International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences
Vol-11, Issue-5; September-October, 2026

Peer-Reviewed Journal
Journal Home Page Available: https://ijels.com/
Journal DOI: 10.22161/ijels



Bridging the L2 Speaking Gap through Multimodal Re-Speaking

Dr Mary Sooria, Dr Deepa George

Assistant Professor, Department of English, St Paul's College, Kalamassery, Kerala, India

Received: 26 Sep 2026; Received in revised form: 23 Oct 2026; Accepted: 27 Oct 2026; Available online: 30 Oct 2026
©2026 The Author(s). Published by Infogain Publication. This is an open-access article under the CC BY license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Abstract—*Oral fluency in English does not always grow along with the acquisition of vocabulary, grammar and written language. Learners' hesitation, anxiety and difficulties in spontaneous oral communication are not uncommon when they perform well in academic English. The study investigates the effectiveness of a Multimodal Re-Speaking Cycle (MRC), an integrated classroom intervention that aims at facilitating secondary-school students' linguistic knowledge to be expressed orally. A quasi-experimental study was conducted on a group of 40 students of Class IX of a secondary school in Ernakulam district, Kerala. The results were evaluated based on a pre-test post-test speaking task. The evaluation method followed a recurring pattern of multimodal input like verbal self-analysis, group interaction, verbal intervention re-speaking, and reflection. The mean score increased from 5.11 (SD = 2.32) in the pre-test to 17.45 (SD = 2.67) in the post-test, producing a mean gain of 12.34 points. It was a very large within group effect size (Cohen's dz = 4.19), and there was a statistically significant difference, t (39) = 26.52, p < .001. 40 participants had higher post-test scores. The results indicate the importance of a structured cycle of repeated oral performance, noticing, multimodal support, interaction, and scaffolding as a productive way to develop L2 speaking. The study demonstrates the pedagogical potential of viewing attempts at first speaking as less of a performance and more as an opportunity for reflection, support and better re-speaking.*

Keywords— ***L2 speaking, oral performance, task repetition, re-speaking, multimodal learning, noticing***

I. INTRODUCTION

English has a significant role in the Indian educational system and is taught from the school level, however, continuous instruction in English as a language of learning doesn't necessarily foster the confidence or competence of the learners' spoken skills. This means that learners can grasp grammatical structures, do written work, read English literature, and do examinations well but have a hard time engaging in spontaneous conversation in English. The gap between the knowledge of the language and its use in oral expression is an essential pedagogical problem.

Several processes are necessary to take place almost concurrently when one is speaking. The learner needs to think up ideas, find words to use, construct sentences and structures, pronounce words with sufficient intelligibility, adjust what was said to the listener's feedback, and keep the conversation going. As a language activity, speaking gives little opportunity for planning and revising like many written activities do. Students might, for example, have the necessary language competences but not be able to apply them effectively in the time- and mind-bursting environment of an oral task.

This difference between the linguistic resources learners possesses and the resources they have access to for real-world communication is described as a knowledge–performance gap in the present study. This can happen due to lack of vocabulary or lack of the ability to organize thoughts during speech, poor interaction with language partners, as well as poor ability to recall words quickly, to articulate thoughts while speaking, and to keep going despite mistakes.

There is an effective aspect of speaking. Others can tell if someone hesitates, mispronounces or can't find a word. Errors, embarrassment, and negative assessment can then be an impediment for students to speak. This concern is especially relevant as the willingness to communicate is also related to linguistic ability, perceived linguistic ability, anxiety, and situational factors (MacIntyre et al.).

This was reiterated as a problem to be addressed because of the researcher's previous study of the difficulty of English-speaking. A large proportion of the respondents indicated that they had knowledge of English but found it difficult to carry a conversation. Learners also came to understand that they depended on their mother tongue translation, that they were anxious, afraid to make errors, lacked vocabulary and pronunciation, and required a speaking partner. The results indicated that grammar and vocabulary explanations would not be sufficient to solve the problem. Learners needed to be given opportunities to transform linguistic knowledge into usable oral language, with support.

