and strategic training to activate learners' agency in environmental adaptation; and establishing affective security support systems to achieve optimal allocation of cognitive-affective resources.*

Keywords—linguistic environments; foreign language acquisition; input hypothesis; interaction hypothesis; computer-assisted language learning

1. INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary era characterized by deepening globalization and cross-cultural exchange, foreign language proficiency has emerged as a core competency for individual development and societal progress. The efficiency of language acquisition is not only constrained by learners' cognitive traits and learning strategies but is fundamentally shaped by their linguistic environment. Scholarly consensus, spanning from Krashen (1982)'s "Input Hypothesis" and Vygotsky (1978)'s sociocultural theory to dynamic interaction models within ecolinguistics, acknowledges that language environments systematically influence internalization processes by providing comprehensible input, creating authentic communicative needs, and shaping identity formation. Empirical studies further demonstrate that immersive environments significantly enhance fluency and pragmatic competence (e.g., Collentine & Freed, 2004), while instructional designs optimizing authentic contextual simulations improve learning outcomes (Long, 1996). Nevertheless, existing literature predominantly focuses on natural settings or narrow technologically mediated environments, leaving a gap in integrated theoretical synthesis and evidence-based reflection on how broad language environments which encompass multidimensional interactive structures of sociocultural contexts, educational settings, and media ecology systematically influence distinct acquisition stages.

Second Language Acquisition (SLA) constitutes an exceptionally complex cognitive and socializing process. The language environment, defined as the totality of natural and social conditions in which learners engage with the target language, remains a pivotal variable in applied linguistics research regarding its operational mechanisms and impact magnitude (Wang et al., 2022). In the current global landscape, high-level foreign language skills represent not only a critical asset for personal advancement but also a strategic resource for enhancing national competitiveness. Grounded in established SLA research, this paper aims to systematically synthesize and critically examine the role of language environments in foreign language acquisition. Key objectives include: (1) theoretically delineating the components and operational mechanisms of "language environments"; (2) practically analyzing their multidimensional impact on SLA; (3) investigating learner-internal mediator variables (e.g., agency, motivation, affective attitudes) underlying environmental efficacy; and (4) deriving pedagogical implications and optimization pathways based on the above analysis.

By bridging theoretical and instructional divides, this study endeavors to advance language environment theory for the

dual purpose of enhancing instructional efficacy and fostering profound intercultural communicative competence.

2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

2.1 Input Hypothesis

The Input Hypothesis, proposed by Krashen (1985) within his Monitor Model, centrally contends that the fundamental driver of language acquisition is comprehensible input. This refers to language material encountered by learners that is slightly beyond their current proficiency level (i+1) and possesses communicative value. The hypothesis emphasizes that environmental conditions trigger innate acquisition mechanisms through comprehension, thereby rejecting the efficacy of deliberate grammar instruction prevalent in traditional pedagogy (Krashen, 1982).

Its operational logic functions on three foundational premises. Firstly, input must possess sufficient comprehensibility; semantic decoding necessitates reliance on context, extralinguistic cues, and prior knowledge. Secondly, input must be provided at adequate volume. Failure of the linguistic environment to consistently supply i+1 input leads to fossilization. Thirdly, a low affective filter is prerequisite for input to become intake. Psychological barriers such as anxiety and low motivation impede internalization.

Consequently, an optimal language acquisition environment is conceptualized as the integration of extensive authentic input, low-anxiety interaction, and opportunities for implicit learning. This conceptualization provides the theoretical underpinning for immersive teaching methodologies and naturalistic acquisition pathways (Gass & Mackey, 2007).

Despite its profound insights into the facilitative mechanisms of the linguistic environment, theoretical limitations within the Input Hypothesis have prompted sustained discourse. Scholarly discourse has revolved around three primary points of contention. Firstly, Swain's (1985) pivotal finding, derived from French immersion programs in Canada, demonstrated that input alone fails to foster high-accuracy productive competence. This led to the Output Hypothesis, which emphasizes how language production drives formal restructuring by inducing cognitive conflict. Secondly, the Input Hypothesis presents an oversimplified model of i+1 operation, neglecting learners' active cognitive strategies for parsing input (e.g., associative inference, consciousness-raising) (Schmidt, 1990). Thirdly, the hypothesis underestimates the constructive role of social interaction in shaping input significance. Long's (1996) Interaction Hypothesis, for instance, evidenced how negotiation of meaning, which was achieved through clarification requests, comprehension checks, and the like, dynamically adjusts input comprehensibility, making guided interaction demonstrably more efficacious than raw input within instructional settings. Contemporary research endeavors seek to reconcile these perspectives: digital environments offer potential for customizing i+1 input via intelligent feedback systems, while task-based language teaching frameworks systematically integrate the triadic forces of input, interaction, and output for synergistic effect (Ellis, 2015).

