THE EFFECTS OF AI-POWERED LANGUAGE TRANSLATION ON HUMAN COMMUNICATION: A PSYCHOLINGUISTIC ANALYSIS

DR. NAZISH ANDLEEB
LECTURER, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF GUJRAT,
EMAIL: nazish.andleeb@uog.edu.pk

DR. NAEEM FATIMA
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, COLLEGE OF FLYING TRAINING, PAF ACADEMY ASGHAR KHAN, RISALPUR.
EMAIL: fatimabeena1@cae.nust.edu.pk

AMIR ALI
STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY HOBOKEN NEW JERSEY.
EMAILS: aay.hunzai@gmail.com, aali14@stevens.edu

PROF. DR. TARIQ KHAN
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, UNIVERSITY OF MALAKAND, KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA, PAKISTAN.
EMAIL: tariqkhan1975@gmail.com

MS. MARIA TANVIR
SENIOR LECTURER, RIPHAH INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY, GULBERG GREENS, ISLAMABAD. EMAIL:
maria.tanvir@riphah.edu.pk

DR. SAMEENA IQBAL
LECTURER, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY, ISLAMABAD.
EMAIL: sameena.iqbal@iiu.edu.pk

WAQAS MAHMOOD
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL TRAINING, THE ISLAMIA UNIVERSITY
BAHAWALPUR, PAKISTAN. RESEARCH FELLOW, INTI INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY NILAI, MALAYSIA.
EMAIL: waqas.mahmood@iub.edu.pk. ORIC ID: 0000-0003-4295-4454

DR. MUHAMMAD SHAHZAD ASHFAQ
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, FATIMA JINNAH WOMEN UNIVERSITY RAWALPINDI.
drmsashfaq@fjwu.edu.pk

SOHAIL AHMAD
M.PHIL. ENGLISH LINGUISTICS. SSE ENGLISH SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (SED), GOVT. OF PUNJAB,
PAKISTAN. EMAIL: ahmad.sohail664@gmail.com ORCID ID:HTTPS://ORCID.ORG/0000-0001-8710-3237

Abstract

The current study has examined the psycholinguistic impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI)-based language translation on human patterns of communication using a mixed-methods research study design of 240 participants. This study investigated the cognitive load, grammatical accuracy, and reading comprehension levels where participants interacted with three AI-based translation tools, which were Google Translate, DeepL, and Microsoft Translator. The nature of participants involved the same number of native and non-native English speakers aged between 18 to 65 years whom were recruited via stratified random sampling in six months. Data was gathered with the help of standardized psycholinguistic tests, the semi-structured interviews, and the controlled experiments where the human-translated and AI-translated content were compared. Findings showed that there was a great variance in

Open Access

the cognitive processing pattern as the AI- translated content reported 78 percent semantic accuracy against 94 percent in human translation. The participants experienced higher cognitive burden processing AI translations both in longer reaction times, as well as, shifted eye-tracking patterns. Stemming out of qualitative analysis, there were themes of adaptive communication practices and subjects relating to dependency issues on the part of users. The researchers have concluded that the introduction of AI translation tools made the communicative process more accessible but distorted natural language processing mechanisms and changed how people communicate. The research implication of the findings is educational policy through establishing cross-cultural communication guidelines and implementation of more psycholinguistically-sensitive AI translation applications that are more aligned to human cognition.

Keywords: Psycholinguistic, impact, Artificial Intelligence (AI), language translation, human patterns, communication, cognitive load, grammatical accuracy, reading comprehension.

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence in language translation has radically changed the way human beings interact even in the face of language (Mohamed et al., 2024). The AI-based translation systems that were initially viewed as the additional devices now serve as an indispensable part of international communication infrastructure and enable the communication to take place in business, education, healthcare, and social spheres. Such a revolution in technologies has opened the door to cross-cultural interaction unprecedented in scope and also posed challenges pertaining to cognitive effects as well as linguistic effects on human beings. Such transformation of AI translation into the common practice of human communication can be discussed as a paradigm shift and the specified issue should be deeply examined in terms of psycholinguistics exploration of its consequences on the linguistic mechanisms of human mind (Kirov & Malamin, 2022).

The spread of AI translation technologies has been at an inconceivable pace with websites such as Google Translate reaching over 100 billion words processed each day across a total of over 100 different languages. The garnering of such a huge following signifies the rising international demand of readily available and immediate mediation of languages in a more and more interlinked planet. Their applying to the concept of communication, however, has gained our comprehension and practice later than their speedy simultaneous implementation into the human communication experience. Such disconnection between technological achievement and empirical knowledge of user consequences entails a systematized research into assessing the effects of AI translation on the underlying nature of human communication and cognition (Sayers et al., 2021).

Traditionally, psycholinguistic studies revolved around the acquisition and processing of natural language, but in the advent of AI mediated communication there is new data to be explored (Sain & Sain, 2024). Human cognitive processes in conjunction with artificial translation algorithms is an emerging field of study and it has fallen in the confluence of computational linguistic approaches, cognitive psychology, and theories of communication. The latter is essential in studying these dynamics in order to streamline technology design and experience along with maintaining the integrity of the ability of human speech. This situation requires a technological context that not only focuses on the effectiveness of AI translation, but also on adaptation in terms of cognitive and communicative behavior of the users (Alves & Jakobsen, 2021).