To answer this need, the present study proposes a Multimodal Re-Speaking Cycle (MRC). MRC is a combination of multimodal stimuli, initial speaking, self-observation, guided noticing, peer interaction, linguistic scaffolding, re-speaking, and reflection. It is intended to be a method of carefully incorporating several pedagogical approaches into a recurring classroom procedure rather than a novel philosophy of second language acquisition.

The essential point is that the first time does not always count as the last time.The first speech performance shows problems; the learner's own self-observation and noticing make problems available for reflection; peer interaction and scaffolding offers help to the learner; re-speaking provides an immediate opportunity for the learner to reformulate his/her speech performance. The study thus aims to find out if there is any measurable improvement in the oral performance of class IX students at Kerala School because of participating in this structured cycle.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 L2 Speaking, Anxiety, and Oral Performance

L2 speaking is not just about the knowledge of language. Learners should learn and apply language in an actual real time communicative process. Skehan suggests that learners have limited attentional resources and might struggle to focus their attention on fluency, accuracy, and complexity at the same time. Therefore, the ability to remember and use a grammatical structure or a word acquired doesn't necessarily mean that the learner will be able to do so in spontaneous situations.

Goh and Burns also believe that speaking should be taught, and not merely as an arena to demonstrate language already learnt. Learners must be given opportunities to plan, perform, interact, and reflect on their oral production. The emphasis in this view is on the importance of speaking pedagogy for transitioning from language knowledge to communicative use.

There can be affective factors that exacerbate this change. Two of the factors Horwitz and Cope believe to be important in foreign-language anxiety are communication apprehension and fear of negative evaluation. The model of willingness to communicate by MacIntyre further indicates that in addition to linguistic competence, other factors such as situational confidence and perceived competence are also essential in L2 communication.

The problem is still pertinent in the educational context in India where students might have been formally taught English for a few years but not have been given chances to participate in sustained oral use of English. There has also been recent research that showed anxiety in ELC in Kerala. Das & Zachariah (2025) examined the English-language classroom anxiety and writing anxiety and performance relationship with 188 indigenous school students of Kerala. The study has shed light on the concern of the students of the region regarding the oral use of English language.

(2.2) Task Repetition and Re-Speaking

Repetition of tasks is important in the process of MRC. In repeated task performance, Bygate proved that it can have an effect on the structure and control of oral production. During this time, Bygate and Samuda evolved this idea of repetition as an integrative planning process, where learners re-visit and re-work the language that has been used in the previous production. Learners are receiving an opportunity to restructure communication in a novel methodology. This has been confirmed by another recent research. Aaj, Maftoon and Siyyari investigated the immediate and delayed task repetition with young EFL learners and determined that immediate repetition had a positive impact on complexity, accuracy and fluency and delayed repetition also had a positive effect on aspects of oral performance. Their work has been very relevant due to the fact that they demonstrate the use of task repetition with younger learners.

Another study, which was conducted in a classroom where the students learned the same or parallel tasks with the same communicative content, also supports the value of repeated exposure to familiar communicative content particularly for fluency. More importantly, the results of the meta-analysis carried out by Abdi Tabari, Zhuang and Farahanynia (2025) reveal that task repetition has positive effects on L2 oral performance with regards to various dimensions such as complexity, accuracy, lexical complexity and fluency. A

wide variety of factors such as task or learning context, type of repetition influences the effects, which implies that repetition can be useful but not necessarily.

So, asking the learner to do the same speaking task does not lead to the improvement of the learner and MRC does not consider that the learner will improve when he or she does the same speaking task as before. It's about what goes on between the first and the next act.