2.2 Interaction Hypothesis

The Interaction Hypothesis, systematically developed by Long (1996), posits that the core value of the linguistic environment lies not intrinsically within passive input itself, but in the meaning negotiation processes triggered by social interaction. Such negotiation dynamically adjusts the comprehensibility of input and activates learners' cognitive mechanisms. The hypothesis was predicated upon the socio-cultural theory of Vygotsky (1978) and the input hypothesis of Krashen (1985), yet critically reconceptualized their views of the environment by emphasizing "bidirectional interaction" over "unidirectional transmission". During communicative breakdowns, learners employ strategic interaction to prompt interlocutors to modify linguistic forms, thereby generating tailored input. Such modifications temporarily render linguistic forms more salient, creating a crucial window for attentional resource allocation and linguistic restructuring (Gass & Mackey, 2007). Consequently, an optimal linguistic environment necessitates three core elements: interlocutor sensitivity, cognitive engagement, and an immediate feedback loop, with the density of interaction directly correlating with the rate of language development. This theoretical framework underpinned the development of task-based language teaching methodology, which emphasizes the strategic elicitation of negotiation through tasks designed with inherent information gaps (Ellis, 2015).

The Interaction Hypothesis has undergone continuous refinement through empirical validation and technological innovation. Early empirical studies demonstrated that interaction groups significantly outperformed input-only groups in vocabulary acquisition rates (Cai & Huang, 2023), and that negotiation frequency exhibited a significant positive correlation with the degree of grammatical morpheme internalization. The empowerment offered by technology in the digital era has propelled theoretical evolution: computer-mediated communication research confirmed that synchronous written chat enhances the focus on form effect due to text permanence (Smith, 2004), and intelligent tutoring systems utilize algorithms to detect learners' negotiation trigger points and adjust input modalities in real-time. The contemporary Enhanced Interaction Hypothesis (Plonsky & Ziegler, 2016) therefore contends that technologically mediated environments necessitate a reconceptualization of negotiation pathways—for instance, utilizing virtual reality (VR) to create virtual identities to lower negotiation anxiety, or employing algorithms to generate dynamic partner matching for optimizing cognitive alignment. This provides a neuro-socio-technological integrative framework that offers solutions for overcoming the constraints of interaction found in traditional classroom settings.

2.3 Sociocultural Theory

Rooted in the work of Vygotsky (1978), Sociocultural Theory (SCT) fundamentally challenges traditional perspectives on acquisition. It posits that language competence is not an isolated product of individual internal cognition, but a co-constructed outcome mediated by cultural tools within social interaction. The theory articulates three environmental mechanisms:

Mediation: The environment functions as a network of mediators comprising symbolic signs (e.g., vocabulary, grammar), physical artifacts (e.g., multimodal texts), and social norms (e.g., communicative conventions). Learning occurs when individuals internalize these external cultural resources, transforming them into mental processes.

Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD): Effective language environments necessitate expert-novice collaboration. Through scaffolded support (scaffolding), other-regulation enables the learner to surpass potential developmental thresholds, ultimately leading to self-regulation.

Activity Theory: Language acquisition emerges within goal-oriented collective practices (e.g., classroom tasks). The environment, conceptualized as an activity system, drives cognitive restructuring (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

Consequently, the language environment is conceptualized as both a semiotic landscape infused with cultural symbols and a field of social practice. Its quality is determined by the richness of mediating tools, the level of collaborative synergy in interaction, and the authenticity of activities (Wertsch, 1991). This perspective provides the foundational basis for contextual pedagogical practices and dynamic assessment.

SCT has profoundly reoriented practical approaches to language environment design. Instructionally, "collaborative dialogue" supplants unidirectional lecturing, as teachers and students jointly construct semantic networks (e.g., through collaboratively creating concept maps for writing). Dynamic assessment, meanwhile, refines environmental support by diagnosing learners' potential through interventionist feedback that probes the boundaries of their ZPD (Poehner, 2008).