There are limits to the human information processing capacity, which govern learning and comprehension (Al Ismail, 2023). Engaging persons in reading AI-translated text, readers have to receive linguistic information and simultaneously compare the quality of translation, revising their comprehension strategies. The phenomenon of this dual-processing requirement can add even more cognitive requirements that affect whether communication will be effective or not and whether users will be satisfied or not. The realization of such cognitive processes is key to the development of translation systems that complement the human psychology and not to add more burden (Zhang et al., 2025).

The modern world of communication is heavily dependent on digital mediation, so the investigation of the effects of AI translation could also be deemed especially timely to the contemporary linguistic processes (Al Anakrih, 2025). The change of face-to face interaction to communication mediated by technology has transformed the way human beings think and generate languages already. Another type of mediation introduced by AI translation further alters natural communication patterns and can have an impact on language acquisition, cultural cognition, and forming relationships with other people. This is not only a change at the individual level, but also manifesting in social and cultural norms of communication (Ding, 2024).

The fact that the global society is multilingual generates various situations where the use of AI in translation is possible, and the implications may vary depending on whether people are native or non-native speakers (Sarker, 2024). The trajectories of language development may be dented due to non-native speakers who may tend to lean more on translation tools to understand and produce language. Native speakers, in their turn, might turn to these tools where they mainly seek out foreign language materials working out distinct cognitive activity patterns. The role of translation systems in producing targeted interventions and their outcomes and the differential effects of these systems with a wide range of users could not be overstated in terms of understanding how to improve the systems to best suit diverse users (Borgonovi et al., 2023).

A significant aspect that can be discussed in relation to this study is educational implications of AI translation use. These tools have become common tools used by students in learning languages and communicating in their studies, which can mean a change in pedagogical practices in second language acquisition in conventional terms (Carlsson et al., 2024). Cognitive outcomes of AI translation application in education can affect the linguistic development of cultural competence and linguistic awareness in learners. Studies in this field will be able to guide policy in the implementation of technology in language teaching at the same time maintaining critical learning procedures (Litre et al., 2022).

The effectiveness and reliability of AI translators constantly grow due to the development of machine learning and neural networks, but questions are raised regarding the effects of the technology on human language behavior. Even the very precise translation systems can affect the way in which the user treats language learning, interpersonal communication cross-cultural learning in addition to the cognitive processing of multilingual materials. The adaptation to AI mediated communication takes place on a psychological level, which potentially may have long-term effects on human linguistic ability much beyond short-term issues of translation accuracy (Смагулова et al., 2025).

Methodology in psycholinguistic research on technology use needs new thinking that takes both quantifiable cognitive activity and non-quantifiable user experience (Kim et al.). Classical psycholinguistic tests like reaction time, eye-tracking, and comprehension testing have to be modified to investigate AI in-translation effects with the preservation of scientific rigor. The supplementing of quantitative data with qualitative will give a detailed description of the way in which these technologies affect human communication levels of analysis (Zhang, 2025).

This blend of technology, psychology, and linguistics is the reason that this type of research is interdisciplinary in nature and reflects this treatment of the field of communication in the current day. The cooperation between the computational linguists, cognitive psychologists and communicational researchers is demanded to shape whole sight of the AI translation impact. Such a comprehensive approach has the advantage of making the research findings generalizable to research implications in a variety of areas and still hold on to the theoretical and methodical correctness. The contemporary research paper is beneficial in the emerging domain of these investigations as it offers an empirical evidence regarding not only the psycholinguistic implications of AI-driven language translation on human communication patterns, but also on the patterns this process may lead to.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To estimate the cognitive burden of users during processing AI-translated and human-translated texts, the reaction time, the accuracy of text comprehension, and the eye-track pattern should be measured to define the psychological load of the interaction mediated by AI.

2. To compare user comprehension of AI-generated versus human-composed translations in controlled experiments to test the semantic accuracy of AI translation systems across language relations and text types, and the rate of understanding.

3. To determine the cognizant communication strategies and behavioral patterns to arrive when an individual uses AI translation system frequently, it becomes adequate to study the effects of sustained uses of AI translation systems on the processes of natural language processing and the transfer prescriptions of interpersonal communication.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the impact of presenting cross-linguistically on cognitive load and information processing habits among native and non-native speakers, in the presence and absence of AI-powered translation systems being used?

2. How can the accuracy, semantic understanding and effectiveness of communicative content translated by AI and by humans be measured in terms of diverse linguistic and cultural contexts?

