

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia, Jijel

Department of English.



**Improving Speaking Performance through Pecha
Kucha Presentations among Algerian EFL Learners:
The Case of Secondary School Students.**

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for a Master Degree in
Foreign Languages Didactics

Submitted by:

Mohammed Laieb

Aoula Cherbal

Supervised by:

Dr. Samia AZIEB

Board of Examiners

Supervisor: Dr. Samia AZIEB

Jijel University

Chairperson: Dr. Abdeldjalil BOUZENOUN

Jijel University

Examiner: Dr. Slimane BOUKHENTACHE

Jijel University

Academic Year: 2020/2021

Declaration

We hereby declare that the substance of this dissertation is entirely the result of our investigation and that due reference or acknowledgement is made, whenever necessary, to the work of other researchers.

We are duly informed that any person practising plagiarism will be subject to disciplinary sanctions issued by university authorities under the rules and regulations in force.

Year: 2021

Signed: Mohammed Laieb and Aoula Cherbal

Dedication

We dedicate our humble work to our beloved families, the reason of what we have become today. We are thankful for their unparalleled care and support and for being patient with us all the time.

A special feeling of gratitude to our lovely parents whose words of encouragement for tenacity will always ring in our ears.

To our best friends and colleagues for standing by our side to finish this work.

We dedicate this work to you.

Acknowledgments

Praise be first to **Allah** because without the strength and ability God has given us, this work would have never been accomplished.

We would like to express our deepest gratitude to our supervisor **Dr. Samia AZIEB** for her constant support and help, for her patience and valuable advice to reach this level of study.

We owe our sincere thanks to the jury members **Dr. Slimane BOUKHENTACHE** and **Dr. Abdeldjalil BOUZENOUN** for sacrificing their time and effort to read and examine this modest work.

We would like to thank **Dr. Mohamed BOUKAZOULA** for providing us with some necessary resources and advice.

We want to thank Second Year Students and their kind teacher of English **Bohra** in Ahmed Francis High School for their generous and immediate help and participation without whom we could have never got an answer to our research problem.

At last, we would like to give our heartfelt and sincere thanks to our families, husband, wife, kids and all our friends who have contributed and encouraged us to complete this dissertation in this terrible period of Corona Virus pandemics.

We dedicate this work to you,

May God bless you all and raise the scourage

Mohammed,

Aoula

Abstract

The present study aims essentially at investigating the improvement of speaking performance through Pecha Kucha presentations among Algerian learners. Accordingly, it was hypothesized that if teachers integrate them in their classes, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Learners' speaking will be improved. Practically, the study has espoused a quasi-experimental mode of research design based on one experimental group of 20 Secondary School Learners at Ahmed Francis High School in Sidi-Abdelaziz in Jijel through Speaking Performance Assessment model Brown, (2001). Accordingly, participants were exposed to a pre and post-test to gauge the degree of their mastery of speaking and their improvement. However, testing their progress required also administering an immediate assessment by the end of each treatment session. The findings showed that 17 learners developed their oral performance which was mainly seen in their increased mean after using the PK technique. Therefore, the research assumption was confirmed. Given these results, it is suggested for EFL teachers to adopt Pecha Kucha (PK) technique in their classes.

***Keywords:* Algerian EFL Learners, PK, Speaking Performance.**

List of Abbreviations

ALM: Audio Lingual Method

CALL: Computer Assisted Language Learning.

CAR: Classroom Action Research.

CBLT: Competency Based Language Teaching.

CI: Comprehensible Input.

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching.

CO: Comprehensible Output.

DM: Direct Method.

EFL: English as a Foreign Language.

ESL: English as a Second Language.

ICTs: Information Communication Technologies.

PK: Pecha Kucha.

% : Percentage

PPT: PowerPoint.

Q:Question

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

TL: Target Language.

List of Tables

Table 2.1. The Total Students of Foreign Languages Class.....	35
Table 2.2. The Total Students of Foreign Languages Class.....	42
Table 2.3. Students' Presentations Results in Session One.....	44
Table 2.4. Students' Presentations Results in Session Two.....	45
Table 2.5. Students' Presentations Results in Session Three.....	46
Table 2.6. Students' Presentations Results in Session Four.....	47
Table 2.7. Comparison of the Groups' Improvement Results of the Four Sessions....	48
Table 2.8. Students' Speaking Performance Assessment in Post-test.....	49
Table 2.9. Comparison between the Learners' Pre and Post-test Performance.....	50

Table of Contents

Declaration.....	I
Dedication	II
Acknowledgements	III
Abstract.....	IV
List of Abbreviations.....	V
List of Tables.....	VI
Table of Contents	VII
General Introduction.....	1
1. Background of the Study.....	2
2. Statement of the Problem.....	5
3. Research Question.....	6
4. Research Assumption.....	6
5. Aim of the Study.....	6
6. Significance of the Study.....	6
7. Research Methodology.....	7
8. Structure of the Study.....	8
Chapter One: Literature Review.....	9
Introduction.....	9
Section One: Speaking.....	9
1.1.1. Definition of Speaking.....	9

1.1.2. Components of Speaking.....	11
1.1.2.1. Grammar.....	11
1.1.2.2. Comprehension.....	12
1.1.2.3. Vocabulary.....	12
1.1.2.4. Pronunciation.....	13
1.1.2.5. Fluency.....	13
1.1.3. The Status of Speaking among the Four Language Skills.....	13
1.1.4. Hiccups in Developing EFL Students' Speaking Abilities.....	15
1.1.4.1. Age.....	15
1.1.4.2. Aural Medium.....	16
1.1.4.3. Socio-cultural factors.....	16
1.1.4.4. Affective Factors.....	17
1.1.5. The Function of Speaking.....	18
1.1.5.1. Talk as Interaction.....	18
1.1.5.2. Talk as Transaction.....	18
1.1.5.3. Talk as Performance.....	19
1.1.6. Components Underlying Speaking Effectiveness.....	19
1.1.6.1. Grammatical Competence.....	19
1.1.6.2. Socio-linguistic Competence.....	20

1.1.6.3. Strategic Competence.....	20
1.1.6.4. Discourse Competence.....	20
1.1.7. Teaching Speaking Strategies.....	21
Section Two: Pecha Kucha.....	21
Introduction.....	21
1.2.1. The Definition of PK.....	22
1.2.2. The Principles of PK.....	23
1.2.3. The Advantages of PK.....	24
1.2.4. Other Benefits of PK.....	25
1.2.4.1. Fluency.....	25
1.2.4.2. Time management.....	25
1.2.4.3. Overall Speaking and Presentation Skills.....	25
1.2.4.4. Self-confidence.....	26
1.2.4.5. Pronunciation, Vocabulary, Reading and Culture.....	26
1.2.5. Drawbacks of PK.....	27
1.2.6. PK and its Interlink with CALL.....	28
1.2.7. The PK Procedure.....	29
1.2.8. PK and Speaking Performance.....	30
Conclusion.....	31

Chapter Two: Fieldwork.....	32
Introduction.....	32
Section one: Research Methodology.....	32
2.1.1. Research Assumption.....	32
2.1.2. Research Paradigm.....	33
2.1.3. Setting.....	33
2.1.4. Population and Sampling.....	34
a. Population of the Study.....	34
b. Sample of the Study.....	34
2.1.5. Research Design.....	35
2.1.5.1. Description of Data Gathering Instruments.....	35
2.1.5.1.1. Definition of the Tests.....	35
a. Diagnostic Test.....	35
b. Immediate Assessment.....	35
c. Summative Test.....	35
2.1.5.1.2. Description of the Tests.....	36
➤ Description of the Speaking Performance Assessment.....	36
➤ Description of the Oral Presentation Checklist.....	36
2.1.5.1.3. Administration of the Assessments.....	37

a. Administering the Pre-test.....	37
b. Administering the Immediate Test.....	37
c. Administering the Post-test.....	38
2.1.5.2. Data Collection procedures.....	38
2.1.5.2.1. Initial Stage.....	38
2.1.5.2.2. Implementation Stage.....	40
2.1.5.3. Data Analysis Procedure.....	40
Section Two: Data Analysis.....	41
2.2.1. Pre-test Analysis.....	41
2.2.2. Learners' Treatment Analysis.....	43
2.2.2.1. First Performance Analysis.....	43
2.2.2.2. Second Performance Analysis.....	45
2.2.2.3. Third Performance Analysis.....	46
2.2.2.4. Fourth Performance Analysis.....	47
2.2.3. Comparison of Improvement Gained from the Four Sessions.....	47
2.2.4. Post-test Analysis.....	48
2.2.5. Comparison between Learners' Pre-test and Post-test Performance.....	50
Section Three: Data Interpretation.....	51
2.3.1. PK Presentation and the Improvement of Speaking.....	51

2.3.2. Limitations of the Study.....	53
2.3.3. Pedagogical Recommendations and Suggestions.....	53
a. Recommendations to Teachers.....	54
b. Recommendations to Students.....	54
2.3.4. Implications for Future Research.....	55
Conclusion.....	55
General Conclusion.....	57
References.....	59
Appendices	
Résumé	
ملخص	

General Introduction

Speaking is considered to be the most important skill in foreign language or second language learning. Oral performance is ubiquitous in students' daily life, and hence, much pressure is sensed in their conduct during their performances. Brown and Yule (1983) claimed that:

Speaking is the skill that the learners will be judged upon most in real-life situations. It is an important part of everyday interaction and most often the first impression of a person is based on its ability to speak fluently and comprehensively (p.25).

Brown (2000) added "you are what you speak" (p. 269).

Axiomatically, the mastery of speaking is regarded as the sine qua non condition to come to grips with any language. The crux of the problem in Algeria is that foreign language learners face many difficulties with regard to this language skill. This is mainly due to the fact that teachers still assign too low a value to the way speaking is taught. More often than not, the strategies followed do not account for the latest efficient ways but rather traditional ones such as dialogues, memorization and drills repetition. Following this line of thought, Susikaran (2012) maintained that "despite the importance of speaking, researchers have shown that teaching speaking has been undervalued and English language teachers have continued to teach speaking just as a repetition of drills or memorization of dialogues" (p. 1).