2.4 Output Hypothesis

The Output Hypothesis, proposed by Swain (1985) based on empirical research from Canadian French immersion programs, posits a core tenet refining the logic of language environment construction: solely comprehensible input proves insufficient for triggering the development of higher-order linguistic competence; learners must engage in sustained language production to achieve micro-level monitoring of the grammatical system. This hypothesis delineates three critical functions of output in acquisition: (1) Noticing/Triggering Function: Expression difficulty during output compels learners to attend to form-meaning gaps, thereby activating awareness and prompting the search for new linguistic resources; (2) Hypothesis-Testing Function: Output constitutes the experimental application of interlanguage rules, allowing language hypotheses to be verified through interlocutor feedback; and (3) Metalinguistic Function: Output induces learners to consciously analyze language rules, whereby explicit knowledge accelerates the restructuring of implicit systems (Swain, 1985).

Consequently, the pivotal value of the language environment is redefined: contexts generating output pressure coupled with high-quality feedback loops constitute dual engines for competence development. This framework also provides empirical grounding for the "output-driven principle" within task-based language teaching (Ellis, 2015). The Output Hypothesis has evolved amidst ongoing debate. Challenges to its core proposition first arose concerning the boundaries of output efficacy. Experiments by Hanaoka and Izumi (2012) demonstrated that output effectively facilitates the initial internalization of new forms but cannot independently eradicate fossilized errors. Schmidt (1990) further noted that if output fails to induce perceptual salience, cognitive processing remains confined to the semantic level. These critiques catalyzed a significant theoretical-practical shift: the integration of the Output Hypothesis with Long (1996)'s Interaction Hypothesis yielded the "Output-Negotiation Model". In this model, output propels meaning negotiation; negotiation generates targeted input; and targeted input subsequently optimizes output.

3. Practical Dimension

3.1 Immersion Environment and Language Acquisition

The immersion environment is widely recognized as one of the most effective practical forms for facilitating second language (L2) acquisition. Its core characteristic lies in learners being surrounded by target language input within natural or quasi-natural settings while requiring sustained communicative interaction in that language (Ellis, 2015). Such environments can be categorized as "natural immersion" (e.g., studying in a target language country) and "artificial immersion" (e.g., bilingual education programs). From a cognitive psychology perspective, immersion environments strengthen language processing through the dual mechanisms of high-frequency input and compelled output (Lyster, 2007). Extensive authentic, unsimplified linguistic input continuously stimulates the learner's perceptual system, promoting the acquisition of implicit knowledge (Krashen, 1985). Simultaneously, compelled by communicative necessity, learners must produce purpose-driven output. This process not only activates existing linguistic knowledge and promotes its restructuring within context (Swain, 1985) but also encourages learners to actively notice the gap between linguistic forms and their semantic/pragmatic functions, thereby deepening metalinguistic awareness.

Numerous empirical studies indicate that, compared to traditional classrooms, immersion environments confer significant advantages in cultivating pragmatic competence, enhancing oral fluency, and fostering the internalization of cultural understanding (Kinginger, 2011). The underlying

mechanism is that learners must continuously navigate unpredictable communication scenarios, developing more adaptive communication strategies and automated decoding abilities.

Nevertheless, the efficacy of immersion is constrained by multiple factors. Research indicates that length of residence and intensity of exposure constitute fundamental thresholds, but active social interaction engagement and strategic metacognitive strategy deployment (Cohen, 2014) are the crucial variables determining differential outcomes. The core pedagogical implications are as follows: (1) It is necessary to create authentic task-based contexts that foster both cognitive and affective engagement; (2) Mechanisms should be designed to incentivize learners to move beyond their linguistic safety zone to produce risk-taking output, facilitating linguistic restructuring through timely feedback; and (3) Technology-enabled blended immersion represents a promising direction for expanding access to high-quality input and interaction opportunities.

3.2 Technology-Enhanced Environments and Foreign Language Acquisition

Technology-enhanced environments reconfigure the language learning ecology through digital tools, offering a novel paradigm for creating artificial contexts characterized by high interactivity, personalization, and multimodality. Compared to traditional environments, the core breakthroughs of technology-enhanced environments lie in: (1) Spatiotemporal Flexibility: Mobile-assisted language learning and online platforms (e.g., MOOCs) transcend geographical and temporal limitations to provide sustained linguistic input (Kukulska-Hulme & Viberg, 2018); (2) Adjustable Authenticity: The use of virtual/augmented reality (VR/AR) facilitates the construction of embodied simulation contexts, enabling the training of cultural pragmatic competence within controllable risk parameters (Shadiev & Sintawati, 2020); and (3) Real-time Intelligent Feedback: Automatic speech recognition (ASR) and natural language processing (NLP) engines enable the immediate analysis of grammatical, lexical, and pragmatic errors, generating corrective feedback that significantly enhances the noticing mechanism (Heift, 2010). From the perspective of cognitive load theory, technology-enhanced environments enhance the depth of information processing through multimodal input distribution, thereby decomposing cognitive load. Their efficacy, stemming from data-driven personalization, has been empirically validated in contexts such as academic writing instruction and contextualized listening decoding (Cotos, 2014).