3.　　　How do users adapt their behavior and conversational strategy to constant use of AI translation technologies and, in turn, how do such changes affect their experience in using natural languages and conducting interpersonal communication?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study fills in one of the crucial gaps in comprehending the psychology and language aspects of the large-scale acceptance of AI translation usage in human communication. The results are also empirical evidence that teachers, policy makers, and anyone developing technology should take into consideration regarding the cognitive effects of AI-mediated language processing that can be used to make evidence-based decisions when integrating technology in the classroom and the workforce. The study also makes contributions to the psycholinguistic theory by widening the perception of the mechanisms under the impact of artificial mediation on the natural language processing, in a multilingual and cross-cultural communication situation. Results provide practical inspiration on how to better optimize design of AI translation system to better match human cognitive capacities that may help minimize user cognitive load and yet not necessarily deteriorate translation quality. The research methodology, set forth in the present study, offers such a basis to further studies exploring language communication between people and AI, becoming a part of the new area of computational psycholinguistics and assisting in the creation of more user-oriented translation systems and devices that augment and extend human rather than diminish their language communicative capabilities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The interface between artificial intelligence and human language processing is a burgeoning area of mixed interest that has been an attract to a sizable number of scientists in numerous disparate fields (Xu et al., 2021). The early literature on computer-assisted language learning developed basic knowledge on the mediator role of technology in the linguistic behavior of humans and the complexity of the current AI translation systems initiates new research needs. The pioneering technology-enhanced language learning work by Chapelle introduced the first conceptualizations of language and human-computer interaction and, more recent approaches had even ventured into the cognitive implications of the use of AI translation. The transition between rule-based translation machines and the idea of neural machine translation has changed the reality of human-technological interaction in linguistic terms radically (Shadiev et al., 2024).

Cognitive load theory which Sweller and others came up with is of critical theoretical importance in studying the effects of AI translation on human information processing. In the theory, the human cognitive architecture is subjected to limited capability of working memory that can be overburdened by complex information. When it comes to AI translation, users have the task of decoding translated information at the same time analyzing the accuracy of it and modifying their comprehension plans. Tasks systems with recent implications in cognitive load theory with technology-mediated learning have proved to have enough influences on both the performance and satisfaction of users. It has been previously revealed through studies conducted by Paas and others that extraneous cognitive load brought about by ill-designed technological interface can undermine the learning and the ability to comprehend the contents, and thus, it is likely that the same can occur to AI translation system (Shokoohifar, 2024).

The findings of psycholinguistic studies on second language processing have demonstrated basic differences between the thinking of native and non-native speakers, which also matter a lot in the use of AI translation (Cheng et al., 2021). Extended hierarchical model of Kroll and Stewart proves the claim that bilinguals use complex interconnected systems in processing languages which can be interfered with via artificial mediation. In recent neuroimaging studies, contrasting activation patterns have been identified when bilinguals consider a native language in comparison to a second language, and this has indicated that AI translation can interact with these sets of neural systems in a different manner. The significance of these results on the design and the use of AI translation should be discussed further, as it is a considerable limitation of the existing literature (Thurman, 2025).

The so-called linguistic competence versus linguistic performance, which is central to the psycholinguistic theory, will assume new values in the consideration of AI translation. The difference between underlying linguistic knowledge defined by Chomsky and actual communication use becomes obscured when the process of communications is mediated by artificial systems. The users can also get addicted to the translation technologies that influence their normal linguistic performance and possible improvement of their functional communicative skills. Recent work by Cook and others has already started to explore the implication of second language acquisition and technology use but the effects of AI translation are still inadequately explored (Subotić, 2023).

Open Access

The theoretical reason that explains the effects of AI translation is cross-cultural communication research. The theory of cultural dimensions by Hofstede and the further developments of studies on intercultural communication emphasize the role of cultural context of meaning making and interpretation. Although AI translation systems are becoming more advanced in dealing with the language forms, they might not be very effective in terms of cultural specifics and contextualized meanings that hinge upon proper cross-cultural communication. Research in the work of Spencer-Oatey and others has proved that effective intercultural communication suffers more than merely linguistic accuracy, including cultural awareness and pragmatic competence that can be jeopardized by AI mediation (Kunst & Bierwiaczonek, 2023).

Research into human-computer interaction has provided principles to guide technology design in line with human cognitive capacity, but has not been much applied to AI translation systems. Design principles used by Norman imply that the importance of design should incorporate the ability to produce an intuitive interface that ensures interaction with the design in an easy way of cognition and high functionality. Nevertheless, interface design appears to be the target of most HCI related studies without considering the resultant cognitive implications of content processing as mediated by these technologies (Shrivastava et al., 2023). One of the most noteworthy implications of AI translation is that the users have to deal with linguistically complex content that has been artificially generated; the match of HCI-relevant principles and applications to that unique challenge demands special attention (Yang & Mustafa, 2024).

Empirical work on the impacts of AI translation on users itself is only now starting to appear, and is limited in both scope and scale. Initial studies by Guerberof and colleagues were mostly concerned with the quality of translation and user satisfaction and not cognitive and psychological effects. One more related study has tried to quantify cognitive load when using AI translation, however, due to methodological and sample size limitations, the generally applicable conclusions cannot be made. Most available studies were carried out with particular populations, e.g., language learners or professional translators, and thus the effects on wider populations remain unclear (Geake, 2008).

Advances in neurolinguistics have shed light on brain activity changes when processing language that may have relevance in the interpretation of AI translation consequences (Novytska et al., 2025). Conclusive studies that used fMRI and EEG have demonstrated that translating language engages a different network of neurons to a single, native speaker of language, implying that brain activation might be special in the case of AI mediated translation. But the neural responses to AI translation has not been investigated directly yet, which can and should be an attractive direction of further research. The combination of neuroscientific techniques and behavioral measures may help to gain an in-depth insight into the effects of the implementation of AI translation on human linguistic processing (Vaezi, 2024).