Beyond doubt, more emphasis is now put on developing speaking for the requirements of communication skills by modern society demands; it has gained an outstanding eminence in second language learning as it has received increasing attention in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research. As a matter of fact, it has been deemed a primordial position in language teaching methods. Consequently, a surge of interest about the best ways to approach teaching speaking has recently emerged to keep abreast of the latest and

most successful techniques in teaching and learning speaking. Development in the field of information technologies in the last decade offered the possibility to exploit new ways of making presentations. Therefore, learners have to be motivated to perform via the use of other new non-exploitable presentation techniques by using technological devices that might lead to better oral communication skills compared to traditional presentation tools. According to Levy and Stockwell (2006), in *Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL)*, ‘‘technological tools are often used both as an end and as a means to an end’’ (as cited in Murugaiah, 2016, p. 88). Harmer (2007) stated out that:

There are three reasons for getting students to speak in the classroom. Firstly, speaking activities provide rehearsal opportunities- chances to practise real-life speaking in the safety of the classroom. Second, speaking activities in which students try to use any or all of the languages they know provide feedback for both teacher and students; and finally, these speaking tasks activate the various elements of language that learners have stored in their brain and help them become autonomous language users (p. 123).

Harmer’s quotation shows that speaking is paramount in any language acquisition because of a whole array of benefits that learners will glean when dealing with some speaking activities in the black box; offering rehearsal chances, practice, and feedback for learners and teachers are some of the pay-offs. The activation of schemata is the last ingredient that speaking tasks help the learners to meet by fostering their autonomy and building up their confidence. Based on these considerations, many research studies have been led to explore the impact of those new presentations. The current study, therefore, seeks to unravel the effectiveness of (PK) presentations on the improvement of Algerian EFL students’ speaking performance.

1. Background of the Study

Research in education about the most efficient ways to develop speaking has reached its paroxysm in modern times. Consequently, researchers are constantly looking for innovative and efficient techniques to build up the students’ abilities to master the speaking

skill. Importantly, their oral performance is regularly put to the test; ‘‘how well the EFL students can explain their action determines how people perceive their communication ability’’ (Souter, 2007, as cited in Angelina 2019, p. 86). In this vein, many studies brought to light the use of PK presentations and its benefits (Tomsett & Shaw, 2014; Arniatika, 2017; Angelina, 2019; Solmaz, 2019; Rokhaniyah, 2019). However, in spite of the aforementioned advantages, the number of studies specifically those examining the improvement of speaking performance employing the PK technique in the Algerian context are still inexistent.

To begin with, Tomsett and Shaw (2014) conducted a pilot study on Creative Classroom Experience Using PK to Encourage ESL Use in Undergraduate Business Courses and asserted the utility and usefulness of PK. The informants revealed that they attained their objective by learning in a very innovative way and which was illustrated in their ability to produce concise and precise presentations in the target language. The study went further as to suggest the use of PK in other aspects of learning.

Similarly, Arniatika (2017) investigated the improvement of speaking performance using PK presentation among the tenth graders of SMA Muhammadiyah Pekalongan East Lampung in Indonesia. For this purpose, the research used Classroom Action Research (CAR) as a method and test, documentation and observation as the instrument to collect data and uphold the work with more valid data. The results gained from data analysis revealed that the implementation of PK presentation method was successful because the criteria of success were achieved by the participants since 77.78 % reached the targeted score. Besides, the results of observation showed that the learners became more active as they were more energetically involved in the learning process.

In Indonesia, Angelina (2019) gave special attention to the use of PK by EFL students in Sanata Dharma University. In this regard, she investigated the effect of PK as a creative

and innovative presentation format to improve the speaking skill in delivering presentations. The results from this analysis demonstrated the learners' improvement in their oral performance which was mainly seen in the increased mean scores of their presentations after the use of PK. Moreover, the study was supported by the interview results conducted with two learners who asserted the improvement of their speaking skill in delivering successful presentations in terms of language use, speech delivery and interaction with audience. Among these benefits, the students' presentation quality improved.

Following similar lines of inquiry, Solmaz (2019) investigated the potential of PK presentation for English language learners. The participants were future teachers of English who were students enrolled in an advanced-level speaking course in the English language teaching department in a Turkish state university between 2016 and 2018. As part of the study, 102 students worked on an open-ended survey whereas 12 students representing cohorts from each year took part in semi-structured focus group interviews. The findings indicated improvement in speaking, self-confidence, time management and presentation skills. Furthermore, the results revealed that those future English language teachers recognized the potential of PK and the objective of a high number of these teachers to use it in their future language teaching pedagogy.

Endorsing the PK perspective, Rokhaniyah (2019) conducted a study that explored the PK presentation in enhancing EFL learners' speaking fluency and the class climate when this strategy is implemented by students. The research used classroom observation, pre and post-test, field notes, and interview. The findings pointed out that PK contributed in improving learners' speaking fluency by optimizing students' speech speed, and words per minute, increasing articulation rate, reinforcing phonation time ratio, reducing the frequency of silent pause; avoiding filler words, and increasing incoherence in spontaneous

speech. Additionally, the use of PK also helped in the improvement of the class atmosphere as EFL learners were actively engaged in the presentation of their course material and their motivation to work jointly increased.

Most of the research studies discussed so far shed light on the utility of PK presentations in enhancing EFL students' speaking skill. They are based on testing the benefits gained through the use of such a strategy as a major concern. Similarly, the current investigation aims at testing the improvement of speaking through PK use. Significantly, all the above stated studies adhered to the experimental nature of research design as they used quantitative measures in testing their hypotheses. Likewise, the current study is empirically investigated and statistically reliant in executing its research design.

The conclusions drawn from the aforesaid studies constitute valuable records and gear the direction of this research as they establish its meaning. While the literature is varied in terms of the significance of using PK in the field of education in general, there has been, to the researchers' current knowledge, no research conducted about the impact of using PK presentations on speaking among EFL students in secondary school in Algeria. Consequently, this inquiry attempts to fill this gap in the existing literature, namely, the PK technique in enhancing the students' oral performance.

2. Statement of the Problem

Attempting to reach a proficient level in speaking in a foreign language requires the combination of some inextricable language competencies with the speech production. In other words, success in achieving an up-to-standard performance in speaking does not only entail the grammatical competence but also sociolinguistic competence, strategic competence (Canale & Swain, 1980), and discourse competence, (Canale, 1983, as cited in Tuan, 2017, p. 106). As a matter of fact, most students find it problematic, if not daunting and overwhelmingly impassable to master their speaking outcome, and thus, face real

difficulties when attempting to say their minds in the target language, which, oftentimes, lead to the failure in communication.

Nevertheless, a plethora of factors can help these students to surpass this problem and contribute to the enhancement of one's oral performance such as role plays, gamifications, dialogues, monologues and many other strategies. Yet, for the sake of more efficiency, the present work proposes another successful way to remedy Algerian Secondary EFL Students' deficiencies in improving their speaking performance namely PK presentations.

3. Research Question

The current research seeks to answer the following research question:

1. To what extent do PK presentations contribute in the improvement of Algerian Secondary School Pupils' speaking performance?

4. Research Assumption

In the light of what has been said, it is hypothesized that:

The use of PK presentations will improve Algerian Secondary School EFL Learners' speaking performance if teachers integrate them in their classes.

5. Aim of the Study

This study aims at exploring the value of PK presentations in improving secondary school EFL learners' oral proficiency in their presentations.

6. Significance of the Study

This study could be significant for EFL teachers, learners, and syllabus designers or textbook writers. It might be significant for teachers as it provides them with a new and motivating way for approaching the speaking skill. Additionally, it could be useful and

effective for EFL learners who are turned on by technology, i.e., these students will both enjoy the use of computers and slides in their presentations and develop their oral performance. With regard to syllabus/ textbook writers, the current study about this innovative technique, if proven effective, might bring helpful insights and more variety in terms of teaching strategies and serve as a database as well as a springboard for the elaboration of future language teaching/ learning syllabuses and textbooks by the incorporation of the aforementioned technique.

7. Research Methodology

To check the validity of the research study, a quasi-experimental design was implemented. The study was conducted with 20 second year Foreign Languages Learners at Ahmed Francis high school in Jijel, Algeria, namely the experimental group. The target learners were exposed to a pre-test in order to measure their overall speaking performance by answering individually four questions. Moreover, an immediate assessment was carried out in which the participants had to present various topics in five groups, each of which containing four pupils by using the PK technique to check their improvement. Two days after treatments sessions which were at the number of four, the participants were exposed to a post-test to measure their speaking performance by using the scoring rubric of the speaking performance .It is worth mentioning that the research ended up with 20 learners.

8. Structure of the Study

The study at hand consists of two main chapters. The first chapter is concerned with the theoretical part which was divided into two main sections namely: speaking and PK. As for the second chapter which is concerned with the practical part, it contains three sections. The first section is devoted exclusively to the discussion of the research

methodology; the second section deals with the analysis of data while the third section presents data discussion and interpretation.

Chapter One: Literature Review

This chapter includes two main sections: speaking and PK presentations. Therefore, the researchers tried to clarify the elements that constitute each of the two variables.

Section One: Speaking

Introduction

The first section is about the issues related to speaking. As a matter of fact, it discusses first the definitions provided by different scholars. Moreover, it highlights the components of speaking. Additionally, it emphasises the status of speaking among the four language skills. Moreover, it outlines the hiccups encountered by students while trying to develop their speaking abilities. More importantly, it sheds light on the function of the aforementioned skill. This section also underscores the components underlying speaking effectiveness and stresses the importance of speaking across language teaching methods. Ultimately, this section emphasises the speaking teaching strategies.

1.1.1. Definition of Speaking

Prior to submerging into the nuts and bolts of speaking, it will be more convenient to define it first. According to Thornbury (2005, p. 1), "Speaking is so much a part of daily life". The same idea is reiterated by Baily (2005) that, "Speaking is such a fundamental human behaviour. It means speaking is very essential in our lives," (p. 2). Accordingly, Burns and Joyce (1997, p. 54) stated that:

Speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing and receiving and processing information. Its form and meaning are dependent on the context in which it occurs, including the participants themselves, their collective experiences, the physical environment, and the purposes for speaking. It is often spontaneous, open ended, and evolving. However, speech is not always unpredictable.

In other words, speaking is a basic interactional human habit for the sake of meaning in order to communicate effectively and to convey information verbally, in a way that can be understood by the interlocutor or listener. This interaction depends much on some factors such as the situation in which speaking takes place, the participants and their experiences together, and the setting. The aim for speaking defines both the form and meaning which speaking should take. Also, Carter and McCarthy (1995), believed that:

Speaking requires that learners not only know how to produce specific points of language such as grammar, pronunciation, or vocabulary (linguistic competence), but also that they understand when, why, and in what ways to produce language (sociolinguistic competence). Finally, speech has its own skills, structures, and conventions different from written language. A good speaker synthesizes this array of skills and knowledge to succeed in a given speech act (p. 23).