However, the potential afforded by technology is constrained by three core challenges: Foremost is the limited interactional depth in human-computer interaction, while computer-mediated communication facilitates remote peer feedback, the absence of paralinguistic cues and reduced social presence can impede the development of higher-order pragmatic competencies, such as the interpretation of implied meanings (Blake, 2016). Secondly, there exists the risk of technology-pedagogy misalignment: The use of tools disconnected from a socio-cultural activity framework can lead to task implementation becoming perfunctory (Friedman & Kern, 2014). Finally, from the perspective of digital equity divide, disparities in infrastructure and digital literacy may exacerbate inequalities in access to learning resources.

4. Core Mediating Variables: Learner Agency, Motivation, and Affective Attitudes

4.1 Learner Agency and Foreign Language Acquisition

Learner agency refers to an individual's autonomous capacity to proactively regulate the learning process, set strategic goals, and implement actions within a specific sociocultural context (van Lier, 2008). In contrast to traditional motivational theories, agency theory emphasizes the learner's fundamental role as an agent-as-transformer, rather than a passive recipient. This implies that even within identical linguistic environments (e.g., immersion programs or technological platforms), individuals actively reshape the actual impact of the environment on acquisition through behaviors such as goal-setting, strategic selection, and interactional negotiation (Mercer, 2012). Empirical studies demonstrate that agency influences acquisition outcomes through three primary mediating pathways. Firstly, in mediating input processing, learners with high agency actively filter, annotate, and reproduce linguistic resources from their environment (Palfreyman, 2014). Secondly, in the catalyzing identity transformation phase, learners reconstruct their L2 self through conscious social participation, thereby directing cognitive resources towards language acquisition (Ushioda, 2011). In terms of functioning as an adversity buffer, in the face of environmental constraints (e.g., limitations in technological platform interaction), agency drives the employment of metacognitive strategies (e.g., self-monitoring/reflective journaling) and affective regulation techniques (e.g., growth mindset training), sustaining effective learning engagement (Oxford, 2017).

Research focusing on Chinese learners provides corroborating evidence, indicating that agency can significantly mitigate the effects of input scarcity in traditional classroom settings. For instance, students who autonomously create virtual language ecologies (e.g., cross-national language partner communities) demonstrate a greater propensity to overcome interlanguage fossilization (Zheng et al., 2024).

The activation of agency is moderated by both environmental and individual dimensions. Environmentally, contextual empowerment serves as a crucial prerequisite. When environments afford ample choices (e.g., customizable learning paths on technological platforms), authentic decision-making opportunities (e.g., cross-cultural task decisions in immersion programs), and effective reflective scaffolding, learners are more likely to develop strategic self-regulatory capabilities. Individually, self-efficacy and attribution patterns constitute core drivers: learners who attribute language progress to controllable effort are more inclined towards risk-

taking output and problem-solving behaviors (Dörnyei, 2005). Consequently, the core principles of instructional design should be constructing agency space, developing metastrategic awareness, and cultivating a growth-oriented agentic identity. These principles collectively underscore the pivotal mediating function of agency between the learning environment and acquisition outcomes.

4.2 Learning Motivation and Foreign Language Acquisition

Learning motivation, as a core mediating variable between linguistic environment and acquisition efficacy, is essentially a directional drive system formed through the interaction between the individual and their environment (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Moving beyond the traditional dichotomy (instrumental/integrative), contemporary research emphasizes the dynamic hierarchical nature of motivation as shaped by environmental stimuli: (1) Foundation Layer: Environmental provision of salient goals activates integrative motivation; (2) Operational Layer: Technology platforms' instant reward mechanisms reinforce the sustained engagement of instrumental motivation; and (3) Meta-Layer: Cross-cultural contact triggers the ideal L2 self, facilitating a transformation in motivational quality (Dörnyei et al., 2016).