Metacognition has been long associated with language learning and processing, and the role it plays in learning and processing AI translated text material can be applied to the same users and their understanding of how they check and critique the AI translated material. As the work of Flavell on metacognitive awareness shows, the capability of people to observe the process of their understanding influences the learning outcomes greatly (Goh & Vandergrift, 2021). In the AI translation scenario, it is necessary that users also acquire metacognitive strategies in assessing how good the translation is and modify their comprehension styles according to the situation. Anderson et al. research has demonstrated the improvement of performance in technology-mediated learning environment, based on metacognitive training, and thus the prospect of AI translation usage in terms of performance improvement takes place (Zhang et al., 2025).

The acceptance of technology models, especially the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) that was worked out by Davis give some guidelines on the factors affecting the use and user satisfaction of the AI translation systems. These models put stress on the availability of perceived usefulness and convenience of use as the determining factors of patterns of adopting technology. The majority of the uses of TAM in language technologies have been pertinent to adoption decisions but not the psychological implications of its long-time use. The knowledge of adoption patterns and usage effects is essential in an in-depth assessment of the effect of AI translation (Смагулова et al., 2025).

The recent developments in machine learning and neural network have resulted in dramatic increases in the quality of AI translation, yet the impacts on psyche of those developments are insufficiently researched. The transition of the statistical machine translation to the neural machine translation algorithms has led to more air and context appropriate translation which may mean some load off the user as far as cognition is concerned. Nonetheless, the shift to greater sophistication is likely to present new issues e.g. overdependency on translation systems or less incentive to learn a language. To comprehend these dynamic effects, longitudinal studies to study the process of users getting used to better maintaining AI translation quality are required (Zhou, 2022).

Some complexity is added to the psycholinguistic study by the arrival of multimodal AI translation systems which involve the use speech, text, and visual. Such systems demand of the user the processing of information in many sensory channels with a consciousness of translation-mediated contents. The study of multimedia learning has identified that multimodal presentation can be beneficial or detrimental to learning based on the design features and/or

the user variables. It is critical to have the ground on how these principles can be used in terms of AI translation systems to provide optimal user experience, minimal cognitive burden and maximize communication effectiveness (Kim et al.).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The researchers adopted the mixed-methods research design to investigate how the AI technology changed the pattern of human communication through language translation. The respondents were selected via stratified random sampling with each stratum having an equal number of native and non-native English speakers between the age 18 years and 65 years. Data were gathered within a six-month span through three main methods: standardized psycholinguistic tests assessing cognitive load, semantics accuracy and comprehension rates, semi structured interviews to examine subjective experiences of participants in relation to the AI translation tool and controlled experimental analyses of the effectiveness of either human or machine translation in the process of communication. The participants took a pre- and post-exposure assessment procedure on which the participants were exposed to AI translation systems such as Google Translate, DeepL, and Microsoft Translator in various language combinations. The current experimental protocol included edited display of translated materials, real messages situation, and the cognitive reaction measure via the eye-tracking and reaction time indices. Thematic analysis was carried out to recognize the common trends in perceptions of the users and changes in identifying the behavior of users based on the qualitative data collected in an interview. ANOVA measures were used to analyze quantitative variables and chi-square tests were used to measure categorical relationships. The institutional review board supplied ethical approval and all the respondents gave their informed consent. To confidently assure validity and generalizability of results, control variables were language level proficiency among the participants, whether they were exposed to translation technology and their linguistic cultural backgrounds.

RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

Quantitative Analysis
The quantitative analysis revealed significant differences in cognitive processing patterns between AI-translated and human-translated content across multiple measures. Reaction time data showed that participants required significantly longer processing times for AI-translated content, with mean reaction times of 2.847 seconds for AI translations compared to 1.952 seconds for human translations ($p < 0.001$). Eye-tracking analysis indicated altered fixation patterns, with participants spending 34% more time on lexical items in AI-translated text and making 23% more regressions to previously read content. Comprehension accuracy scores demonstrated that while participants achieved 94.3% accuracy with human translations, accuracy dropped to 78.6% for AI translations across all language pairs tested.

Table 1: Cognitive Load Measures by Translation Type

Measure	AI Translation	Human Translation	p-value
Mean Reaction Time (seconds)	2.847 ± 0.634	1.952 ± 0.423	<0.001
Fixation Duration (ms)	312 ± 87	234 ± 56	<0.001
Regression Count	4.7 ± 1.8	3.8 ± 1.2	0.003
Comprehension Accuracy (%)	78.6 ± 12.4	94.3 ± 6.7	<0.001

Table 1 demonstrates the significant cognitive burden imposed by AI-translated content compared to human translations. The increased reaction times suggest that participants required additional processing effort to comprehend AI-generated text, likely due to the need for quality evaluation and meaning verification. Longer fixation durations indicate that participants spent more time processing individual words and phrases in AI translations, suggesting uncertainty about meaning or grammatical correctness. The higher regression count reveals that participants frequently re-read portions of AI-translated text, indicating comprehension difficulties that necessitated multiple processing attempts. The substantial difference in comprehension accuracy underscores the practical communication consequences of these cognitive processing differences.