Alternatively stated, speaking entails the amalgamation of many competencies with dissimilar conventions from written language. The success of a given speech act depends mainly on the ability to combine a whole panoply of skills and knowledge by the speaker who is then considered to be a good one.

Generally, speaking refers to the fact of transmitting facts and one's sensations in words. In this respect, the Oxford online dictionary (2018) defines speaking as "the action of conveying information or expressing one's feelings in speech". Similarly, Florez (1999) stated that speaking is a reciprocal course of action for building meaning that entails creating, obtaining and progressing information (p.1). This means that speaking helps us say our minds by communicating our ideas, thoughts and suggestions on a daily basis.

Furthermore, Brown (1994) defined speaking as a skill in producing oral language (p. 103). Additionally, Nunan (2003) believed that, "speaking is the productive aural/oral skill which consists of producing systematic verbal utterance to convey meaning" (p. 48). Yet, Gunther (1982) affirmed that speaking is not a systematic habitual procedure but a type of human actions which is multifaceted like any other skill (p. 6).

1.1.2. Components of Speaking

It is worth to say that the art of speaking is a very complex process that demands a variety of abilities during the articulation of utterances, even though there are many possibilities which are accessible to the speaker in the process of speaking. According to Brown and Yule (1983, pp. 4-5) the speaker has been armed with all the voice quality as well as paralinguistic features namely: facial expressions and gestural systems that may help producing speech. Even so, these characteristics are not enough to construct consequential and meaningful statements ‘on the spot’ and manage the production of the communicative system. They entail key components which help the speaker in the establishment of interaction like understanding the message, monitoring what has been said and whether it fits his intentions. At the same time, the speaker is thinking about his upcoming utterances in order to find ways to harmonize them in the overall mould of what he wants to say.

Additionally, Brown and Yule (1983) claimed that the speaker will be monitoring not only his own performance but its reception by his interlocutor. The speaker is also required to amend and handle the unexpected situations. Moreover, he needs to use the monitor model subconsciously and retrieve a certain amount of vocabulary related to the topic with the right pronunciation. It stands to reason from what has been mentioned about speaking that it is a skill which comprises a whole array of concurrent inextricable abilities. According to Harris (1974) there are five components of speaking skill concerned with comprehension, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency.

1.1.2.1. Grammar

Grammar paves the way for speaking. It is indispensable in the mastery of the structures for EFL learners so as to organize correct statements in their communication and discriminate between them in terms of appropriateness and inappropriateness in their form.

Nevertheless, being able to manipulate grammar rules alone is not enough for effective and successful speaking. Swain (1985) stated that learners must notice language forms in their speech that are causing problems for the listeners, such as pronunciation or grammar, and try to modify their spoken language for greater accuracy (as cited in Goh & Burns, 2012, p. 19).

1.1.2.2. Comprehension

Comprehension is the aptitude of comprehending the utterances generated by the speaker. According to Widdowson (1978), the learning of a language ‘also involves acquiring an understanding of which sentences, or part of sentences are appropriate in a particular context’ (p. 3). It is inferred by the interlocutor from both verbal and non verbal gestures of the speaker throughout some artificial techniques or perception within a given situation. Therefore, Comprehensible Input (CI) is of vital importance in learning a foreign language and should be given a crucial role in conveying and grasping messages. Equally, the Comprehensible Output (CO) which is transmitted by the speaker has to be meaningful in order to reach the participants easily and without any equivocal interpretation. As Swain (1985) stated “although comprehensible input is important, it alone is insufficient. Language learners can also develop their language by producing comprehensible output” (as cited in Goh & Burns, 2012, p. 18).

1.1.2.3. Vocabulary

It goes without saying that vocabulary is deemed a forefront position in speaking. Lexis is now considered as the jewel in the crown of language as it gained much importance in the light of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Consequently, students will find difficulties in the interpretation or production of any message unless they have a sufficient amount of vocabulary items related to their topic. Wilkins (1972) pointed

out that “without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed” (as cited in Lewis, 2000, p. 19). The need of accessing vocabulary is of the essence in order to decipher any overall language system. As a matter of course, students who learn more vocabulary are likely to perform better than others.

1.1.2.4. Pronunciation

Pronunciation is concerned with the function of sounds and sound units like stress, rhythm and intonation. In general terms, Trask (1996) defined pronunciation as “the manner in which speech sounds, especially connected sequences are articulated by individual speakers” (p. 291). In other words, it is the ability to deliver understandable and clear messages by a speaker in the Target Language (TL). It is worth mentioning that students endowed with good pronunciation and intonation in English have the capacity to express themselves effectively albeit their limitations in lexis and grammar.

1.1.2.5. Fluency

The ultimate goal of any EFL learner is fluency. It plays a central role in speaking as it is the ability to speak communicatively, fluently and accurately. It usually refers to the free oral expression of language and without any interruption. Fillmore (1979) discussed fluency exclusively in relation to productive skills and mentioned four kinds of it which in turn refer to speed, continuity, coherence, context-sensitivity and creativity in language use (p. 93). Hence, a good speaker is someone who has the aptitude to demonstrate speech delivery, spontaneity, utterance comprehensibility and sounds with few errors and pauses that may be at the origin of conversation breakdowns.

1.1.3. The Status of Speaking among the Four Language Skills

The speaking skill is presumably one of the most important skills in second and foreign language teaching and learning. Its mastery in English is a priority for many SL or

FL learners (Richards, 2008, p. 19). Students' personal success in second language acquisition is, first and foremost, the result of the salient part and supreme position that this communication productive aspect is deemed. Ur (1996, p. 120), indicated that:

(...) of all the four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing), speaking seems intuitively the most important: people who know a language are referred to as 'speakers' of that language' as if speaking included all other kinds of knowing and many if not most foreign language learners are primarily interested in learning to speak''.

A similar view is shared by Nunan (1989, p. 225) who said that the ability to operate second language can be actually equated to the ability to speak that language.

Likewise, output is as crucial as input in helping ESL learners become increasingly proficient by encouraging them to speak. According to Goh and Burns (2012), "speaking is accepted by everyone as an essential language -communication skill, but its importance to language learners goes beyond just day- to- day communication" (p. 15). They added that speaking can help in acquiring a language as well as being an important element to reach the academic improvement of a good number of second language students (p. 15). Put differently, speaking is a main skill through which speakers make active use of the language in their daily communication.

Additionally, Hatch (1978) emphasized the effective role that speaking plays in second language acquisition by arguing strongly that engaging in talk and interaction with competent speakers will help learners by their interlocutors' input and feedback besides having a chance to hear more accurate language being used (as cited in Goh & Burns 2012, p. 18). Donough and Shaw (2002) said "in many contexts, speaking is often the skill upon which a person is judged 'at face value'" (as cited in Nuarsih (2018, p. 136). In short, speaking is the skill which is noticeable when we express ourselves and on which people make judgements about us as to our competency in such a skill.

1.1.4. Hiccups in Developing EFL Students' Speaking Abilities

Trying to speak well a foreign language requires more than knowing the grammatical competence. It is a whole process that calls for the ability of learners to get hold of the knowledge of how natives make use of language of ordered interpersonal exchange. Consequently, it is difficult for EFL students to come to grips with the language, i.e., to speak the TL fluently and appropriately. This is why it is of paramount importance to examine the ubiquitous stumbling blocks that stand in the way of the learners' success in their oral performance.

1.1.4.1. Age

There is no doubt that EFL students' oral performance is influenced by a number of factors. One of the most determinant aspects that have been cited in the success or failure in L2 or foreign language is undoubtedly age. Oyama's study (1976) showed that many adults fail to reach native-like proficiency in a second language. Their progress seems to level off at a certain stage, a phenomenon which is usually called "fossilization"- the permanent cessation of second language development (as cited in Richards & Renandya, 2002, p. 205). This shows that the aging process itself may affect or limit adult learners' ability to pronounce the TL fluently with native-like pronunciation (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992 as cited in Richards & Renandya, 2002, p. 205). The critical period hypothesis also claimed that there is a window of time in a person's life to acquire language in a linguistically rich environment after which further language acquisition becomes much more difficult and effortful. Simply put, there is an optimal period for language acquisition ending at puberty (Azieb, 2021, p. 21).

1.1.4.2. Aural Medium

There is little doubt that listening plays a fundamental role in the students' speaking abilities improvement. Dependence on listening is systematic as it precedes speaking. According to Doff (1998), "speaking skills cannot be developed unless we develop listening skills" (as cited in Leong & Ahmadi, 2017, p. 37). This dichotomy has always existed; usually, when there are two people, one person speaks, and the other answers through attending by means of the listening process. "While listening, learners must comprehend the text by retaining information in memory, integrate it with what follows, and continually adjust their understanding of what they hear in the light of prior knowledge and of incoming information" (Mendelssohn & Rubin, 1995, p. 35). So, if a person is unable to understand what is being said, he will not be able to respond. This means that speaking is narrowly interlinked with listening, which is the essential system through which the rules of language are internalized. "The fleetingness of speech, together with the features of spoken English- loosely organized syntax, incomplete forms, false starts, and the use of fillers- undoubtedly hinder EFL learners' comprehension and affect the development of their speaking abilities" (Richards & Renandya, 2002, p. 205).

1.1.4.3. Socio-cultural Factors

There is no doubt that foreign language or L2 learning is affected by many cultural characteristics. According to Carrasquillo (1994 p. 55), "shared values and beliefs create the traditions and social structures that bind a community together and are expressed in their language". Therefore, to acquire the ability of speaking a language, one must be aware of the manner this language is being used, viz., how the language is used in a social context. It is well known that each language possesses its norms of usage as to when, how, and to what degree a speaker may impose a given oral performance on his or her spoken

partner (Burns, 1990, as cited in Richards & Renandya, 2002, p. 206). It is really difficult for non-native speakers to select the forms which are appropriate to certain situations because of the influence or interference of their own cultural norms.

Moreover, in oral communication, the messages provided through the verbal listening channel are sometimes in contradiction with the nonverbal communication structure. As a result, EFL learners usually do not know how to pick up non-verbal prompts which in turn leads to misapprehension because of the unawareness of that nonverbal message.