Cross-cultural research reveals significant individual differences in the environmental response threshold of motivation: learners with high openness exhibit significantly greater sensitivity to contextual cues than those with low openness. Crucially, technology-mediated environments can significantly lower this threshold (Zou et al., 2025). The motivational evolution of Chinese foreign language learners exhibits distinct characteristics. During the transition from a phase dominated by instrumental motivation driven by examination pressure (secondary school) to an integrated-instrumental composite phase (undergraduate studies), the interaction density and cultural authenticity within an internationalized campus environment serve as critical levers triggering this qualitative shift in motivation. The mediating effect of motivation manifests through two core pathways: firstly, the resource-activation benefit pathway; and secondly, the adversity compensation pathway. For instance, when environmental support is insufficient, Autonomous Motivation can compensate for the quality and efficiency of input through the creation of a personal linguistic ecosystem (Freiermuth, 2020).

4.3 Affective Attitudes and Foreign Language Acquisition

The mediating role of affective attitudes between the linguistic environment and acquisition outcomes manifests as the "psychological lens effect", whereby learners process environmental input differentially through affective filters (Dewaele, 2015). Negative emotional attitudes, such as language anxiety, exacerbate cognitive resource depletion: individuals experiencing high anxiety exhibit significantly reduced working memory bandwidth compared to their calmer counterparts within identical immersion environments (Gregersen & MacIntyre, 2014). Conversely, positive attitudes trigger enhanced neuroplasticity. This mediating effect operates through three distinct bidirectional regulatory mechanisms: the environmental authenticity-affective valence loop, in which highly authentic environments (e.g., interactions within target culture communities) lower anxiety thresholds, while positive affect reciprocally fosters deeper engagement, thus forming a positive feedback cycle; the affective shielding role of technology mediation, where asynchronous communication environments (e.g., email writing) can circumvent immediacy-related anxiety, although excessive reliance potentially weakens emotional adaptability; and culture distance as an amplifier, as pre-existing negative attitudes lead to intensified avoidance behaviors when individuals encounter environments marked by potent cultural conflict events (Jackson, 2019).

Pedagogical interventions aimed at regulating affective attitudes should focus on situational empowerment strategies. These include constructing scaffolding systems for emotional safety; developing tools for converting affective capital that guide learners in transforming indigenous cultural emotional resources into motivational drives for creative expression in the target language; and establishing dynamic affective profiles, whereby physiological sensing technologies monitor emotional fluctuations during environmental interactions. The core objective of such interventions lies in transforming affective attitudes into constructive environmental interaction energy. Empirical practice within the Chinese context indicates that groups of international students receiving adaptive affective training demonstrate superior resilient engagement within authentic cultural settings (Mao, 2024).

5. Key Pedagogical Implications and Pathways for Practical Optimization

5.1 Constructing Multidimensional, Situated Linguistic Environments Centering on the Classroom

Building upon the tripartite mediating mechanism linking linguistic environments to acquisition efficacy, namely, strategic agency influencing learning motivation, which subsequently shapes affective attitudes, classroom instruction necessitates transformation into an ecological hub anchored within authentic social contexts. The implementation pathway involves an integrative three-layered design: technologically, mixed reality environment design extends the physical classroom into a field of cultural practice; within the content layer, dynamic matching of multimodal inputs occurs, automatically adjusting environmental complexity based on learner profile data, while simultaneous integration of native cultural interfaces mitigates cultural-cognitive dissonance (De Back et al., 2023); at the interactive layer, a system of role niches is created, utilizing blockchain technology to establish sustainable classroom pragmatic communities. The authentic social utility embedded within these identity-based tasks demonstrably enhances motivation for linguistic production (García & Wei, 2014).

Drawing on the theoretical analysis and empirical evidence regarding the multidimensional impact of linguistic environments on foreign language acquisition, the primary pathway for optimizing pedagogical practice lies in redefining the role of the classroom itself as the central nexus, focusing on cultivating a situated linguistic ecology integrating multi-level and multimodal elements (Krüger, 2023). With respect to the first optimization priority, deep enhancement of the classroom's physical and social environmental "situated embeddedness" is crucial: moving beyond the static replication of textbook content, teachers should meticulously design simulated or authentically derived communicative tasks, project-based learning activities, and role-playing scenarios to model diverse socio-cultural contexts. This approach compels learners to collaboratively construct meaning and experientially embody the dynamic interplay among linguistic forms, social functions, and cultural conventions while solving authentic problems. Concurrently, the mediating function of the classroom's material and technological tools requires concerted expansion: integrating authentic audiovisual materials from the target language culture, digital learning platforms, and intelligent assistive systems empowers students to encounter diverse discursive styles, broadening the scope and depth of their language input and interaction channels. Most critically, the systematic cultivation of active social interaction networks within the classroom is paramount: through orchestrating scaffolded collaborative learning, fostering inclusive discourse communities, and providing immediate, embodied, meditational feedback from the teacher, the classroom is transformed into a high-density, accessible field of linguistic practice, effectively bridging the gap between classroom training and real-world social application.