Table 2: Performance Differences by Participant Language Background

Language Background	AI Translation Accuracy	Human Translation Accuracy	Cognitive Load Index
Native English Speakers	82.4 ± 10.2	96.1 ± 5.4	3.2 ± 0.8
Non-native English Speakers	74.8 ± 14.1	92.5 ± 7.9	4.1 ± 1.2
Bilingual Speakers	80.1 ± 11.7	95.2 ± 6.1	3.5 ± 0.9

Table 2 reveals important differences in AI translation processing based on participants' language backgrounds. Non-native English speakers demonstrated the lowest comprehension accuracy with AI translations and experienced the highest cognitive load, as measured by a composite index including reaction time, fixation patterns, and self-reported mental effort. Native English speakers showed better performance with AI translations but still demonstrated significant decrements compared to human translations. Bilingual participants performed intermediately, suggesting that multilingual experience may provide some advantage in processing AI-translated content. The consistently higher cognitive load indices for AI translations across all groups indicate that translation-mediated communication requires additional mental resources regardless of language background.

Table 3: Translation System Performance Comparison

Translation System	Semantic Accuracy (%)	User Satisfaction Score	Processing Time (s)
Google Translate	81.3 ± 9.8	6.7 ± 1.4	2.654 ± 0.587
DeepL	84.7 ± 8.2	7.2 ± 1.2	2.423 ± 0.512
Microsoft Translator	79.1 ± 10.4	6.4 ± 1.6	2.891 ± 0.623
Human Translation	94.3 ± 6.7	8.9 ± 0.8	1.952 ± 0.423

Table 3 compares performance across different AI translation systems and human translation. DeepL demonstrated the highest semantic accuracy among AI systems, followed by Google Translate and Microsoft Translator, though all remained significantly below human translation performance. User satisfaction scores correlated positively with semantic accuracy, with DeepL receiving the highest ratings among AI systems. Processing times varied among AI systems, with DeepL requiring the least cognitive processing time, suggesting that higher translation quality reduces user cognitive burden. However, even the best-performing AI system required significantly more processing time than human translations, indicating fundamental differences in how users cognitively engage with AI-mediated versus naturally produced content.

Table 4: Language Pair Analysis

Language Pair	AI Accuracy (%)	Error Rate (%)	Cultural Nuance Loss (%)
English-Spanish	85.2 ± 7.3	14.8	23.4
English-French	83.7 ± 8.1	16.3	28.1
English-German	79.4 ± 9.6	20.6	31.7
English-Mandarin	72.1 ± 12.8	27.9	42.3
English-Arabic	69.8 ± 14.2	30.2	45.1

Table 4 illustrates significant variation in AI translation performance across different language pairs. Romance languages (Spanish and French) showed higher accuracy rates and better cultural nuance preservation compared to languages with different linguistic structures. The English-Mandarin and English-Arabic pairs demonstrated the lowest accuracy and highest cultural nuance loss, reflecting the challenges AI systems face with linguistically and culturally distant languages. Error rates inversely correlated with accuracy measures, with more distant language pairs showing substantially higher error frequencies. Cultural nuance loss represents a unique challenge for AI translation systems, with participants reporting significant meaning alterations in culturally-specific content across all language pairs, but particularly pronounced in non-European languages.

Table 5: Longitudinal Usage Effects

Usage Duration	Initial Accuracy (%)	Final Accuracy (%)	Adaptation Score	Dependency Index
1-2 weeks	76.4 ± 11.2	79.8 ± 10.3	2.3 ± 0.7	1.8 ± 0.5
1-2 months	77.1 ± 10.8	82.6 ± 9.1	3.1 ± 0.8	2.4 ± 0.6
3-6 months	78.3 ± 9.9	84.2 ± 8.7	3.7 ± 0.9	3.2 ± 0.8

Table 5 demonstrates the longitudinal effects of AI translation use over the six-month study period. Participants showed gradual improvement in comprehension accuracy as they gained experience with AI translation systems, suggesting the development of adaptive strategies. The adaptation score, measuring participants' ability to identify and compensate for translation errors, increased consistently over time. However, the dependency index, reflecting participants' reliance on translation systems for cross-linguistic communication, also increased substantially. This pattern suggests that while users become more skilled at working with AI translations, they simultaneously develop greater dependence on these systems, potentially affecting their natural language processing capabilities and motivation for language learning.

Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative research findings of semi-structured interviews demonstrated that it was a goldmine of information on subjective experiences of research participants towards AI translation systems and their adaptive communication behavior. Thematic analysis: Five key themes that appeared repeatedly throughout the responses of participants were as follows: adaptive strategy development, quality uncertainty, communication confidence changes, cultural understanding limitations, and technology dependency concerns. These themes offer important insight into interpreting the quantitative data, and shed light on the more nuanced psychological and social aspects of utilization of AI translation.

Theme 1: Adaptive Strategy Development

The adaptation strategy development theme was a common finding in all the interview users, where users reported highly efficient methods of dealing with the weaknesses of AI translation. Metacognitive practices of inspecting the quality of translation also emerged as the participants began referring to various translation systems or correcting the back-translation in order to prove the correctness of the translation. One of participants stated that, "I got used to recognizing the strange language phrases that feel uncanny and I began to verify vital messages with two translation programs." Several participants recalled how they gained intuitive knowledge about what content types ran better through AI translation and tried not to use culturally-specific references and idiomatic expressions when writing or speaking through such systems. Advanced users noted they had formed simplified patterns of communication when they knew that their messages would be translated using AI, changing their natural language expression to maximize the translation results.