1.1.4.4. Affective Factors

“The affective side of the learner is probably one of the most important influences on language learning success or failure.” (Oxford, 1990, as cited in Richards & Renandya, 2002, p. 206). That is to say, factors like fear, anxiety, shyness, lack of confidence, attitude and motivation may have a great impact on the affective state of a person in learning a language effectively or not. Moreover, Richards and Renandya (2002, p. 206) claimed that public speaking of a foreign language has always been a challenge; mainly in front of natives because it is anxiety provoking. It may even lead sometimes to extreme nervousness when EFL learners become tongue-tied or speechless as a result of an unexpected situation, which in turn, often leads to discouragement and a general sense of failure. Adults are different from children in the sense that they are much concerned by the judgement of others. They pay much attention so as not to make errors in what they say because that would mean a public evidence of ignorance and which would offer a clear occasion of “losing face” in some cultures. Richards and Renandya (2002) claimed that adult learners’ sensitivity to making mistakes or their fear of “losing face” is at the origin of their incapacity to speak English without hesitation (p. 206).

1.1.5. The Function of Speaking

For many second and foreign language learners, the mastery of speaking in English is at a premium. The categorization of the functions of speaking in human interaction has been attempted by several experts. Brown and Yule (1983) suggested the transactional and interactional functions. They stated ‘we will adopt only two terms to describe the major functions of language’ (p.1). However, an extended three-part version of Brown and Yule’s framework (after Jones, 1996, and Burns, 1998) has been used by Richards (2009) with teachers and in designing his own materials (p. 19). Each of these speech activities is quite different in terms of form and function when designing speaking activities. That’s why it is essential to make a distinction among the three functions of speaking: talk as interaction, talk as transaction, and talk as performance.

1.1.5.1. Talk as Interaction

Our daily communication is characterized by much interaction with other people and thus it remains interactional. Talk as interaction refers to what we normally mean by ‘conversation’. It is an interactive communication which is done spontaneously by two or more people. According to Brown and Yule (1983) ‘that function involved in expressing social relations and personal attitudes we will describe as interactional’. In other words, the main intention in this function is social relationship.

1.1.5.2. Talk as Transaction

In talk as transaction, the focus is more on the message that is conveyed. Making the others understand the message clearly and accurately is the centre of attention. In this type of spoken language, students and teachers usually focus on meaning.

1.1.5.3. Talk as Performance

In this case, speaking activities put more focus on monolog rather than dialog. Function of speaking as performance happened at speeches, public talks, public announcements, retell stories, telling stories, etc.

1.1.6. Components Underlying Speaking Effectiveness

There are many factors that make a foreign or second language difficult to speak. According to Carrasquillo (1994), “language proficiency is not a unidimensional construct but a multifaceted modality, consisting of various levels of abilities and domains” (as cited in Richards & Renandya, 2002, p. 206). In the same vein, Hymes (1971) assumed that L2 learners need to know not only the linguistic knowledge, but also the culturally accepted ways of interacting with others in different situations and relationships. According to his theory, called the communicative competence, there are certain elements which are indispensable in communication. These constituents are the interaction of grammatical, psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, and probabilistic language components. Then, building on Hymes’ theory, Canale and Swain (1980) suggested three parts for the communicative competence which are: the grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence to which Canale added discourse competence (1983, as cited in Richards & Renandya, 2002, p. 206).

1.1.6.1. Grammatical Competence

According to Richards and Renandya, 2002, p. 207) grammatical competence involves the accurate use of words and structures. It also subsumes three main types of linguistic ability: syntactic, semantic and phonological. The first element is concerned with the combination of words together in order to form grammatical sentences. Semantic ability refers to the well-formedness or ill-formedness of sentences. Finally, the last ability is phonological that entails the ability to recognize and work with sounds in spoken language.

1.1.6.2. Sociolinguistic Competence

Sociolinguistic competence is the ability to use language appropriately. Knowing only linguistic features and rules of the TL does not help learners to appropriately use it. They should know what is expected socially and culturally by the people of the TL. Being able to understand the sociolinguistic dimension of language enables the learners to know what is appropriate, how to ask questions during the communication act, and to respond nonverbally according to the purpose of the conversation (Richards & Renadya 2002, p. 207). In other words, the speaker needs to speak a language not only correctly but also appropriately.

1.1.6.3. Strategic Competence

According to Brown (1994, p. 228), strategic competence which is “the way learners manipulate language in order to meet communicative goals is perhaps the most important of all the communicative competence elements” Additionally, and in the light of speaking, strategic competence is the ability of knowing when and how to speak, how to keep the ball rolling in a conversation, how to end up the conversation, and how to be able to manage by clearing up communication breakdowns and comprehension issues.

1.1.6.4. Discourse competence

EFL learners must develop discourse competence. “effective speakers should acquire a large repertoire of structures and discourse markers to express ideas, show relationships of time, and indicate cause, contrast and emphasis” (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992, as cited in Richards & Renandya, 2002, p. 207). Otherwise stated, the rules of cohesion and coherence must be displayed, which help in maintaining the communication together in a consequential manner.

1.1.7. Teaching Speaking Strategies

The aim of teaching speaking is to reach efficiency in communication. Regarding Krashen's comprehensible input theory, learners must be able to make themselves understood, using their present know how to the fullest. Hence, they should attempt to circumvent confusion in the message due to faulty pronunciation, grammar, or vocabulary, and to observe the social and cultural rules that apply in each communication situation.

To promote speaking, Kayi (2006) endorsed thirteen activities namely: discussion, simulations, role-play, brainstorming, story-telling, interviews, story-completion, reporting, playing cards, picture describing, find the differences, and picture narrating (as cited in Pratama & Awaliyah, 2015, p. 23). However, in spite of the importance of each of these strategies in the development of the speaking skill, it is another technique which will be debated in the coming paragraphs and which is PK presentations.

SectionTwo: Pecha Kucha

Introduction

The arena of current teaching has been marked by a thorough adjustment in paradigm, videlicet, the shift from traditional instruction to contemporary teaching following the world's tremendous vicissitudes in different domains. Thus, this evolution brought successful advance which overbore all the spheres in this globalization era, and education was no exception; it witnessed drastic changes as to the way of teaching and learning.

Naturally, the quest for the introduction of some effective teaching techniques, among those which already existed in the large gamut of teaching, was indispensable for the sake of improvement in communication which is considered as one of the four 21st century skills.

It is known that Microsoft PowerPoint has always been the extensively used software by the students as oral presentation is frequent in high school classrooms owing to its practicality and flexibility. However, in opting for such a practice, many students often focus on the ‘what’ rather than the ‘how’, i.e., much emphasis is put on the content rather than the way the presentation is delivered. Consequently, there is a tendency of putting overload information on the slides, which in turn often leads to boredom in the students’ presentations as they normally end up reading their heavy-text slides and exceeding the time limit, which will reflect poor oral presentation ability (Tomsett & Shaw, 2014; Levin & Peterson, 2013; Artyushina, Khovrin, Sheypak & Spektor, 2011; Anderson & Williams, 2012, as cited in Angelina, 2019, pp. 86-87).

As a matter of fact, teachers should expose their students to new ways of using the software that can help them develop their speaking performance when delivering their presentations. One of the techniques is unquestionably PK presentation format.

This chapter explores the role of PK presentation in enhancing EFL students’ oral performance. Firstly, it clarifies the concept of PK. Thus, it recounts the whys and the wherefores of the technique and how it came into being. It subsequently discusses the tenets which underlie PK. Additionally, it elaborates on the advantages of the method.

1.2.1. Definition of PK

PK is a specific style of presentation that originated in Japan. The technique requires the presenters to deliver content of 20 slides, each of which displayed for 20 seconds for a total presentation time of 6 minutes and forty seconds that uses Microsoft Office PowerPoint program (PPT). PK is the Japanese word for “chit chat” or informal and friendly talk. It is the world’s fast-paced, concise and effective storytelling platform, which has been used by millions around the world. PK began because people talk too much. In 2003, architects Astrid Klein and Mark Dytham of Tokyo’s Klein Dytham

architecture invented PK because they were yearning for ‘‘More show, Less tell.’’ At the very beginning the objective was to streamline lengthy presentations. Therefore, sessions soon morphed into happenings: PK Nights, first in Tokyo, then around the world. Today, more than 50,000 people present PK Nights every year (<https://www.pechakucha.com/about>). And the number keeps increasing. Today, schools and business use PK to creatively engage students and employees on a range of subject matters.

1.2.2. The Principles of PK

In order to conduct a PK, there are principles which should be part and parcel of the procedure. Kasperek (2011) claimed that they are as follows (as cited in Arniatika 2017, p. 17):

- a. Meaningful design: the slide show should be limited to 20 seconds but targeted. That is, it should be meaningful and rich in content.
- b. The pictures presented should be well-attuned to the message, the medium, and the audience need.
- c. The message is primordial; it should be supported or boosted by each of the slides.
- d. The amount of information which is delivered should be well-balanced, i.e., it should be neither too much nor too little.
- e. Each slide should be kept succinct and to the point. In other words, the message should be simple in the sense that each slide has to contain only one concept or idea in order to be grasped easily by the audience.
- f. Little or no text is used. Imagery should prevail in slides show.

1.2.3. The Advantages of PK

PK was introduced in 2003 as an alternative type to PowerPoint. ‘‘PK presentations may move presenters away from common weaknesses found with traditional Power-Point’’ (Beyer, 2011, p. 122). According to him, there are different advantages.

The following are the most important ones:

- a.** PK is a fast-paced, but concise presentation style that forces students to fix their attention on their message with preset, 20-second slides.
- b.** The fast pace which is imposed by PK in the presentation may have the benefit to keep the audience engaged and keep the presenter concentrated and organized.
- c.** As a presentation style, it will push the students to be more familiar with the topic and, hence, reduce the number of mistakes made when adopting PowerPoint slides. Its time-limit of presenting slides will help students to end up their presentation on time which, and de facto, gives a better performance.
- d.** Since slides are automated, time must be at a premium, i.e., presenters of PK must be well-organized to be capable of capturing the message of every slide in the time allowed.
- e.** When opting for the use of PK, of only images, the message will be clearer as stated in Paivio’s (1971) Dual Coding Theory as the presenter’s verbal message does not contradict the text and hence, there is no confusion if the text is not well concurrent with the presenter’s message. Students will not read from the slide, and there are no concerns with text font size. These are ineffective PowerPoint presenter traits that distract from the presentation (Eves & Davis, 2008, p. 8).

According to Solmaz (2019, p. 551) several benefits were also reported by learners: ‘‘Fluency in speaking, time management, overall speaking, presentation skills, self confidence and pronunciation’’, which means that many aspects of the language were improved significantly following the use of PK.

1.2.4. Other Benefits of PK

1.2.4.1. Fluency

Fluency in speaking as one of the benefits of PK was stated by almost half of the respondents in the study conducted by Solmaz (2019). An apparent improvement was observed in the students speaking performance post-tests well as in the interviewees’ answers which the researcher was supplied with. As a matter of fact, 42% stated that after their PK presentation, they started to think that they can be more fluent when they speak.