5.2 Embracing Technology Empowerment to Create Interwoven Virtual-Real Environments

Transformative information technologies profoundly reconfigure the boundaries and substance of linguistic environments, offering strategic pathways to bridge the gap between the limited scenarios available within the classroom and authentic socio-pragmatic needs in the real world. Effective pedagogical optimization necessitates a systematic embrace of technology empowerment, specifically focusing on constructing an accessible, anytime/anywhere linguistic practice ecosystem characterized by the deep interweaving of virtual and physical spaces (Çelik & Baturay, 2024). This endeavor centers critically on establishing three foundational pillars.

The primary technological pillar involves expanding the spectrum of linguistic input and situated experience through the strategic use of immersive technologies and vast authentic corpora. This encompasses the targeted integration of virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR) to simulate authentic social and cultural spaces (Xu, 2023), thereby driving learners towards embodied perception of contextualized linguistic rules within high-fidelity simulations. Concurrently, deep application of native digital media libraries from target language countries enables the development of dynamically leveled corpus resources tailored to learner proficiency, ensuring both the idiomaticity and temporal relevance of the input language.

The second essential pillar focuses on constructing high-frequency language output and collaborative fields that transcend temporal and spatial constraints through intelligent interaction tools. This manifests through deploying technology-driven conversational agents for scenario-based, immediate oral practice, which provide personalized corrective feedback and adaptive difficulty scaling; and establishing cross-cultural cloud collaboration platforms that connect learners with native speakers or global learning communities, honing linguistic negotiation and strategic competence while engaging in purposeful authentic social tasks.

Ultimately, the third pillar leverages big data analytics engines to achieve granular diagnosis of learning processes and implement adaptive meditational interventions. Crucially within pedagogical practice, this involves generating dynamic learner language development profiles using tracked behavioral data; and constructing intelligent tutoring systems capable of automatically identifying knowledge gaps and pragmatic errors and enabling instructors to deploy precisely targeted timely-adaptive scaffolding.

The fundamental purpose of such technology empowerment transcends breaking down physical and educational barriers; it lies in transforming fragmented, high-cost authentic linguistic practice into accessible, embodied daily learning processes. This alignment ensures the linguistic environment truly serves the principles of individualized, ubiquitous, and needs-based acquisition.

5.3 Cultivation Strategies and Affective Support

Building on the in-depth analysis of the multifaceted impact of speech community environments on language acquisition presented earlier, this section proposes targeted cultivation strategies designed to optimize the utilization of beneficial environmental factors and mitigate adverse influences. It also emphasizes the indispensable construction of an affective support system. The primary strategy entails the deliberate design of instructional environments. Creating highly interactive classroom settings that simulate authentic language exposure compensates for the lack of a target language environment. Specific methods include implementing task-based learning, project-based learning, and similar pedagogical activities that stimulate profound language engagement (Lee et al., 2024). Extensive integration of multimedia resources, alongside leveraging digital platforms or virtual exchange communities, establishes authentic-like immersive language exposure and facilitates opportunities for both asynchronous and immediate communication. These measures specifically focus on enhancing learners' context

adaptability and practical cross-cultural communicative competence.

Secondly, systematic instruction in metacognitive and autonomous learning strategies is deemed crucial. Instructors must systematically guide learners in conducting needs analysis and equip them with effective methods for utilizing extracurricular resources, monitoring their learning progress, and adjusting personal strategies. This empowers learners to become active agents capable of constructing and expanding their personal linguistic environments (Karlen et al., 2023).