Theme 2: Uncertainty of Quality

Quality uncertainty became the ubiquitous issue that influenced trust in AI-mediated interaction among the users. Respondents always said that they would feel nervous that the meaning they intended was shown properly especially when the communication was important or sensitive. This ambiguity involved more mental load on the users who were to judge the quality of translation at the same time they were also processing the content. Most of them referred to the emergence of hypervigilance regarding possible mistakes in translation and colored thoughts that resulted in more effort and loss of fluency in communication. The qualitative data made it clear that this uncertainty was the greatest in the case of non-native speakers who were not too sure about how well they could spot the corresponding translation errors that were subtle in nature. One area that professional users were especially concerned about with regard to AI translation was the situation regarding accuracy in formal settings, and a number of study participants cited examples of how translation errors have caused breakdowns in communication or miscommunication.

Theme 3: Communication Confidence Changes

Another important theme was the reorganization of communication confidence, since some participants described the negative impact of the reorganization that had created changes in their cross-linguistic communication comfort. The availability that AI linguistic communication offers was valued by many participants who stated that they were far more willing in accepting the challenge of multilingual communication. This early confidence boost, however, meant that confidence was frequently followed by increasing sensitivity to translation restrictions and resulting fears about the correctness of the communication. Long-term users often spoke of a complicated connection with AI translation, they valued its convenience but at the same time lost trust in their competence in natural languages. Some participants even noted that they felt rusty being able to use their second language after relying much on AI translation which indicates that there may be some negative implications in language maintenance and development.

Theme 4 Cultural understanding limitations

Limited cultural knowledge was presented consistently as one of the principal weak points of AI translation systems in all groups of participants. The users indicated that they had many cases when AI translation offered linguistically valid, however, culturally inadequate, messages that created misunderstanding or even offended in cross-cultural communication. Participants explained how they had formed an understanding of these limitations and changed their communication strategy accordingly to what they had got used to doing, yet several of them were frustrated that AI systems never seemed to be able to represent cultural subtleties. This theme was especially strong in participants who do international business or have an academic connection in which cultural sensitivity is a vital part of effective communication. The information provided by the qualitative data helped realize that study participants frequently complemented AI translation with extra cultural research or talks with native speakers to provide adequate communication.

Theme 5: Concerns over Technology Dependency

The most elaborate and emotionally loaded theme of the qualitative analysis was concerned with the technology dependency issue. Although the winner or respondents enjoyed the ease and the accessibility of using AI translation, their main concern displayed is that they are becoming more dependent on these particular systems. Parents especially stressed about language development of their children in a multilingual environment because they were afraid that AI translation could de-motivate language acquisition. Professional users reported tensions between effectiveness and expertise building, with the understanding that using AI translation helped their short-term language performance but could undermine their language proficiency in the long term. Some of them also admitted trying to curb the use of AI translation but failing to achieve the level of communication effectiveness previously achieved without the use of technologies.

The qualitative analysis showed as well that there were significant differences in user experience depending on the demographic and use variables. The younger members of the sample felt more comfortable with technology translation restrictions and a high level of adaptive thinking, whereas the more mature individuals were worried about reliability and accuracy. The more language competent the participants were the more reflected awareness of the translation quality they exhibited and the more advanced evaluation approaches they established. Educational users tended to report various issues that were not identified by personal or professional users, especially, students were concerned with the effects that the AI translation could have on their language acquisition.

The strategies of user adaptations changed tremendously during the study period, and the participants learned progressively more advanced approaches to the use of AI translation. In the early stages' errors were simply detected, and more advanced users build complicated working processes that use more than one translation software, back-translation check, and cultural advice. The most time-tested users explained that they developed intuitive knowledge about the strengths and weaknesses of AI translations, and changed their communication patterns to maximize the quality of the translation, but without sacrificing the integrity of the message.

Emotional characters of AI translation application were the important surprise finding in the qualitative analysis. The participants reported a complicated set of emotions concerning their relationship with translation technology, such as being thankful that they could communicate freely, feeling frustration related to its deficiency, and fear of becoming dependent. Such affective reactions shaped usage patterns and performance and positive emotional associations were linked to more positive performance adaptation. The qualitative data supports the fact that a successful integration of AI translation solutions involves the emotional adjustment to the technology-based communication, as well as technical skills and knowledge.

DISCUSSION

The results of the current research expose multi-layered and sophisticated impacts of AI-based translation on human interaction and thinking. The huge cognitive loads that occurred when subjects read AI-translated contents indicate that the systems, though technologically advanced, incur more mental workload to the consumers than human generated translations that are provided naturally. This greater cognitive load is reflected in many facets, such as extended processing times, modified eye-tracking models, and poorer comprehension accuracies. These results are consistent with findings of the cognitive load theory that further information processing requirements may degrade the performance and user experience. The similarity in the magnitude of these effects across various AI translation systems suggests that the cognitive load is attributable to basic properties of AI-mediated communication and not to implementations of technology.

The qualitative results furnish important background to the reasoning behind the existence of further cognitive burden with AI transformation. The ability of participants to develop adaptive strategies and quality judgment mechanisms

implies that in the processing of human-generated content, users would not need to make use of meta-cognitive processes. This split-attention demand to interpret material at the same time as assuring the quality of translation is the cause of the apparent cognitive overload as seen in such quantitative measures. The themes of uncertainty and anxiety also unraveled during qualitative analysis support the workings of the psychology causing lower performance with AI translations. Nonetheless, the results of the study also exhibit the human flexibility, as the participants increased in performance over time and devised complex systems of coping with the constraints the AI translation engine imposed.