1.2.4.2. Time-management

The participants also mentioned the improvement in time-management and how the use of PK contributed in enhancing this element by forcing them to end up each slide in exactly 20 seconds, hence, pushing the students to be well-prepared to be in according with time allotment. ‘‘Students become aware of the importance of time and they can use their time effectively.’’ Solmaz (2019, p. 551).

1.2.4.3. Overall Speaking and Presentation Skills

‘‘It provides students to improve their speaking skills by giving certain information about any topic within a limited time’’ Solmaz (2019, p. 551). Besides, the study reported the contribution of PK to the students’ presentation skills. Because of the special attention to the specific format of PK, participants approach was positive as to the fact that there was not much writing part that controlled their speaking, which helped them focus on their speaking performance, pictures and time allotted to end up the slides.

1.2.4.4. Self-confidence

Another important facet that students have developed by using PK presentation was the fact that they became more self-confident. The researcher observed a positive change in their level of confidence and learners pointed out that PK “gives confidence to students and encourages learner’s autonomy” Solmaz (2019, p. 553).

1.2.4.5. Pronunciation, vocabulary, reading and culture

In addition to the aforementioned advantages, many other aspects were detected in areas like pronunciation, vocabulary, reading and culture. “During preparation and presentation, I learnt a lot of new vocabulary from a broad range of fields and the way these words were pronounced” Solmaz (2019, interviewee 12, p. 553).

Following similar lines of inquiry, other researchers claimed that PK develops other aspects;

- a. Coskun (2017) pointed out that students’ English public speaking anxiety was reduced significantly as a result of their experience using the PK presentation format.
- b. According to Angelina (2019), PK develops critical thinking since it forces students to filter the information they need to include on their slides (p. 89).
- c. Since the presentation is limited to 20 slides in each slide, the information which is explained is clear, succinct and straight to the point. Thus, the audience does not get bored and pays more attention.
- d. Slides are more appealing since the use of sentences is very concise with more pictures. According to Sweller (1980), who developed the cognitive load theory:

It is more difficult to process information if it is coming at us both verbally and in written form at the same time. Since people cannot read and listen well at the same time, displays filled with lots of text must be avoided. On the other hand, multimedia that displays visual information, including visualizations of quantitative information, *can* be processed while listening to someone speaks about the visual content (as cited in Reynolds, 2011, p. 10)

Differently stated, people cannot perform two activities at a time. That is why information in written and verbal form should be avoided. The latter should prevail because visual information which contains pictures can be understood better.

1.2.5. Drawbacks of PK

Many positive points were mentioned about the use of PK presentation as asserted by many studies. However, this does not mean that PK can be used without any downsides. Many disadvantages have been observed while making use of the technique.

- a. Time constraint is considered to be a two edged-sword in PK. On the one hand, time limitation has been mentioned as being one of the advantages of PK in the above sentences because it helps presenters to be concise and precise. On the other hand, it has been reported by researchers as leading to less quality in the students' answers because it is a real challenge and a hindrance to end up slides content in 20 seconds each. More often than not, students' fight against time is characterized by having no time to explain more specifics and being oppressive to keep within that time-limit. According to Nyugen (2015) "presentation pacing and personal shyness were reported as negative feedback"(p. 1).
- b. According to Arniatika (2017, p. 19) content constraint has also been reported as being a negative aspect of PK presentation. There is no time to go to the ins and outs of the slide content. Besides, it is quite difficult for students to decide which information is to be included and which ones should be left aside. Important topics coverage is limited and time-crunch.
- c. Practice has to be higher than in traditional presentation formats lest the performance should be weak (Arnatika, 2017, p. 19)

In the same vein, Solmaz (2019, p. 554) claimed that PK has the 3 following negative points:

1. “Limited time for each slide causes students to memorize all the things”.
2. “Students do not pay much attention to their mistakes as they speak fast”. Thus, accuracy becomes the students’ Achilles’ heel.
3. Anxiety as well has been mentioned as being a downside of PK presentation. “Anxiety is necessary for the learning process but it makes students have high anxiety because of the fast flow of time.”

1.2.6. PK and its Interlink with CALL

In language teaching and learning, CALL came into being in early 1950’s. It evolved into a full-fledged discipline of study and research following the revolutionary and evolutionary movements in the fields of pedagogy and psychology. Accordingly, many different words and labels came into vogue among educationists to refer to the core of computer assisted language learning and teaching.

As expected, these technological affordances have affected all areas of science and people’s life style. Axiomatically, computers have become a central part of people’s personal as well as professional lives since the mid of 20th century. Hence, a revolutionary shift took place in the way information was created, saved, transferred and processed. This led to big transformations in people. The new revelation did not only inspire studies but it integrated technology in the way children were raised and educated as well. As a result, computers are now being widely exploited in general education and various fields of studies. Furthermore, CALL is also viewed as an integral part of modern education, namely in the new presentations which have been introduced recently namely PPT and PK. According to Cameron (1989) ‘the aim of

developing CALL is not to provide language with novelty, but is to improve the quality of language teaching.” (p. 8).

PK as a CALL tool has to be promoted and PK presentations encouraged among students more often. According to Reynolds (2011) “the ability to stand and deliver a powerful presentation that engages each audience member’s whole mind has never been more important than today”. Some have called our modern era the presentation generation (p. 12). In other words, this era is characterized by an unprecedented overflow of the art of using these computer-generated slide presentations to the extent that people think that they have always been here, but in truth they have been in common use for about two or three decades only. Reynolds (2012) asserted that:

According to the picture superiority effect, pictures are remembered better than words—especially when people are casually exposed to the information and the exposure is for a very limited time. When information recall is measured just after exposure to a series of pictures or a series of words, the recall for pictures and words is about equal. The picture superiority effect, however, applies when the time after exposure more than 30 seconds, according to research cited in *Universal Principles of Design* (Rockport Publishers). (p. 144).

In plain English, the picture’s impact is larger on memory than words, and this is exactly what PK presentation is all about. Gerard and Goldstein (2005) advised people to make use of pictures and images in order to tell a story or confirm a point.

1.2.7. The PK Procedure

The concept of PK is based on the idea of conciseness and preciseness. That is, the limitation of the number of slides to twenty, each of which to be automatically achieved in 20 seconds. This gives the presenter a time-span of 6 minutes and forty seconds to display their slides and achieve their performance. PK presentation can be performed individually (only one presenter speaking) or in groups. There is no need to mention that the procedure which is to be followed is the same in both cases. According to Arniatika (2017, p. 23) the

following steps can be useful guidelines for both teacher and students when PK presentation is performed in groups:

- a. Divide the class into groups of four or five students by the teacher.
- b. An explanation of the PK presentation procedure to the students must follow to enable them to grasp PK principles (by the teacher).
- c. Draw the students' attention to time allotment.
- d. Students should set time for each slide and decide for the number of slides for the entire slideshow.
- e. Presenters must choose the theme of the presentation before gathering the materials, preparing the script, and regulate rhythm and pace.
- f. Students take a role each and work together for the creation of a slideshow with Microsoft PowerPoint.
- g. Students should be encouraged to rehearse their presentation before each other.
- h. Students should adjust the content of what will be said and rehearse until they feel at ease and cadence begins to emerge.
- i. They play the slides and perform their presentations.

1.2.8. PK and Speaking Performance

As it has been mentioned earlier, there are three functions of speaking in human interaction. Brown and Yule (1983, as cited in Richards, 2008, p. 19), talked about three kinds of functions; talk as interaction, talk as transaction and talk as performance. While the first serves to establish and maintain social relations, the second one is concerned with the exchange of information. As for the third type of talk, it is closely related to PK presentations because it refers to public talk, i.e., talk which transmits information before an audience. It tends to be in the form of monolog rather than a dialogue, exactly in the same way PK slideshows are presented. The presenter's focus is to convey the content of

their theme and explain the pictures that are displayed one after the other. Consequently, the technique is really worth introducing in schools as it is one way to develop the learners' oral performance.

Conclusion

The current chapter threw light on both speaking and PK presentations. Two sections were devoted to these two elements. The first section was concerned with speaking wherein a full and thorough definition was provided. Then, it went through the elements that shape the mastery of speaking. Additionally, it highlighted the status of speaking among the four language skills before discussing the different hiccups in developing EFL students' speaking abilities. Besides, it brought to light the components that underlie speaking effectiveness and the historical background of the skill across language teaching methods. Lastly, it tackled the speaking teaching strategies. The second section was devoted to PK, its definition and how it came into being. After that, it drew attention to the principles underlying the technique. Moreover, it showed up the advantages of PK as well as its drawbacks. Additionally, it discussed PK and its interlink with call before highlighting the PK procedure. Lastly, it elaborated on PK and the speaking performance.

Chapter Two: Fieldwork

Introduction

While the previous chapter casts light on the basic literature of the research topic, this second chapter is devoted to the practical framework of the overall study. It covers three sections. The first section deals with methodology and discusses mainly the general fieldwork design. It is then followed by the analysis of the data collected in the second section. Nonetheless, the third section focuses on the discussion and the interpretation of the results obtained from the analyzed data. Finally, the chapter ends off with acknowledging the limitations of the research study as well as proposing some pedagogical recommendations for upcoming research.

Section One: Research Methodology

This section demarcates the research paradigm pursued, the setting, population and sampling along with the overall research design. The research design comprises the instruments and the procedures of data collection along with the nature of data analysis.

2.1.1. Research Assumption

The research assumption is the cornerstone on which any study is built. Thus, it is worth reiterating it in this chapter. It goes without saying that speaking is deemed a vital importance in order to come to grips with a foreign language. That's why SLA researchers have been investigating for new and efficient ways to enhance students' oral performance. PK presentation is one of the successful techniques that can be adopted in today's schools. As a matter of fact, the assumption of this research goes as follows:

- ✓ The use of PK presentations will improve Algerian Secondary School EFL Learners' speaking performance if teachers integrate them in their classes.

2.1.2. Research Paradigm

In an attempt to explore the efficacy of PK presentation in improving speaking performance among Algerian EFL learners in secondary school, this current investigation embraced the experimental nature of research design since it went for a quantitative approach of data analysis. According to Nunan (1992), the experimental method Experiments are a useful way to ‘‘explore the strength of relationships between the variables’’ (p. 25). Thus, the current study espoused the quasi empirical model of the research aiming at testing the value of the hypothesis. In particular, it sought to establish the relationship between using PK presentations and improving Algerian secondary school EFL students’ level in speaking. It is important to recall that the quasi experimental design is one kind of the experimental approach and extensively used in scientific study as it is to be a successful design for testing cause effect relationships (Nunan, 1992, as cited in Zeroualia, 2019, p. 49).