Equally crucial is the creation of a secure, inclusive learning atmosphere characterized by low affective anxiety, which serves as a fundamental precondition for unlocking potential and encouraging risk-taking and experimentation (Heinz et al., 2025). Instructors must remain highly cognizant of issues related to language anxiety. Through the implementation of reasonable assessment practices, the emphasis on procedural progress, the provision of constructive feedback rather than excessive error correction, and the promotion of peer collaborative learning, the fear of negative evaluation among learners can be reduced. This approach fosters the gradual development of a positive linguistic self-concept. At the institutional level, comprehensive support is required to enable instructors to implement these strategies effectively. This includes safeguarding opportunities for teacher professional development focused on contextualized pedagogy (e.g., relevant training programs) and providing matching resource support (e.g., psychological counseling services). The ultimate goal is to foster the development of a supportive learning community where language acquisition receives adequate nourishment in both cognitive and affective dimensions, thereby achieving more holistic and sustainable language proficiency development.

6. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that the language environment functions as a critical variable in foreign language acquisition, systematically influencing learning outcomes through multifaceted mechanisms. Theoretically, the Input Hypothesis, Interaction Hypothesis, Sociocultural Theory, and Output Hypothesis collectively illuminate how environments facilitate language internalization via distinct pathways: comprehensible input, meaning negotiation, social mediation, and output-driven processing. At the practical level, evidence confirms that immersive environments enhance pragmatic fluency through exposure to high-frequency authentic input and forced output demands, whereas technology-enhanced environments optimize resource accessibility and processing depth by leveraging spatiotemporal flexibility and intelligent feedback.

Central to this understanding is the recognition that the efficacy of any language environment is subject to a threefold mediation and moderation by learner factors: agency, motivation, and affective disposition. High agency drives deep resource processing and facilitates identity reconstruction; the dynamic hierarchy of motivation (shifting from instrumental to integrative) adapts in response to continuous environmental iteration; and the affective filter effect directly regulates the allocation of cognitive resources.

Consequently, pedagogical optimization should be grounded in a triad of integrative principles: Firstly, it necessitates constructing multi-dimensional environments characterized by the synergistic integration of physical and virtual spaces, thereby strengthening cultural authenticity and fostering dynamic adaptation through technological empowerment. Secondly, pedagogical efforts must emphasize deepening strategic scaffolding and metacognitive training, actively catalyzing learners' agency in transforming and adapting their learning environments. Thirdly, the establishment of affective safety design principles and social presence support mechanisms is vital to achieve optimal resource allocation across both cognitive and affective dimensions. Future research should focus on further exploring the neurocognitive mechanisms underlying the interaction between environmental factors and acquisition processes, facilitating a deeper translation of theoretical insights into evidence-informed pedagogical practices.

REFERENCES

[1] Blake, R. (2016). Technology and the four skills. *Language Learning & Technology*, 20(2), 129-142. https://doi.org/10.64152/10125/44465

[2] Cai, D., & Huang, L. (2023). Effects of input modality on alignment in continuation writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 62: 101060. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2023.101060

[3] Çelik, F., & Baturay, M. H. (2024). Technology and innovation in shaping the future of education. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11: 54. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00339-0

[4] Cohen, A. D. (2014). *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language* (2nd Edition). Routledge.

[5] Collentine, J., & Freed, B. F. (2004). Learning Context and Its Effects on Second Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(2), 153-171. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263104262015

[6] Cotos, E. (2014). Enhancing writing pedagogy with learner corpus data. *ReCALL*, 26(2), 202-224. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344014000019

[7] De Back, T. T., Tinga, A. M., & Louwerse, M. M. (2023). Learning in immersed collaborative virtual environments: design and implementation. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 31(8), 5364-5382. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2021.2006238

[8] Dewaele, J.-M. (2015). From obscure echo to language of the heart: Multilinguals' language choices for (emotional) inner speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 87, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.06.014

[9] Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

[10] Dörnyei, Z., Henry, A., & Muir, C. (2016). *Motivational currents in language learning: Frameworks for focused interventions*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

[11] Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Motivation* (2nd Edition). Pearson, Harlow.

[12] Ellis, R. (2015). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition* (2nd Edition). Oxford University Press.

[13] Freiermuth, M. R. (2020). Introduction and overview: The inescapable confluence of technology, psychology and second language learners and users. In M. R. Freiermuth & N. Zarrinabadi (Eds.), *Technology and the psychology of second language learners and users* (pp. 3-32). Palgrave Macmillan/Springer Nature.

[14] Friedman, H. S., & Kern, M. L. (2014). Personality, Well-Being, and Health. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 719-742. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115123

[15] García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Palgrave Pivot London.

[16] Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2007). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition. In B. Vanpatten, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 175-200). London: LEA.

