

# Interactional Modifications Develop L2 Speaking Skills: A Case Study of L2 Adolescent Learners on YouTube

Juxia Wang

Nanyang Technological University  
Email: wang\_juxia@g.nie.edu.sg

## ABSTRACT

There has recently been a growing interest in video-mediated discourse. The previous study has shown the benefits of video-mediated exchange in interactional adjustment. Most online communication studies have only compared video-mediated discussion to audio or telephone talk. The objectives of this paper were to compare interactional modification in video-mediated and face-to-face conversations. The study is based on six case studies that a YouTube blogger filmed. The findings revealed some characteristics influencing interactional change in video-mediated discussions but not face-to-face engagements. The results constitute a significant step forward in interactive video conversation interaction modification research.

**Keywords:** *Interactional modification, video-mediated conversation, face-to-face interaction, foreign talk characteristics*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the role of video-mediated dialogue in interactional modification has gotten more attention from various fields. In recent years, researchers have shown a growing interest in video-mediated conversation to improve L2 learners' speaking skills. The video-mediated discussion is an integral part of the second language acquisition method since it helps with interactional modification. The AT&T Picturephone, which was first introduced at the 1964 New York World's Fair, was one of the most significant events of the 1970s. Interactional alteration is linked to exposure to the target language setting or interaction with native speakers. Various variables have been related to recasting, negotiation, and corrective feedback in prior studies of interactional change [1]. The topic of video-mediated communication has been a contentious one. The issue of video-mediated conversation has been a controversial and much-disputed subject within the field of interactional modification of second language acquisition. There is substantially less information concerning the effects of video-mediated discourse on interactional change than on face-to-face interaction. Although there are many studies on the impact of interactional modification, most of them are limited to

face-to-face interactions. So far, no research has been able to replicate these results in a video-mediated interaction exchange. Some researchers have found that video-mediated dialogue can improve interactional modification, while others have found it can worsen [2, 3, 4]. However, it is unclear if video-mediated discussion improves L2 learners' speaking skills in the same way as face-to-face engagement does. The relationship between video-mediated exchange and interactional modification is investigated in this research, and interactional modification analyses foreigner talk characteristics. The following research questions were addressed in this study: 1. Does video-mediated communication promote L2 speaking capabilities as effectively as face-to-face conversation? 2. In video-mediated dialogues, do learners have different interactional modification characteristics? This research uses a case-study approach to examine the exchanges between non-native speakers and native speakers in various video-mediated discussions. The reader should keep in mind that the study is based on a case study seen on YouTube.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Interactional modification has always been the focus of much previous research into second language learning. It is only since the work of Michael Long (1981) that the

study of interactional modification has gained momentum [5]. Numerous studies have attempted to explain that interaction modification promotes L2 speaking skills [4,6,7,8]. Comprehensible Input has been identified as a significant contributing factor to the decline of many species of developing L2 speaking [9]. The interaction hypothesis of SLA [10, 11, 12] holds that interaction enhances the acquisition of a second language (L2) by integrating input variables (e.g., negative feedback), internal learner capacities (e.g., attention), and speech output. Gass and Varonis discovered in a 1984 study that the more experience NSs had listening to NNS speech, the more they grasped [13].

An earlier survey of foreigner speaks discourse (FTD) has revealed that native speakers help alleviate the interactional stress of non-native speakers in a range of methods. The topic switching is frequently accepted by NSs, who repair the conversation by getting the incorrect response as a topic nomination [5]. Nonverbal cues including gaze, facial expression, posture, and physical proximity are needed to facilitate verbal information. These can be used for a wide range of purposes. They may help understand the meaning of the utterance [14, 15]. They may also promote smooth speaker transition with eye gaze and posture alteration, though the significance of these cues is controversial [16]. At last, listeners' nonverbal actions may provide input to the speaker to examine the effect of their speech on the listeners [17].