2.3 Noticing, Multimodality, and Scaffolding

From noticing, one can derive a theory for the reflective aspect of MRC, as Schmidt does. It can assist learners in being able to recognize the variations in their intended and actual output. This is particularly the case to produce oral language, such as when speaking. Hesitation, lexical difficulty, repetition, or difficulty in pronunciation may be out of immediate awareness if an utterance is produced.

Oral performance elements will be re-thought based on the recorded and guided self-observation. Campbell's teaching training observation, model input, and task repetition emphasizes the pedagogical benefits of providing reflection between performances. In MRC, the awareness is not complete; rather, it is selective, that is, students can identify manageable difficulties that they can make a difference in if they speak about them again.

Support through multimodal stimuli is given. Visual material such as images, sequences of images or short AV material, or situational prompts, can provide meaningful content for learners to speak about, which will consequently make the generation of ideas and language less demanding. Their involvement with the MRC is not about technology but thinking and talking.

Scaffolding is not given before, but after the first performance. Vocabulary, expressions, and pronunciation support (connectors, sentence starters) are provided as they are needed at the time of speaking. This implies that the support can intervene in a "communicative need" experienced by the learner, rather than making available a "whole model" that the learner can emulate.

Peer interaction is another form of interaction that plays a similar role. It allows the opportunities for pupils to speak to be spread out and allows pupils to hear alternative expressions, test language, negotiate meaning, and rehearse ideas. MRC purposely introduces peer interaction between initial interaction and re-speaking with the aim of some direct contribution to re-formulation.

2.4 Research Gap

Some of the earlier research has given evidence of the importance of task repetition, noticing, interaction and multimodal support and affective factors in L2 speaking. However, each of these components is studied separately. Research into repeating tends to be on fluency, accuracy and complexity; research into anxiety tends to be on affective barriers; research into noticing or multimodality tends to be on individual pedagogical mechanisms.

Moreover, while there is more research in younger children, the context of ESL secondary school is relatively underrepresented compared to the adult/ college context. In the field of research, some reports on language anxiety and communicable issues have been noted; the field of research in the Indian context for structured oral performance development of school learners is yet to be explored extensively regarding the communicative issues.

The study intertwines these principles into one recursive sequence:

Multimodal Stimulus →Initial Speaking →Self-observation →Guided noticing →Peer interaction →Linguistic scaffolding →Re-Speaking →Reflection

The contribution is thus not one of assuming that the novelty of the linguistic components is what one is interested in, but rather to consider a classroom procedure that is systematic and integrated, and whose aim is to fill the gap between linguistic knowledge and oral performance.

III. OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study was set against the aim of investigating the potential of the Multimodal Re-Speaking Cycle for the development of L2 oral skills of secondary school learners. It was used to identify a particular level at which the learners begin their oral-performance, to perform the structured re-speaking cycle, and to make comparisons of pre- and post-oral-performance scores.

The main research question was:

Do there appear to be significant differences between the L2 oral-performance scores of secondary-school students who took part in a Multimodal Re-Speaking Cycle and secondary-school students who did not take part in the cycle?

The null hypothesis was that the mean pretest scores would not be significantly different from the mean post test scores after the intervention and the alternative hypothesis was that the mean post test scores would be greater than the mean pretest scores following the intervention.

IV. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design and Participants

The study was conducted with a group of 40 students of class IX in a secondary school in the Ernakulam district of

Kerala. A pre-test was given in speech prior to the intervention, and a post-test was conducted after the instruction programme and MRC.The design enabled the post-intervention performances of each learner to be compared with their initial performances.

4.2 Speaking Assessment

The pre-test and post-test were both similar to the speaking assessment that was given a maximum of 25 marks each. Five areas of oral performance were looked at: fluency, vocabulary and lexical resource, grammatical control, pronunciation/comprehensibility, and communicative effectiveness.

Multiple dimensions were used to recognise that effective oral performance is not something that can be summarised as grammatical accuracy. Learners also need to arrange their ideas, acquire vocabulary, maintain comprehensible speech, and successfully convey meaning.