[17] Gregersen, T., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2014). *Capitalizing on Language Learners' Individuality: From Premise to Practice*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

[18] Hanaoka, O., & Izumi, S. (2012). Noticing and uptake: Addressing pre-articulated covert problems in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 332-347. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.008

[19] Heift, T. (2010). Prompting in CALL: A Longitudinal Study of Learner Uptake. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 198-216. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01017.x

[20] Heinz, M., Graham, L. & Maulana, R. (2025). Towards more equitable and inclusive learning environments: forging new connections and research directions. *Learning Environments Research*, 28, 189-199. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-025-09553-0

[21] Jackson, J. (2019). *Introducing Language and Intercultural Communication*. London: Routledge.

[22] Karlen, Y., Hirt, C. N., Jud, J., Rosenthal, A., & Eberli, T. D. (2023). Teachers as learners and agents of self-regulated learning: The importance of different teachers competence aspects for promoting metacognition. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 125: 104055. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104055

[23] Kinginger, C. (2011). Enhancing Language Learning in Study Abroad. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 58-73. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000031

[24] Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practices of Second Language Acquisition*. Los Angeles, Pergamon.

[25] Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.

[26] Krüger, M. (2023). Theory of Second Language Acquisition. In M. Krüger (Eds.), *Media-Related Out-of-School Contact with English in Germany and Switzerland* (pp. 51-93). Springer VS, Wiesbaden.

[27] Kukulska-Hulme, A., & Viberg, O. (2018). Mobile Collaborative Language Learning: State of the Art. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 49, 207-218. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12580

[28] Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural Theory and The Genesis of Second Language Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[29] Lee, S. M., Wang, X., Park, I., & Lestiono, R. (2024). It feels so real! Situated authentic language learning in immersive virtual reality. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29, 24023-24045. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12807-8

[30] Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie, & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.

[31] Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and Teaching Languages through Content: A Counter-Balanced Approach*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[32] Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development: An empirical study of question formation in ESL. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 557-587. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263199004027

[33] Mao, Y. Academic adaptation of international students in the chinese higher education environment: A case study with mixed methods. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 103: 102082. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2024.102082

[34] Mercer, S. (2012). Self-Concept: Situating the Self. In S. Mercer, S. Ryan, & M. Williams (Eds.), *Psychology for Language Learning: Insights from Research, Theory and Practice* (pp. 10-25). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

[35] Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies: Self-Regulation in Context* (2nd Edition.). Routledge.

[36] Palfreyman, D. M. (2014). The Ecology of Learner Autonomy. In G. Murray (Eds.), *Social Dimensions of Autonomy in Language Learning* (pp. 175-191). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

[37] Plonsky, L., & Ziegler, N. (2016). The CALL-SLA interface: Insights from a Second-Order Synthesis. *Language Learning & Technology*, 20, 17-37. https://doi.org/10.64152/10125/44459

[38] Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic Assessment: A Vygotskian Approach to Understanding and Promoting L2 Development* (Vol. 9). Springer Science and Business Media, Berlin.

[39] Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158. doi:10.1093/applin/11.2.129

[40] Shadiev, R., & Sintawati, W. (2020). A review of research on intercultural learning supported by technology. *Educational Research Review*, 31: 100338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100338

[41] 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

[42] 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). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

[43] Ushioda, E. (2011). Language learning motivation, self and identity: current theoretical perspectives. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24(3), 199-210. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2010.538701

[44] van Lier, L. (2008). Agency in the classroom. *Sociocultural Theory and the Teaching of Second Languages*, 186-193.

[45] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[46] Wang, F., Zhang, J., & Long, Z. (2022). Language learning environment: Spatial perspectives on SLA. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13: 958104. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.958104

[47] Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the Mind: A Sociocultural Approach to Mediated Action*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

[48] Xu, H. (2023). The integration of virtual reality and augmented reality technology and its future application areas. *Advances in International Computer Science*. 3(5), 29-34. https://doi.org/10.12208/j.aics.20230048.

[49] Zheng, D., Cowley, S. J., & Nuesser, M. (2024). The New Ecolinguistics: Learning as Languaging with Digital Technologies. *Frontiers of Digital Education*, 1, 109-119. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44366-024-0026-7

[50] Zou, Y., Kuek, F., Feng, W., & Cheng, X. (2025). Digital learning in the 21st century: trends, challenges, and innovations in technology integration. *Frontiers in Education*, 10: 1562391. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1562391