Backchannel cues are the most common structure. These are generally oral messages like "uh-huh" or "yes" that are said while another person is speaking. Head nods can also indicate that communication occurs face-to-face rather than over the phone [1]. Hawkins, 1999, for a more detailed examination of the role of apparent and actual understanding signals [18]. The NS's judgment to continue the discourse was most likely influenced by this NNS's employment of a significant number of appropriately positioned backchannel clues. May also aid the speaker in transitioning smoothly by using eye contact and posture shifts, though the significance of these cues is unclear [16]. Previous studies have failed to demonstrate a statistically significant difference in interactional modification between face-to-face interaction and video-mediated conversation. Therefore, video-conferencing is a comparatively fresh communication medium [19]. The video-mediated discussion appears to be positively related to promoting L2 speaking. It's critical to have oral communication that encourages meaningful negotiations [20] by scaffolding feedback. Unfortunately, given the limited time many students spend in traditional classrooms and the shortage of opportunities to speak the target language outside of the school, this is a tough challenge [21]. Recent studies on computer-mediated communication that decided to take a cognitive and metacognitive approach found that students benefited from authentic input from expert

speakers and engaged in both comprehension and production negotiations through interactive dialogues [22, 23, 24, 25, 26]. Otherwise, Learners' language and cognitive skills are extended through contextual mediated inside their zone of proximal development [27].

In comparison to audio-only or video-mediated dialogues, face-to-face conversations include more speaker turns, shorter turn lengths, and more pauses [28, 29]. Audio-only or video-mediated interactions, on the other hand, tend to be more formal, with fewer interruptions and longer utterances, especially when visual and audio signals are simultaneous or lagged [29]. Interaction with people face to face is more 'efficient.' Furthermore, as video-mediated conversations have more interruptions, speakers are led to believe that this medium, for whatever reason, has difficulty managing turn-taking, mainly when the transmission is hindered [30].

Numerous studies have looked into distance students' motivation, learning style, introversion, autonomy, flexibility, ambiguity tolerance, locus of control, and self-direct-endless characteristics [31]. Computer-mediated communication researchers found that L2 lexical knowledge is critical in online interaction between native and non-native speakers since it is the primary trigger for the meaning negotiating process [22, 24, 26]. To reduce speaking anxiety and enhance collaborative contact, opportunities for creating good relationships should be provided by having participants meet each other in person initially [32, 33]. Most of Lee's 2007 study participants did not hire body gestures or voices to convey meaning and compensate for their language failures [21]. Speakers in face-to-face communication may easily see and hear what the other is doing and looking at without seeing what each other is doing or looking at, as in video conferencing [30]. According to Clark and Brennan (1991) [34], communication is a collaborative process that requires coordinated action from all participants, and grounding is essential for maintaining coherence.

These results suggested that face-to-face interaction and video-mediated conversation significantly form the L2 interactional modification. This section summarises the literature regarding the characteristics of video-mediated conversation via face-to-face interaction. This research study is based on the following two hypotheses: 1. Does the video-mediated conversation have the same efficiency as face-to-face do in promoting L2 speaking skills? 2. Does learners have different interactional modification characteristics in video-mediated conversations?

### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1. PARTICIPANTS

In this study, the research subject is a university student from India who majors in Electronics and Communication Engineering, and English is his second language. He is an English learning and teaching blogger on YouTube, and he often invites some native English-speaking bloggers to chat in his videos. The topics they talk about are designed while the content is improvised in the videos. There are two native speakers, Ashely and Emma, from South Africa and England. Both of them are English bloggers on

[https://youtu.be/mLKnbvEAss?list=PLO3J5fIZ4JbX-uOv9KZ71ZodeDXrv2wp\\_](https://youtu.be/mLKnbvEAss?list=PLO3J5fIZ4JbX-uOv9KZ71ZodeDXrv2wp_)

#### 3.2. DATA COLLECTION

Here are two conversations which are the transcriptions of the videos on the channel of Indrajit on YouTube.

(Video one, Ashely and Indrajit talked about how to learn English. NS=Ashely, NNS= Indrajit)

Conversation one

NNS: ... and at the beginning what do you face, or what do you find in the students for struggle they are learning English but usually fine?

NS: Surprisingly not a problem with the language.

Conversation two

NS: When you are learning English what do you find the most difficult?

NNS: Uh the most difficult I have no basic words basic book apps, so, and also at the beginning and the primary level, I am very shy, is the people and also to speak English in front of people because my native language rather than say my native dialect is Bengali. So I speak always Bengali and I have no surrounding like things, like things related to people or English people.

Conversation three

NS: Do you still feel like an introvert?

NNS: Yeah, sorry?

NS: Do you still feel like an introvert?

NNS: No, exactly never. I am nowadays I am so extrovert...

(Video two, Emma and Indrajit talked about the food. NS=Emma, NNS= Indrajit)

Conversation four

NS: So do you have any other desserts that are good for India?