4.3 Multimodal Re-Speaking Cycle

The intervention was a replication of eight stages. The intervention was based on eight recurring stages.

In the multimodal stimulus stage, learners were presented with visual, verbal, or audiovisual information that provided meaningful content for the learners to use for communication. Then they made a first attempt to speak using the language they could muster and followed it up with another attempt. Then they made an initial attempt to speak, using the language that they had, and tried again.

In self-observation, learners revisited their own performance; guided noticing focused on selected difficulties either in hesitation or lexical gaps, in pronunciation, in expressions that are not complete, or in organisation.

Learners were then exposed to peer interaction, allowing them to share ideas and meet with other expressions. Linguistic scaffolding followed to offer specific vocabulary, pronunciation cues, sentence building, connectors or other language needed that emerged as a result of the difficulties identified during the initial performance.

In the re-speaking task, learners repeated the task, but they did not memorize their first response, rather they reconstructed it. Lastly, reflection helped them see what they could do better and any on-going challenges.

It was thus necessary to make the following progression:

attempt → observation → noticing → support → reconstructed performance.

The intervention lasted for about six weeks, with 2 sessions each week with about 12 sessions lasting 40-45 minutes.

4.4 Data Analysis

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used in the analysis of the pre-test and post-test scores. Means, standard deviations, medians, ranges of scores, and individual gains were investigated. A paired-samples t-test was used to assess the significance of the mean difference since the same 40 learners took both assessments. A p value of $< .05$ was chosen as the criterion for statistical significance.

Cohen's dz was also computed to assess the extent of change on an individual level.

V. RESULTS

Learners' improvement was significant between the two assessments. The mean pre-test score was 5.11 out of 25 (SD = 2.32), while the mean post-test score increased to 17.45 (SD = 2.67). The median went up from 5.00 to 17.00. The pre-test scores vary from 0 to 9, and the post-test scores vary from 13 to 23.

Table 1. Pre-Test and Post-Test Performance

Measure	Pre-Test	Post-Test
N	40	40
Mean	5.11	17.45
SD	2.32	2.67
Median	5.00	17.00
Minimum	0	13
Maximum	9	23

Overall mean gain was 12.34 marks and the standard deviation of the gain-scores was about 2.94. Remarkably, all 40 participants had higher post-test scores than their pre-test scores. This meant that the improvement of only some of the better pupils in the group was not the cause of the rise in the group mean.

The difference was statistically significant ($t(39) = 26.52$, $p < .001$) and was confirmed using a paired-samples t-test. The 95% confidence interval for the mean gain was around 11.40 to 13.28 marks. So, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Cohen's dz = 4.19, which is a very large within group difference. This effect size reflects the pre/post change of the group that participated in the intervention and does not imply that MRC is superior to an alternative teaching approach in a controlled setting.

VI. DISCUSSION

The results show that the use of Multimodal Re-Speaking Cycle significantly improved the oral-performance scores of the learners. There was a statistically significant difference between the mean value, which increased from 5.11 to 17.45, and all 40 learners had improved. The results

of this study support the pedagogical validity of teaching speaking as a process as opposed to a final product.

6.1 Language Knowledge to Oral Use

The research is especially salient for the knowledge–performance gap that was a catalyst for the study. In the primary efforts of MRC, it was not the aim of providing learners with more abstract knowledge of English. Instead, they were encouraged repeatedly to draw upon and use the linguistic resources they had at their disposal in communicative contexts.

The importance of first-time speaking was clear as it helped to make the points that may be missed in the written part of the exercise obvious. Problems in lexical retrieval and pronunciation, grammatical formulation, fluency, and organisation were found in spontaneous speech. When performance issues arose due to difficulties rather than being pre-selected because of the teacher's language problems, these were then observed and scaffolded.