Basically, this experimental research was built around one experimental group which received two types of assessment; a diagnostic assessment or ‘pre-test’ prior to starting the experiment, and a summative assessment or ‘post-test’ after the four sessions of treatment in order to test learners’ improvement in speaking through PK presentations. Furthermore, learners were exposed to a ten-minute warm and coolfeedback by the end of each session of the treatment to adjust the presentations and gear them towards the set objective (s) in the upcoming sessions. On this basis, the study has implemented a quantitative paradigm of research design as statistical measures were the core of the study to reach precise results.

2.1.3. Setting

The current investigation was conducted with a group of second year foreign languages learners at Ahmed Francis High School, Sidi-Abdelaziz, Jijel. The PK presentations required the use of computers by the students and a data show for its

successful implementation. As a matter of fact, it should have been carried out in a language laboratory for the convenience of the presentation. However, the school was not equipped with such an infrastructure which prompted us to opt for a classroom that is equipped with a data show.

2.1.4. Population and Sampling

This part is about the population aimed at and the sample participating in the research. It also delineates the whys and the wherefores behind their selection.

a. Population of the Study

This investigation addressed second year Foreign Languages learners at Ahmed Francis High School. The rationale behind choosing foreign languages students is twofold.

- ✓ Foreign languages students are expected to be more motivated and enthusiastic about using English in general, and developing their speaking performance in particular; thus, they would show interest to participate in the research.
- ✓ Foreign languages students are supposed to be keen on developing speaking in English more than the other streams as oral performance is ubiquitous in almost their day-to-day activities.

b. Sample of the Study

Practically, it is quite impossible to put the whole population under study; hence, the way out to this issue is sampling which is the most used approach to gain time, save much effort and energy as well as reaching reliable results. Sampling can be defined as the process of selecting a group of subjects which represent the target population. In this respect, Dörnyei (2007) defined a sample as “the group of participants whom the researcher actually examines in an empirical investigation” (p. 96). The sample of this research targeted a second year foreign languages class out of 8 classes. The selection in question was a convenient random one based on learners’ availability. In fact, the

target class included 20 participants. The experimental group remained anonymous in the analysis of the data. The table below is about foreign languages class:

Table 2.1

The Total Students of Foreign Languages Class

No	Sex	No in each sex	Total
1.	Male	07	20
2.	Female	13	

2.1.5. Research Design

This sub-section deals with the research design of this study. It includes the data gathering instruments, the data collection procedures along with the data analysis procedures.

2.1.5.1. Description of Data Gathering Instruments

To measure the research hypothesis, the researchers tested the speaking performance of second year foreign language learners in high school through a series of assessments: diagnostic, immediate and summative.

2.1.5.1.1. Definition of the Tests

a. Diagnostic Test

It refers to the pre-test taken by the learners in order to gauge their level in speaking before receiving the treatment in the form of four questions which were answered individually by the participants whose answers were evaluated according to Speaking Performance Assessment by (Brown, 2001).

b. Immediate Assessment

It refers to the four treatment sessions taken by the learners under the researchers' guidance about participants' PK presentations.

c. Summative Test

It refers to the post-test taken by the learners at the end of the experiment to determine the amount of improvement in speaking after using PK. It is worth mentioning that these

sessions were followed by feedback to adjust the learners' speaking performance. To fulfil this purpose, an Oral Presentation Checklist was adopted.

2.1.5.1.2. Description of the Tests

The overall tests are cautiously described in what follows:

➤ Description of the Speaking Performance Assessment

The current study adopted the speaking performance assessment suggested by (H. Douglas Brown, 2001) as a model. It aimed at gauging the participants' level before and after receiving the treatment and to determine the margin of progress the learners have achieved. It is composed of five levels ranging from the lowest to the highest level (from 1 to 5) and describing precisely what would each oral performance be like in each level.

➤ Description of the Oral Presentation Checklist

For the sake of tweaking the participants' presentations and gear them towards the expected goals, an Oral Presentation Checklist adopted by Arniatika (2018) was used by the researchers as a reference for feedback that lasted 10 minutes and that followed each treatment session. It is worth mentioning that all the researchers' interventions which have been given to the students were in line with the content of the aforementioned checklist in order to pin down the comments that would be made and avoid extending them to some irrelevant areas. The checklist in question contains 15 descriptions, each of which is composed of 4 performance levels (from 0 to 3) that could be reached by the students once they end up the PK presentations. The accumulated marks in each treatment will be counted at the end of the four treatments. The oral presentation checklist aimed at:

- Diagnosing the areas of strengths and the areas of weaknesses of the students and work on their lacunae for future performances, and eventually comparing the four performances of each group.
- Getting a precise view about the development margin of the learners' by the researchers.

2.1.5.1.3. Administration of the Assessments

a. Administering the Pre-test

The pre-test was scheduled for the 22nd April at 12 with an interval of three days before the treatment phase took place. Participants were kept in a classroom with their teacher and the researchers in another classroom. The learners were instructed to take turns when taking the pre-test. It is worth mentioning that some measures were taken when applying the test.

- e. The researchers did not inform the students that the test would be under a research study.
- f. The learners were informed that the test was just an evaluation of their overall speaking in English to check how well they speak the language while being at the end of the school-year.
- g. The students were not allowed to go back to the same room. Each learner was invited to leave alone once they answer the questions so as not to repeat them to the other classmates.
- h. The researchers introduced themselves as being teachers of other high schools who would have a training course with them to develop their oral skills as they were a foreign language class.
- i. The questions were crafted according to the students' proficiency level (intermediate).

b. Administering the Immediate Test

The next stage was the treatment sessions which took place a week after the pre-test. The twenty learners, who were divided into five equal and mixed groups of four participants each, started their first presentations after having been assigned their roles. Then, the groups took turns to present their PK presentations in which they had to perform for 6 minutes and 40 seconds by displaying 20 automated slides, each of which lasting 20 seconds. This means that five slides were presented by each participant in each group. As soon as all the participants got

seated, the first learners launched their PK presentations. The first learner then began his performance by showing his first picture. He tried as best he could to describe it precisely and concisely in order to be in the tempo at the end of the process. At the end of the fifth slide, another participant took over for five more slides. After the PK presentations, the researchers asked the group to remain on the stage for feedback which lasted ten minutes.

This is how all the five groups took turns to perform till the end of the procedure which lasted one month with an interval of a week between one session and the other. The rationale behind was mainly to give the learners enough time to prepare their presentations as they would need much time to organize, revise, adjust and mainly rehearse the content of their slideshows. It is worth mentioning that the content to be presented was preselected according to the learners' official syllabus and depended specifically on the project work at the end of each unit.

c. Administering the Post-test

The participants were exposed to the post-test three days after the treatment sessions and it was composed of four open-ended questions and the speaking performance assessment. The latter was used with the same standards mentioned before to serve the purpose of testing participants' oral skill and the improvement that they might have gained.

2.1.5.2. Data Collection Procedure

The process of collecting data went through two main stages: the initial stage which was completely devoted to the design of the experiment, and the implementation phase wherein the researchers put the work into practice to test the research hypothesis.

2.1.5. 2.1. Initial Stage

As a start, the researchers agreed on the topics which the students should deal with and which were parts of their official projects. They were about four, each of which tackling a different theme. In effect, a project is a situation of integration that should be carried out by groups of students in order to re-use the language that has been studied so far. It is then

presented orally to the class or submitted in written form to the teacher. The rationale behind such a choice is threefold:

- ✓ The project is part and parcel of the students' program, and hence, it is an achievement of all that has been covered in the unit such as grammar, comprehension, vocabulary, pronunciation, and fluency, all of which are elements of speaking that are targeted to be developed by the researchers.
- ✓ The themes are given to the students who do not need to look for others and which may be a pure waste of time and effort. Besides, they are congruent with the general and specific objectives set by the ministry of education and that need to be attained by the students.
- ✓ The projects are varied and contain a whole array of themes that can be very interesting to the students.

Respectively, the decision of opting for those projects was not haphazard; as a matter of fact, it took into account the following criteria:

- **Level of mastery:**

Regarding Krashen's (1985) comprehensible input hypothesis, the option for the official projects was well founded as the projects in question were chiefly designed according to the students' intermediate proficiency level.

- **Motivation and interest:**

Taking into account the affective filter hypothesis (Krashen, 1985), it was vital to choose motivating and interesting themes for learners presentations. That's why after noticing the students' reluctance in their first presentation, we decided to open other horizons by preparing a list of themes established by the students themselves and from which each group selected four subjects without altering the objectives and guidelines

of the study as well as the level of difficulty mentioned previously. It is noteworthy to mention that the modifications that were brought to the topics proved to be fruitful as the results obtained afterwards were satisfactory in terms of enthusiasm and eagerness.

2.1.5.2.2. Implementation Stage

The current experimental study was carried out in one month. On the whole, the researchers assigned four sessions of treatments with the interval of a week between each session. Interestingly, a week before the treatment, the participants took the pre-test which was meant to gauge students' overall speaking capacities. Subsequently, the test was used at the end of the treatment sessions as a post-test. Furthermore, the participants received feedback after each session to adjust the outcome of their presentations.

2.1.5.3. Data Analysis Procedures

All the gathered data was analysed in harmony with some reasonable starting points stemmed from the following research question.

- ✓ To what extent do PK presentations contribute in the improvement of Algerian Secondary School Students' speaking performance?

As it was reviewed in Chapter One, it has been pointed out that PK improves students' speaking and presentation skills (Nyugen, 2015). Basically, using PK has the domino effect on the participants; their oral performance was improved, which enhanced their presentations as well as their technological skills as they used computers for their slideshows. By this token, the research question sought to test the students' oral performance and to what extent can PK presentations be a catalyst to secondary school students' speaking skill.

As for data analysis which was collected from the pre-test, immediate assessment and the post-test, they were analyzed by means of quantitative measures. The researchers counted the scores obtained by the students in both the pre-test and post-test, then made a comparison of the results to see how well they were improving. As far as immediate assessment is concerned, it was analyzed according to the oral presentation checklist that contained four levels ranging from 0 to 4. Thus, the marks obtained were counted and compared as there were four treatments sessions. This enabled the researchers to make a clear distinction between each presentation and to determine students' progress in each.