NNS: Any other dessert? Yeah, uh yes, a lot of desserts Pantoja, Pantoja or Gulab Jamun or a lot of desserts like Javari Sundays, Sundays with filled with water, water means syrup.

Conversation five

NS: Do you have many, so in England we have like Indian's and Chinese's as like food places to go and eat. Do you have like you'll have Italian's, do you have like English places?

NNS: English dishes, yeah, so if we went to a restaurant, we might go to an Indian restaurant or a Chinese restaurant.

NS: Would you have an English restaurant get any dishes, any cuisine?

NNS: Okay, yeah, a big restaurant, five-star students, yeah for kids.

Conversation six

NS: Do you eat different things depending on what the weather's like?

NNS: India is the sixth, sixth season country.

NS: So do you have different meals in different seasons?

NNS: Yes, yes, yes, uh, different fruits different flowers, yeah...

NS: So, like summer we have in the summer, we would tend to eat more salads because it's hot whereas in the winter we would eat like big, big meals, like big hot meals to warm us up.

NNS: Okay, okay, oh it is yeah, I kind of, kind of, yes kind of...

#### 3.3. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis is based on the foreigner talk characteristics and interactional modifications claimed by Long in 1996 [20]. The foreigner talk characteristics in the discourses were displayed as bellowing, careful articulation (Sundays with filled with water, water means syrup), stress on keywords (I am very shy), simplified grammatical structures (I am so extrovert/ a big restaurant, five-star students/ different fruits different flowers), topicalization (I have no surrounding like things, like things related to people or English people/ a lot of desserts Pantoja, Pantoja or Gulab Jamun or many desserts like Javari Sundays), more syntactic regularity (in conversation five and six, NNS was used to say "Okay/ Yeah/ Yes" to connect the content what he was going to say), retention of full forms (in the six conversations, NNS prefer using noun phrases or nouns

to using pronouns when he answers the questions that NS asked, for example, a big restaurant/ five-star students, yeah for kids/ India is the sixth, sixth season country/ different fruits different flowers)

In conversation three, NNS did not get the meaning of NS, and he asked, repeating with rising intonation sorry? Growing intonation questions by NNS means NNS did not understand the utterances, and NNS requested repetition or paraphrasing [35]. Lyster (1998) divided recast into four parts; it was called clarification request in this dialogue [36].

NS: Do you still feel like an introvert?

NNS: Yeah, sorry?

NS: Do you still feel like an introvert?

The result of NS and NNS modifications (whether conscious or not) in all of the examples offered in this article is to assist the NNS in understanding. This reduces the NNS's burden by allowing others to assist him in grasping and producing appropriate language for the setting. However, one could argue that external displays of negotiation and the resolution of that negotiation are merely methods for demonstrating cooperation rather than actual evidence of a meaningful conversation. For instance, in conversation six,

NS: Do you eat different things depending on the weather's like?

NNS: India is the sixth, sixth season country.

NNS did not understand the meaning of NS's question; his answer implicated NS to recast or paraphrase the sentence that she did say; NS got the implication and gave the following question to explain the previous question.

NS: So do you have different meals in different seasons?

NNS: Yes, yes, yes, uh, different fruits different flowers, yeah...

In the following dialogue, NS paraphrased the old question Do you eat different things depending on the weather's like? To a simplified grammatical structure So do you have different meals in different seasons? In this discourse process, the negative feedback of NNS forced NS to modify the words and expressions according to NNS's language level.

As from the NNS's answer, he still had no access to understand the purpose of the NS's utterances. NS provided examples to guide NNS in understanding the content. These following up questions of NS shows the negotiation between NS and NNS. NS wanted to continue the talk, so she had to give NNS comprehensive input. The modification input finally meets NNS's input i+1 agreed by Krashen in 1992 [9].

NS: So, like summer, we have in the summer, we would tend to eat more salads because it's hot whereas in the winter we would eat big, big meals, like big hot meals to warm us up.

NNS: Okay, okay, oh it is yeah, I kind of, kind of, yes kind of...