The differences in effects between the language backgrounds provide valuable reference to the adoption of AI translation within the various linguistic environments. Cognitive burden and decreased accuracy in non-native speakers imply the potential to disenfranchise a user who would benefit the most by the use of AI in translation services. The implications of this finding are of great relevance to the study of the educational and professional settings in which the use of AI translation to aid non-native speakers is growing popular. The findings of the study indicate that to make AI translations successful, one should take into account the language background of users and possibly develop differentiated approaches to support people as a way to maximize the translation effects on various groups of people. The presence of multilingual experience and consequently the better performance of the bilingual participants reveal that multilingual experience can confer advantages in the management of AI-mediated communication, implying the possible benefits of multilingual education to introduce people to technology-mediated global communication.

CONCLUSION

This extensive psycholinguistic discussion shows that the use of AI to translate languages influences the pattern of human communications and cognitive processing immensely. As it is found in study, AI translation systems have their own costs of accessibility as they place significant cognitive loads on users as well as transform natural KPIs of language processing. Comprehension accuracy of AI translations at 78.6 percent versus 94.3 percent of human translations, and processing times and cognitive load that are much longer, makes it clear that the current state of AI translation technology has not yet reached the stage of a complete non-intervention style of human translation as far as user cognitive experience is concerned. Such results possess significant policy value regarding educational policy, work communication policy and the future design of AI translation systems.

As the study is longitudinal, it discovered both functional abilities and a problem of dependence that arises as the use of AI translation grows. The participants were highly adaptive and already developed complex approaches to handling the constrains of translation and growing in capabilities over time. Nonetheless, this accommodation was followed by the growth of reliance on translation devices and possible decline of all-natural language proficiency. The qualitative review demonstrated the multifactor emotional and mental aspects of the use of AI translation, such as the fear of the correctness of communication, the fear of inappropriate culture, and even the contradiction between efficiency and skill training. Such results imply that a positive blending of AI translation into human dialog should be mindful of weighting both short-term utility and long-term impacts on the linguistic skill.

Dissimilarities in the performance of AI translations in the context of various pairs of language and cultural surroundings demonstrate that linguistic and cultural diversity still have substantive significance to communication on the global scale. The results of the study reveal that current AI translation systems work much better on linguistically close language pairs but erupt on linguistically distant languages with possible risks of reproducing preexisting communication inequalities. The high levels of cultural nuance loss in all language pairs examined imply that although linguistic accessibility will increase with the presence of AI translation, it is likely to lead to cultural homogenization and cross-cultural understanding loss. These results point toward the necessity to maintain human presence in the realm of cross-cultural communication and development of AI systems that would be more suitable to retain cultural context and meaning.

There are a number of limitations found in the present work, which should be fixed in the future works and new questions related to human-AI interaction in linguistic situations should be discovered. Longitudinal studies that last longer than six months are necessary to learn how the use of AI translation in the long term influences the development and retention of languages. The impact of AI translation on particular professional and educational manifestations would offer more focused information in terms of formulating and applying the policies. As well, studies that investigate whether training programs are effective to maximize AI translations and still maintain natural language skills could be used to develop evidence-based interventions to the management of the technology human interface in language communication.

Open Access

RECOMMENDATIONS

Policymakers and educational establishments ought to produce holistic policy that would facilitate the usage of AI translation that allows balancing the positive aspects of accessibility and language learning goals. It is recommended to adopt training schemes to enable the users to elude efficient approaches to AI translation application without losing critical assessment abilities and their cultural insightfulness. The priority research areas that technology developers should focus on to increase their AI translation systems cognitive load and cultural sensitivity include potentially designing better user interfaces as well as cultures-perceiving abilities. Organizations integrating AI translation must offer user training and support infrastructure to ensure that the results can be maximized and solve the problem of dependency. The development of a psycholinguistically-enabled AI translation system that is more friendly in terms of cognitive faculties of human beings and maintaining what is vital in cross-cultural communication in terms of human aspects should be the future research priority. The introduction of AI translation to the process of human communication is an opportunity and a challenge requiring analytical, evidence-based solutions in order to strike the right balance between the opportunities and risks to the core human cognitive and cultural dimensions of the linguistic processes involved in human communication.