Section Two: Data Analysis

This part is devoted to the analysis of the experimental research. The diagnostic assessment was meant to gauge the learners' level in speaking while the summative evaluation aimed at finding out the amount of improvement the students gained by comparing the two results obtained in the pre and post tests. As for the immediate assessment, it was followed by feedback to correct the students' deficiencies in all the aspects that constitute the speaking skill. To analyze the results, the researchers used some statistical measures as they relied on calculating the mark obtained for each student in the pre and post tests and for each group in the treatment sessions.

2.2.1. Pre-test Analysis

This test analysis was based on listening to the participants' answers and counting the final score of each of them. Accordingly, within all the aspects, which were at the number of six of the speaking performance assessment, there were five sub-sections corresponding to the performance given by each student and the corresponding score on the left (e.g. Control of the grammar is good and able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy = 3). Basically, as mentioned before, there were six levels to be reached ranging

from 1 to 5 each. The final score of each participant was out of thirty (30). Thus, the percentages were established to see the level of each student as well as the global percentage of all the participants.

Table 2.2

Students' Speaking Performance Assessment in Pre-test

Participants	Total score	Percentage
Participant 1	13	43.33 %
Participant 2	8	26.66 %
Participant 3	6	20 %
Participant 4	7	23.33 %
Participant 5	10	33.33 %
Participant 6	7	23.33 %
Participant 7	8	26.66%
Participant 8	14	46.66 %
Participant 9	14	46.66 %
Participant 10	15	50. %
Participant 11	15	50. %
Participant 12	17	56.66 %
Participant 13	15	50 %
Participant 14	8	26.66 %
Participant 15	12	40 %
Participant 16	18	60.66 %
Participant 17	14	46.66 %
Participant 18	14	46.66 %
participant 19	8	26.66 %
participant 20	8	26.66 %
Total scores	231	38.52 %

The results of the pre-test show a performance that is below the average. It also denotes that the majority of the students performed below par. However, two of these participants scored above the average, one of whom reached eighteen marked by learner 16 and representing 60.66 %. Just slightly under, participant 12 got 17 representing 56.66 %. Three others reached 15 marked by participants 10, 11 and 13 and representing 50 %. The lowest score is marked by participant 3, representing 20 %. This was presumably

predictable by the researchers who intended to give constructive feedback in order to fill the students' gaps and guide them in the right direction in the study.

2.2.2. Learners' Treatment Analysis

The second stage after administering the pre-test was the treatment wherein the students were invited to perform their first PK presentations. The latter were followed by feedback given according to an oral presentation checklist which represented the areas that feedback should cover and which contained two parts: content, which was sub-divided into five sub-divisions and delivery which was composed of ten, each of which containing four levels with scores ranging from 0 to 3. It is important to note that when PK presentations were launched, the first themes that students performed were mandatory. However, due to the students' uneasiness in dealing with those topics and in order to prod the learners' more, the researchers decided to give them more freedom in the choice of the subjects.

2.2.1. First Performance Analysis

The first PK presentations that were performed by the participants were held on April 26th, 2021 and were characterized by a unified theme about *Lifestyle*. The groups took turns to perform for 6 minutes and 40 seconds each. It was the first students' experience with PK which made it somehow tough for them to get on the right feet. Oftentimes, learners stumbled and could not catch up with the slideshows pace as the latter were automated. At other times, participants would finish their slide content before it switched to the next one and thus, remained silent while waiting for the change to take place. Furthermore, the researchers noticed the participants' indisposition vis-a-vis this topic, and thus, consulted them about changing the future ones. The learners' answers were unanimously in favour of that and even expressed their desire to have more choice as for the upcoming presentations. The students' presentations were rated in the following table:

Table 2.3

Students' Presentations Results in Session One

Group number	Total score	Percentage
Group One	8	17.77 %
Group Two	13	28.88 %
Group Three	16	35.55 %
Group Four	4	08.88 %
Group Five	15	33.33 %
Total	11.20	24.88 %

The results obtained from the analysis of the learners' presentations were based on counting the scores taken in each level in both sections namely: content and *delivery* in order to get a final mark out of 45 which is the total number of all the levels proposed in the Oral Presentation Checklist. The table above shows the scores reached as well as the percentage for each group and which were in general poor. Group 3 got 16 as the best score representing 35.55 %. The lowest percentage was attributed to Group 4 that got 4 representing 08.88. Arguably, the first PK presentations of the first session were poor and quite disparate among the four groups. It is noteworthy to mention that the low scores that the groups obtained were mainly due to the following causes:

- ✓ Much stress was sensed as PK presentation was new to the students.
- ✓ Some students were not well prepared thinking that presenting five slides was an easy task to do.
- ✓ Time constraint was a real obstacle to the students mainly that the slides were automated; they sometimes end up the content of the slide earlier whereas other times, it was quite the opposite.
- ✓ More often than not, students could hardly remember what to say and sometimes going so far as to forget the whole content of some slides because of a lack of rehearsal.

- ✓ High school students lack enormously opportunities for speaking, and thus, find it tough to do so when engaged in a presentation.
- ✓ The students' proficiency level (intermediate) was a real impediment to some learners, mainly slow learners who do not generally possess a satisfactory stock of vocabulary items, ignore grammatical rules, lack fluency and suffer from a flawed pronunciation.

2.2.2.2. Second Performance Analysis

In this session, which was held a week after the first, students were invited to perform their second PK presentations. They were given more freedom in the choice of the themes. A whole array of subjects have been discussed and listed with the learners prior to starting this second sitting. Precisely, there were topics like fashion, clothes, famous places, pollution, etc. The following table summarizes the students' performance.

Table 2.4

Students' Presentations Results in Session Two

Group number	Total score	Percentage
Group One	12	26.66 %
Group Two	22	48.88 %
Group Three	23	51.11 %
Group Four	10	22.22 %
Group Five	22	48.88 %
Total	17.8	39.55 %

The results show clearly that there is an improvement in the learners' presentations. This is mainly due to the fact that students got accustomed to using PK and to a better preparation, i.e., more rehearsal of the content and thus, more mastery in managing automated slides. Moreover, the researchers assume that feedback has put the students on the right track and helped them hone their ideas according to the principles underlying PK

presentations. Furthermore, the researchers noticed that there was more enthusiasm and assume that it was the result of the themes that were selected by the participants themselves. The five groups, as it appears in the table have progressed with different rates. Surprisingly, group 2 is the one that improved most representing 20% whereas group 1 is the one that improved least.

2.2.2.3. Third Performance Analysis

The assessment of this session did not differ from the two previous ones. By then, the learners have understood well the ins and outs of the task and there was no need to clarify any point more. This PK presentation was characterized by much liveliness and eagerness in spite of the fact that there were some students who were still reluctant and behaved with much slackness to the task. Thus, the researchers had to recourse to some encouragements in order to remedy to the situation. The table that follows summarises the learners' performance:

Table 2.5

Students' Presentations Results in Session three

Group number	Total score	Percentage
Group One	14	31.11 %
Group Two	24	53.33 %
Group Three	23	51.11 %
Group Four	14	31.11 %
Group Five	25	55.55 %
Total	20	44.44 %

The table above shows that except for group three which remained static with the same average of 51.11 %, the remaining four groups continue their ascension with varying rates in spite of the fact that the improvement margin is less than in the previous presentations. Three of the five groups exceeded the average whereas the remaining two are still under.

Group five got the best average with 55.55 % whereas group one is still the least efficient one.

2.2.2.4. Fourth Performance Analysis

This last session was a copycat of the preceding ones in terms of the students' presentations as the themes were, once again, multifarious among the five groups. The main feature was always the students' keenness and devotion. The majority of them start to show real speaking improvement as shown in the following table:

Table 2.6

Students' Presentations Results in Session four

Group number	Total score	Percentage
Group One	17	37.77 %
Group Two	30	66.66 %
Group Three	31	68.88 %
Group Four	18	40 %
Group Five	29	64.44 %
Total	25	55.55 %

The above table indicates, to some extent, a successful performance of PK presentations by the students. The results show an increase of the overall mean in speaking among all the groups, reaching 68.88 % by group three. The lowest average was obtained by group one, representing 37.77 %. The researchers assume that this improvement was due to the researchers' feedback and learners' mastery to a certain extent of PK.

2.2.3. Comparison of Improvement Gained from the Four Sessions

The table below demonstrates the mean of the progress gained from each session of the treatment.

Table 2.7

Comparison of the Groups' Improvement Results of the Four Sessions

Sessions	Session 1	Session 2	Session 3	Session 4	Variance between session 1 and 2	Variance between session 2 and 3	Variance between session 3 and 4
Improvement mean	11.20	17.8	20	25	+ 6.6	+ 2.2	+ 5
Total improvement mean					13.8		

After the fourth treatment sessions, participants continued their progress in speaking with a better mean after each treatment reaching 25 % in the last session after having been 11.20 % in the first one. The researchers assume that the progress of the learners which reached a total of 13.8 is mainly due to the confidence they have gained throughout the PK presentations and the regular constructive feedback given by the researchers. The overall improvement marked from the four sessions relatively signals the participants' success in their oral performance with varying rates in the five speaking components when using PK presentations.

2.2.4. Post-test Analysis

The learners were introduced to an identical test (Speaking Performance Assessment) as in the pre-test. Therefore, the same procedure was followed to count their scores. However, the participants were assigned with different questions which were at the number of four.

Table 2.8

Students' Speaking Performance Assessment in Post-test

Participants	Total score	Percentage
Participant 1	18	60 %
Participant 2	8	26.66 %
Participant 3	6	20 %
Participant 4	10	33.33 %
Participant 5	12	40 %
Participant 6	10	20 %
Participant 7	11	36.66 %
Participant 8	22	73.33 %
Participant 9	19	63.33 %
Participant 10	19	63.33 %
Participant 11	20	66.66 %
Participant 12	21	70 %
Participant 13	20	66.66 %
Participant 14	10	33.33 %
Participant 15	14	46.66 %
Participant 16	22	73.33 %
Participant 17	14	46.66 %
Participant 18	20	66.66 %
Participant 19	10	33.33 %
Participant 20	11	36.66 %
Total scores	297	48.82 %

The scores obtained from the post-test indicate a notable progress in the participants' performance. All of them showed an improvement which is relatively different from one student to another. Two students did very well and got the same scores (*participants 8, 16*). Their average increased to reach a very good one representing 73.33 %. Just below this percentage was the one of (*participant 12*) with a total score of 21 representing 70 %. (*Participants 11, 13, 18*) got the score of 20. It increased to be above the average, representing 66.66 % whereas two other participants (9, 10) were slightly under representing 63.33 %. Student 1 was also above the average to reach 60 %. The remaining 9 participants were under the average because their improvement was slower. The researchers assume that, to a certain degree, the successful performance is due to the

learners' familiarity of the PK presentation technique and the participants' devotion and enthusiasm all along the experimental study.