In conversation six, it is evident that NNS's speech was dominated by yes, uh, yeah, okay, oh, kind of. NNS had never realised that the NS was asking for the meals in different seasons of India. NNS used a series of backchannel cues to continue the conversation [1]. As video-mediated interaction is different from the face-to-face conversation [37], participants could eyeroll each other. Instead, participants only can see the half body of participants on screen, which hides some of the gestures and non-language interactions. In conversation six, NNS offered backchannels yes, uh, yeah, okay, oh, kind of instead of nod, which always happened in face-to-face discussions. Short feedback utterances generated by the listener to convey functions such as concentration, agreement, or acknowledgement of the speaker's content are known as backchannels [37].

Listeners employ nonverbal strategies to signal their desire to contribute in face-to-face conversations. However, speakers could provide clues to select the next speaker in video-mediated conferences before asking [29]. In the transcription between NS and NNS, It was not evident that NNS transited the turn to NS after NNS responded to the questions. Participants in face-to-face interactions have equal access to the conversational floor in practice, but external factors such as understanding might impact involvement [38, 39]. In the transcription, NS always asked the questions to lead NNS to hold a conversational floor, which displayed that only one participant could have the casual floor in the video-mediated conversations. The transcription showed that NS led the discussions, and NNS followed the device's forms to answer the questions. These forms as the modification input are essential for second language learners of the product.

#### **4. RESULT**

Surprisingly, the data's most striking result is for adult NSs in interactions. Conveying messages is more significant than providing corrective feedback to NNSs. Most foreigner talk characteristics and modification input were displayed in video-mediated discussions, but the differences from the face-to-face communications between NS and NNS. The backchannels and non-verb language have not happened simultaneously as face-to-face interactions. Additionally, NS gives the questions to lead NNS to hold the conversational floor rather than NNS actively fighting for the chances to speak up. NNS was with few interruptions to figure out what the NS said, even NNS was not grasping the meaning, and NS would

give up their primary purpose to accept the misunderstanding topics from NNS.

## 5. DISCUSSION

A strong relationship between face-to-face interactions and interactional modification has been reported in the literature. Concerning the first research question, it was found that video-mediated conversation is not as efficient as face-to-face interaction. The most prominent finding from the analysis is that the interactional modification of the video-mediated conversation is understood by default, even if the participants do not understand it. Not like face-to-face interaction, the participants could interrupt immediately and figure out. Thus video-mediated exchange has less interactional modification than face-to-face conversation, which means L2 learners have less comprehensible input chances than those in the target language context and face-to-face interaction.

In contrast to earlier findings, however, no evidence of interactional modification of video-mediated conversations can ultimately bridge the gap of speaking chances lacking in the classroom. A possible explanation for these results may be the lack of adequate samples related to the personal characters or the relationship between learners and speakers. Some of the results may be influenced by these unobserved variables. However, caution is required because of the limited sample since these findings may not apply to all people. It is, therefore, likely that such connections exist between interactional modification in video-mediated conversations and the proficiency level of learners and the characteristic of learners. The present results are significant in at least two critical respects. First, face-to-face interaction cannot be replaced by video-mediated conversation in practising speaking. Second, the learner's psychological factors and technology issues easily influence the video-mediated conversation. These findings might help others find new ways of interactional modification of video-mediated conversation. Using a different method to reach this topic in future studies might be possible.

## 6. CONCLUSION

Returning to the original question, it is now possible to state that interactional modification in video-mediated discussion is less effective in developing a learner's speaking skills than face-to-face communication. This study added to the growing evidence that interactional changes in video-mediated conversations are not as prominent as face-to-face interactions. One of the study's merits is its comprehensive analysis of the video-mediated discussion. These findings suggest that psychological variables and technological constraints should be emphasised when researching this field.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Selinker, L., & Gass, S. M. (2008). *Second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Ass.
- [2] Alló, M., Buggiano, V., Fededa, J. P., Petrillo, E., Schor, I., De La Mata, M., ... & Kornblihtt, A. R. (2009). Control of alternative splicing through siRNA-mediated transcriptional gene silencing. *Nature structural & molecular biology*, 16(7), 717-724.
- [3] Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361-382.
- [4] Parker, K., & Chaudron, C. (1987). *The Effects of Linguistic Simplification and Elaboration Modifications on L2 Comprehension*. University of Hawai'i Working Papers in English as a Second Language 6 (2).
- [5] Long, M. H. (1981). Questions in foreigner talk discourse. *Language learning*, 31(1), 135-157.
- [6] Hawkins, E. W. (1999). Foreign language study and language awareness. *Language awareness*, 8(3-4), 124-142.
- [7] Gass, S., & Varonis, E. M. (1984). The effect of familiarity on the comprehensibility of non-native speech. *Language learning*, 34(1), 65-87.
- [8] Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2006). Input, interaction and output: An overview. *AILA review*, 19(1), 3-17.
- [9] Krashen, S. (1992). The input hypothesis: An update. *Linguistics and language pedagogy: The state of the art*, 409-431.
- [10] Gass, S. M. (2003). Input and interaction. *The handbook of second language acquisition*, 2, 224-256.
- [11] Connor, U. M., & Long, M. H. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language learning*, 44(3), 493-527.
- [13] Gass, S., & Varonis, E. M. (1984). The effect of familiarity on the comprehensibility of non-native speech. *Language learning*, 34(1), 65-87.
- [14] Argyle, M., Lalljee, M., & Cook, M. (1968). The effects of visibility on interaction in a dyad. *Human relations*, 21(1), 3-17.