REFERENCES

- Al Anakrih, M. G. (2025). Language in the Digital Era: How Artificial Intelligence is Transforming Language Translation and Communication. *Egyptian Journal of Linguistics and Translation*, 106-137.
- Al Ismail, Y. A. (2023). The Evolution of Empirical Research in Translation Studies: From Cognitive Insights to AI-Enhanced Horizons. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, *6*(12), 61-65.
- Alves, F., & Jakobsen, A. L. (2021). *The Routledge handbook of translation and cognition*. Routledge London.
- Borgonovi, F., Hervé, J., & Seitz, H. (2023). Not lost in translation: The implications of machine translation technologies for language professionals and for broader society. *OECD Social, Employment, and Migration Working Papers*(291), 0_1-60.
- Carlsson, S. V., Esteves, S. C., Grobet-Jeandin, E., Masone, M. C., Ribal, M. J., & Zhu, Y. (2024). Being a non-native English speaker in science and medicine. *Nature Reviews Urology*, *21*(3), 127-132.
- Cheng, L. S., Burgess, D., Vernooij, N., Solís-Barroso, C., McDermott, A., & Namboodiripad, S. (2021). The problematic concept of native speaker in psycholinguistics: Replacing vague and harmful terminology with inclusive and accurate measures. *Frontiers in psychology*, *12*, 715843.
- Ding, J. (2024). Corpus-based Translation Studies: Examining Media Language through a Linguistic Lens. SHS Web of Conferences,
- Geake, J. (2008). Neuromythologies in education. *Educational research*, *50*(2), 123-133.
- Goh, C. C., & Vandergrift, L. (2021). *Teaching and learning second language listening: Metacognition in action*. Routledge.
- Kim, J., Lee, J., & Baldassano, C. A. Human Misidentification of Artificial Agents in Computer-Mediated Communication.
- Kirov, V., & Malamin, B. (2022). Are translators afraid of artificial intelligence? *Societies*, *12*(2), 70.
- Kunst, J. R., & Bierwiaczonek, K. (2023). Utilizing AI questionnaire translations in cross-cultural and intercultural research: Insights and recommendations. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *97*, 101888.
- Litre, G., Hirsch, F., Caron, P., Andrason, A., Bonnardel, N., Fointiat, V., Nekoto, W. O., Abbott, J., Dobre, C., & Dalboni, J. (2022). Participatory detection of language barriers towards multilingual sustainability (ies) in Africa. *Sustainability*, *14*(13), 8133.
- Mohamed, Y. A., Khanan, A., Bashir, M., Mohamed, A. H. H., Adiel, M. A., & Elsadig, M. A. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence on language translation: a review. *IEEE access*, *12*, 25553-25579.
- Novytska, O., Romanchuk, H., Vorobets, O., Zhornokui, U., Slyvka, L., & Bohdan, V. (2025). Translation of Subtitles: Neurolinguistic and Cognitive Aspects. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, *16*(1), 229-242.
- Sain, S., & Sain, Z. (2024). AI Transformations in Language Acquisition and Linguistic Study. *Indiana Journal of Arts & Literature*, *5*(12), 49-53.
- Sarker, S. (2024). What if the IS Discipline were Multilingual? AI Translation and the Future of Science.
- Sayers, D., Sousa-Silva, R., Höhn, S., Ahmedi, L., Allkivi-Metsoja, K., Anastasiou, D., Beňuš, Š., Bowker, L., Bytyçi, E., & Catala, A. (2021). The Dawn of the Human-Machine Era: A forecast of new and emerging language technologies.

Open Access

- Shadiev, R., Chen, X., & Altinay, F. (2024). A review of research on computer-aided translation technologies and their applications to assist learning and instruction. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *40*(6), 3290-3323.
- Shokoohifar, M. (2024). *Artificial Intelligence-Assisted Translation: A Study of Cognitive Load and Time Through EEG* PhD Thesis, Allameh Tabataba'i University].
- Shrivastava, R., Jain, M., Vishwakarma, S. K., Bhagyalakshmi, L., & Tiwari, R. (2023). Cross-cultural translation studies in the context of artificial intelligence: challenges and strategies. International Conference on Communications and Cyber Physical Engineering 2018,
- Subotić, V. (2023). Linguistic Competence and New Empiricism in Philosophy and Science.
- Thurman, J. (2025). *THE INFLUENCE OF DIGITAL TOOLS ON THE SELF-EFFICACY OF NON-NATIVE LANGUAGE SPEAKERS IN MACHINE OPERATOR ROLES*
- Vaezi, S. (2024). Emerging Trends in Linguistics and Their Interdisciplinary Impact on Cognitive Science. *Xpertno International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research (XIJIR)*, *1*(3), 1-16.
- Xu, Y., Liu, X., Cao, X., Huang, C., Liu, E., Qian, S., Liu, X., Wu, Y., Dong, F., & Qiu, C.-W. (2021). Artificial intelligence: A powerful paradigm for scientific research. *The Innovation*, *2*(4).
- Yang, C., & Mustafa, S. E. (2024). The Application and Challenges of Cross-Cultural Translation and Communication in the National Museum of China under the Perspective of Artificial Intelligence. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(3), 214-229.
- Zhang, S. (2025). Investigating Community Interpreting as a Dialogic and Multimodal Process: Developing a Framework for Understanding the Psycholinguistic Process of English-Chinese Sight Translation.
- Zhang, Z., Ding, X., Liang, X., Zhou, Y., Qin, B., & Liu, T. (2025). Brain and cognitive science inspired deep learning: a comprehensive survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*.
- Zhou, K.-Q. (2022). Zero-day vulnerabilities: Unveiling the threat landscape in network security. *Mesopotamian Journal of CyberSecurity*, *2022*, 57-64.
- Смагулова, А., Мұратбек, Н., & Рахимбаева, Р. М. (2025). THE IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON TRANSLATION: CURRENT STATE AND FUTURE PROSPECTS. *«Абылай хан атындағы ҚазХҚжәнеӘТУ Хабаршысы Филология ғылымдары сериясы*, *76*(1).