This process is similar to the process Goh and Burns recommend (2006): "It is suggested that speaking needs to be made explicit by focusing on performance, interaction, and reflection." The utility of knowledge is communicative when the student has repeated opportunities to retrieve and reorganize knowledge in the speech.

Research on task repetition is also in line with this. Bygate and Bygate and Samuda show that the requirements for conceptual activity in a task can become less with prior knowledge.The results are also consistent with recent evidence. Aaj, Maftoon and Siyyari experienced positive outcomes with repetition with younger children; Hunter experienced positive outcomes with repetition of the same communicative content. The 2025 meta-analysis conducted by Abdi Tabari, Zhuang and Farahanynia provides more support with positive results found for task repetition in terms of several dimensions of L2 oral performance.

MRC is no simple repetition, however. Learners observe, notice, interact, and get targeted support between performances. The second performance is to be a re-construction and NOT a replica of the first.

This difference might be a partial explanation for the pedagogical value of re-speaking. If learners simply repeat a failure, they can help to cement in place any weaknesses that they have. When it is repeated with reflection and support, then the learner will have a base to change the next repetition.

6.2 Noticing, Interaction and Scaffolding

Noticing is important in connecting first and subsequent performance. Schmidt's description of the role of conscious attention indicates that students would benefit in their awareness of what they know and don't know in their target language. In MRC, students were asked to focus on a few errors instead of writing down all the errors. This maintained an interest in communication.

It was especially important to speak as soon as possible. If you see a problem and don't use a better version of it, it won't be of much use. Awareness followed Action in the cycle.

Peer support was another form of support. Learners were able to hear other ways of saying things and they could practise their thoughts and talk with other people than the teacher. This is particularly significant when it comes to the researcher's previous discovery that there was a need to have speaking partners as perceived by the learners themselves.

Scaffolding was also malleable. Full model answers were not given prior to the first attempt, but linguistic support was given after learners have experienced communicative difficulty. Vocabulary or expressions thus met a need and could be used when re-speaking.

To enhance this process, multimodal prompts provide meaningful content from which to speak. Their intent would not have been to make a technological claim for the intervention, but to lessen the simultaneous load of content and language.

6.3 Interpreting the Improvement

Assessment of the learner's improvement was done. A significant within-group shift is indicated by a change of 12.34 points on a 25-point scale and a Cohen's dz of 4.19. It was observed that all the participants had made significant improvements.

There was, however, still room for improvement as the initial mean was only 5.11. Oral assessment may also have become familiar due to repeated tasks of speech. It is not possible to completely rule out other factors such as regular teaching in the classroom or increasing intimacy with the speaking context.The paired sample result is statistically significant if there is a reliable difference between the two sets of scores, but it does not prove that MRC was responsible for this improvement.

The most defensible conclusion is thus that the participating learners' oral-performance scores showed a large and consistent increase when participating in MRC. There would be greater cause and effect if there was a controlled study.

VII. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Interpretation of the result proves that the strategies used can enhance the speaking ability of the learners. The initial

response can be used as a tool for diagnosis to identify the areas that require support. Additionally, the study also shows that the mechanical repetition of tasks is not required.

In cases of reflection, interaction and scaffolding between performances, learners can reformulate instead of memorise speech via repetition. Likewise, there shouldn't be corrections for each and every first attempt. Selected problems can be solved during performances while maintaining the communicative flow, while also offering linguistic guidance.

The MRC procedure is also rather flexible to use in a typical classroom. The multimodal support does not have to be technologically advanced; it can be pictures, short clips, situational prompts, or visual sequences. Classrooms can be conducive to speaking practice when individual teacher–student interaction is limited, while pair and group interaction can increase the opportunities for speaking.

It should be noted, however, that there are several restrictions. The study only sampled 40 secondary school learners within one secondary school, which also restricted the wider applicability of the study. Also, the intervention was relatively brief.