- [15] Jaffe, J., Beebe, B., Feldstein, S., Crown, C. L., Jasnow, M. D., Rochat, P., & Stern, D. N. (2001). Rhythms of dialogue in infancy: Coordinated timing in development. *Monographs of the society for research in child development*, i-149.
- [16] Williams, H. C. (1977). On the formation of travel demand models and economic evaluation measures of user benefit. *Environment and planning A*, 9(3), 285-344.
- [17] Short, R. V. (1976). Definition of the problem-the evolution of human reproduction. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B. Biological Sciences*, 195(1118), 3-24.
- [18] Hawkins, E. W. (1999). Foreign language study and language awareness. *Language awareness*, 8(3-4), 124-142.
- [19] Blake, R. J., & Zyzik, E. C. (2003). Who's helping whom?: Learner/heritage speakers networked discussions in Spanish. *Applied linguistics*, 24(4), 519-544.
- [20] Connor, U. M., & Long, M. H. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- [21] Lee, L. (2007). Fostering second language oral communication through constructivist interaction in desktop videoconferencing. *Foreign language annals*, 40(4), 635-649.
- [22] Pellettieri, J. (2000). Negotiation in cyberspace. *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice*, 59-86.
- [23] Kitade, K. (2000). L2 learners' discourse and SLA theories in CMC: Collaborative interaction in Internet chat. *Computer assisted language learning*, 13(2), 143-166.
- [24] Blake, R. J., & Zyzik, E. C. (2003). Who's helping whom?: Learner/heritage-speakers' networked discussions in Spanish. *Applied linguistics*, 24(4), 519-544.
- [25] Lee, L. (2002). Enhancing learners' communication skills through synchronous electronic interaction and task-based instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(1), 16-24.
- [26] Lee, L. (2009). Promoting intercultural exchanges with blogs and podcasting: A study of Spanish American telecollaboration. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 22(5), 425-443.
- [27] Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press.
- [28] Cook, M., & Lalljee, M. G. (1972). Verbal substitutes for visual signals in interaction.
- [29] O'Conaill, B., Whittaker, S., & Wilbur, S. (1993). Conversations over video conferences: An evaluation of the spoken aspects of video-mediated communication. *Human-computer interaction*, 8(4), 389-428.
- [30] Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1996). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A model for linguistically diverse classrooms. *The elementary school journal*, 96(3), 259-273.
- [31] Pichette, F. (2009). Second language anxiety and distance language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(1), 77-93.
- [32] Coverdale-Jones, T. (2000). The use of video-conferencing as a communication tool for language learning: Issues and considerations. *IALLT Journal of Language Learning Technologies*, 32(1), 27-40.
- [33] Esch, E., & Zähler, C. (2000). The contribution of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) to language learning environments or the mystery of the secret agent. *Recall*, 12(1), 5-18.
- [34] Clark, H. H., & Brennan, S. E. (1991). Grounding in communication.
- [35] Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2019, March). In it together: Teachers, researchers and classroom SLA. In 2019 conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL). AAAL.
- [36] Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language learning*, 48(2), 183-218.
- [37] Yngve, V. H. (1970). On getting a word in edgewise. In *Chicago Linguistics Linguistic Society, 6th Meeting, 1970* (pp. 567-578).
- [38] McGrath, J. E. (1984). *Groups: Interaction and performance* (Vol. 14). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [39] McGrath, J. E. (1991). Time, interaction, and performance (TIP) A Theory of Groups. *Small group research*, 22(2), 147-174.