Furthermore, an overall speaking score was used for the present analysis. Additional research might focus on fluency, grammatical correctness, word knowledge, pronunciation, and communication skills individually. Direct measurement of the potential impact of MRC on speaking anxiety and willingness to communicate with validated instruments is also needed. The use of comparison groups, larger number of learners, delay of the post-test, learner interviews, and detailed analysis of recorded speech in future research could yield more convincing data on how and why re-speaking affects oral development.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This study examines one of the main challenges faced by learners of the English language. Although they have knowledge of the language, their ability to communicate is limited. To address this gap between knowledge and performance, the Multimodal Re-Speaking Cycle was created for the classroom setting that incorporates multimodal stimulus, initial speaking, self-observation, noticing, peer interaction, scaffolding, re-speaking, and reflection.

All participants (40 learners) made significant gains, with the mean oral-performance score going from 5.11 to 17.45 out of 25. All participants improved with a mean gain of 12.34 that was statistically significant, $t(39) = 26.52$, $p < .001$. The results suggest that structured re-speaking can be an effective context for the development of L2 oral performance.

Task repetition, noticing, scaffolding, multimodality, and peer interaction are well established in theoretical and empirical bases for task repetition, noticing, scaffolding, multimodality, and peer interaction. The value to be gained from it is to make use of these processes in a unified sequence in the classroom, whereby a first attempt to speak is not the last test of ability, but an opportunity to learn how to speak better.

The pedagogical principle manifested from the study is simple: learners do not necessarily have to be accredited by their first attempt. The classroom provides opportunities for them to have challenges as well as opportunities for support and opportunities to speak again. If students have some knowledge of the language but are still reluctant to speak it, then that bridge can be a crucial step towards achieving communicative competence.

REFERENCES

[1] Aaj, Ali, Parviz Maftoon, and Masood Siyyari. “Do Young EFL Learners Benefit from Task Repetition?” *The Language Learning Journal*, vol. 52, no. 6, 2024, pp. 650–661.

[2] Abdi Tabari, Mahmoud, Jingyuan Zhuang, and Mahsa Farahanynia. “Task Repetition and L2 Oral Performance: A Meta-Analysis.” *System*, vol. 135, 2025, article 103868.

[3] Bygate, Martin. “Effects of Task Repetition on the Structure and Control of Oral Language.” *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing*, edited by Martin Bygate, Peter Skehan, and Merrill Swain, Longman, 2001, pp. 23–48.

[4] Bygate, Martin, and Virginia Samuda. “Integrative Planning through the Use of Task Repetition.” *Planning and Task Performance in a Second Language*, edited by Rod Ellis, John Benjamins, 2005, pp. 37–74.

[5] Campbell, Matthew. *The Effects of Noticing Training, Model Input and Task Repetition on L2 Speech Production*. Macquarie University, 2022. Doctoral thesis.

[6] Das M, Reshma, and Binu Zachariah. “Acculturation and English Writing Anxiety among Indigenous Students of Kerala.” *Discover Education*, vol. 4, 2025, article 249.

[7] Goh, Christine C. M., and Anne Burns. *Teaching Speaking: A Holistic Approach*. Cambridge UP, 2012.

[8] Horwitz, Elaine K., Michael B. Horwitz, and Joann Cope. “Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety.” *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 70, no. 2, 1986, pp. 125–132.

[9] Hunter, Ann-Marie. “The Poster Carousel in the ESL Classroom: What Happens to Learners’ L2 Fluency during Same and Parallel-Task Repetition?” *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 58, no. 1, 2024, pp. 479–510.

[10] MacIntyre, Peter D., Richard Clément, Zoltán Dörnyei, and Kimberly A. Noels. “Conceptualizing Willingness to Communicate in a L2: A Situational Model of L2 Confidence

and Affiliation." *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 82, no. 4, 1998, pp. 545–562.
[11] Schmidt, Richard W. "The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning." *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 11, no. 2, 1990, pp. 129–158.
[12] Skehan, Peter. *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford UP, 1998.