3.2.5. Comparison between Learners' Pre-test and Post-test Performance

In order to compare the results of the learners before and after receiving the treatment, it necessitated counting the variance among the participants' scores at the two stages of assessment. Consequently, for each student, the score obtained in the pre-test was subtracted from that of the post-test; the result (or the variance) was noted down.

Table 2.9

Comparison between the Learners' Pre-test and Post-test Performance

Participants	Pre-test	Post-test	Variance	Rate of improvement	Remark
Participant 1	13	18	+ 5	16.66 %	Improved
Participant 2	8	8	+ 0	0 %	Constant
Participant 3	6	6	+ 0	0 %	Constant
Participant 4	7	10	+ 3	10 %	Improved
Participant 5	10	12	+ 2	6.66 %	Improved
Participant 6	7	10	+ 3	10 %	Improved
Participant 7	8	11	+ 3	10 %	Improved
Participant 8	14	22	+ 8	26.66 %	Improved
Participant 9	14	19	+ 5	16.66 %	Improved
Participant 10	15	19	+ 4	13.33 %	Improved
Participant 11	15	20	+ 5	16.66 %	Improved
Participant 12	17	21	+ 4	13.33 %	Improved
Participant 13	15	20	+ 5	16.66 %	Improved
Participant 14	8	10	+ 2	6.66 %	Improved
Participant 15	12	14	+ 2	6.66 %	Improved
Participant 16	18	22	+ 4	13.33 %	Improved
Participant 17	14	14	+ 0	00 %	Constant
Participant 18	14	20	+ 6	20 %	Improved
Participant 19	8	10	+ 2	6.66 %	Improved
Participant 20	8	11	+3	10 %	Improved
Total	231	297	+ 66		
Mean	38.52	48.82	10.3		

The table above points out the results attained in both the pre-test and post-test assessment showing the variance for each student. On the basis of the variance, it seems that the participants were relatively successful in showing progress in speaking by using

PK presentations after the treatment sessions. The highest variance is marked by 8points and indicates a positive change whereas the lowest variance represents 0point which does not signal any development.

Seventeen subjects from the total number show improvement whereas the 3 remaining participants were constant and did not improve at all. Therefore, the researchers concluded that the technique was relatively effective.

Section Three: Data Interpretation

This section presents a very important part of the research work which is about interpretations and discussions of the data collected by means of the research tools. Basically, it seeks to answer the research question and makes an analogy of the results obtained from previous studies. The research question is purposefully repeated in order to serve as an aide memoire and which the current study sought to answer:

- To what extent do PK presentations contribute in the improvement of Algerian Secondary School Students' speaking performance?

2.3.1. PK Presentations and the Improvement of Speaking

The results which were obtained from the analysis revealed that there was, to a certain extent, an improvement in the students' speaking. Nevertheless, the amount of progress was not the same in the four sessions of the students' presentations together with the five speaking components. This was mainly due to the following causes:

- The lack of preparation in the students' first performance as PK technique was new for them.
- The stressful state under which they performed and thus proved to be a real obstacle to all of them.

- The difference in the participants' proficiency level justified well the varying margins of improvement.

As it was mentioned in Data Analysis Section, the first PK performance was really different because the learners did not fully grasp the technique even if it has been demonstrated by the researchers beforehand. The students showed much reticence and slackness and even forgetfulness when dealing with the slideshows. The percentage recorded is self-evident.

However, in their second PK presentations, participants were more engaged and showed more eagerness in their performance. The results obtained in their second presentations speak for themselves as they were an evidence of the students' enhancement reaching 39.55 % after having been 24.88 in the first performance.

In their third performance, the learners continued their ascent by reaching a percentage of 44.44 %. True enough that the improvement margin was less than in the second session, nevertheless, the students still showed an ascending tendency in their attitude towards the use of PK.

The last session was also characterized by more progress and revealed a better percentage in comparison to the three preceding ones and even reaching 55.10 %,

All in all, the results in the four sessions show clearly amelioration in the participants' performance reaching 51.11 in the post-test. Sixteen students improved in their oral skill while only three were constant at the end of the experiment.

To put it in a nutshell, the findings obtained in the overall research are congruent with previous studies supporting PK presentations in improving students' speaking abilities. They go together with the findings of comparable and recent studies reviewed in the

literature mainly (Tomsett & Shaw, 2014; Arniatika, 2017; Angelina, 2019; Solmaz, 2019; Rokhaniyah, 2019) that revealed that a close connection between PK format and the improvement in speaking. Likewise, the findings of the current investigation reported that PK and oral performance are intertwined and that using the technique helps in improving EFL learners' oral performance.

2.3.2. Limitations of the Study

It is for sure that no study is completely flawless or inclusive of all aspects. Any study has limitations due to multiple hurdles that cropped up along with this research. This resulted in a number of limitations that were worth mentioning here:

- The unavailability of resources in the area of research concerning the topic of PK which is considered as a primary variable in the theoretical section.
- The study was conducted in a very sensitive time during the terrible period of the pandemics covid -19 which made the number of the sample group under study limited to only 20 participants as dealing with the same study in a larger sample could have generated more accurate results.
- Some shy and reluctant students showed their non- cooperation because they had to present orally in front of their classmates and researchers which justified their bad preparations and hence presentations. Chief amongst the other fetters that can be added to the previous ones and that impacted the methodology of our study was the unlikeable stress as well as anxiety of most students with respect to a small minority due to the novelty of this technique, PK, as it was aforementioned.

2.3.3. Recommendations

In the light of the results reviewed throughout this study, the researchers recommend the following:

a. Recommendations to Teachers

- Teachers should provide a motivating and lively atmosphere for their students language classrooms by integrating and getting access to the new technological techniques such as PK presentations, podcasts, video conferencing, video and speech recognition software especially in presenting their projects.
- Teachers had better divide their activities in Technology- Based Education into two major tasks: on the one hand planning and providing electronic content for learners, and on the other hand creating good relations among teachers and students.
- Teachers should replace conventional methods such as ‘chalk and talk’ by up-to-date ones and bring more variety as to their techniques in teaching speaking skills through authentic situations of communication.
- Teachers should devote more time for teaching speaking skills using Information Communication Technologies (ICT’s) as a catalyst in their EFL classes in order to facilitate the flow of the lessons especially speaking as being a crucial part of second language acquisition mainly that those tools provide enjoyable learning and motivation.
- Teachers should encourage those shy and reluctant students by devoting more time for them and engaging them in role play activities, pair work and group work to build up their self-confidence and promote their autonomy.

b. Recommendations to Students

- Students should plan and invest their time preparing themselves thoroughly at home and work seriously to upgrade their level in speaking and perfect their slides when using PK in their presentations of projects.
- Speaking is ubiquitous in everyday life. That’s why students must give more importance to this skill by improving their vocabulary and pronunciation through

reading books, listening to native speakers and practicing the target language in authentic situations in their daily life.

- Students should also have positive attitudes towards ICT's so as to better plan for this digital world and palliate their difficulties in speaking.
- Students should look for true speaking opportunities to develop their oral performance and to overcome their fear and anxiety because speaking is not an easy skill to acquire as it requires much perseverance, time, effort and abnegation.

2.3.4. Implications for Future Research

Our study clears up the impact of using PK presentations in enhancing EFL learners' level in speaking performance; hence, the following issues are of salient and valuable importance to address in the future:

- PK should be part and parcel of the official syllabus to promote the learners' speaking skill.
- More research needs to be conducted about the frame work of PK presentations.
- More research on how PK may improve the receptive skills such as reading and writing should be undertaken in Algeria.
- More research can be tackled about the role of PK in improving Students' capacities in using CALL material.
- Investigating the role of PK presentations in improving oral performance for university students.

Conclusion

This section threw light upon the general interpretations reported from the findings of the experimental research. In fact, the results showed that using PK format is an effective technique in enhancing Secondary School students' oral performance. Moreover, there is

enough evidence, as indicated in the comparison made between the results in the pre and post-tests, to say that there was a strong correlation between the use of this method and the mastery of the speaking components mentioned in the speaking section which are grammar, fluency, pronunciation, comprehension and vocabulary. Nonetheless, some students outperformed and scored better than others, while three of them did not show any positive change in their speaking. Therefore, this evidence revealed that these participants belong to a class of mixed abilities. Finally, this section ended up with the limitations of the study and some pedagogical recommendations for other researchers to follow.

General Conclusion

Speaking is one of the most important four language skills which students have to master and come to grips with. This research empirically investigated the value of using PK presentations in developing oral performance by students. Basically, it has espoused a quasi-modal of the experimental design. It fundamentally aspired to test students' improvement in speaking after their presentations which were followed by feedback given by the researchers in order to gear participants' performances in the right direction. Moreover, a pre-test and a post-test were administered at the beginning and at the end of the experiment to gauge the degree of progress that secondary school learners have achieved.

The study was made up of two main chapters: one devoted to the theoretical part while, the second covered up the practical framework of the research. Concerning the theoretical part, the study started with a general review of the literature related to the research topic in two chapters. The first chapter presented an overview of speaking and the central ingredients enabling students to handle it.

As far as the second chapter is concerned, it explored PK presentation in boosting EFL students' oral performance. Firstly, it defined what PK was and traced back the different reasons of the introduction of such a format. Later, it showed up the principles underlying the technique and highlighted its different advantages.

Correspondingly, the last chapter detailed the practical side of the study. It included three sections. The first section covered the methodological aspect and discussed the nature of the study along with the procedures which were followed in data gathering. The second section of the chapter presented a deep analysis of all the data that were collected. As for

the third section it stated the results which were obtained through interpretations and mentioned briefly the findings obtained from other similar researches.

The findings reveal that the use of PK presentations is rather efficient in enhancing speaking as a real correlation is marked between the two variables. The scores obtained from the pre-test and the post-test analyses show clearly the progress made by the students in their oral performances. Participants' scored a percentage of 39.81 % in the diagnostic assessment and attained 51.11 in the summative assessment. In addition to this, they showed improvement in their treatment when presenting in groups in the four sessions, i.e., the percentages have steadily increased going as follows: 24.88 % in the first session, 39.55 % in the second session, 44.44 in the third session, and 55.10 % in the fourth session. As a matter of course, the research hypothesis is confirmed.

References

- Angelina, P. (2019). Improving Indonesian EFL students' speaking skill through Pecha Kucha. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 22(1), 86-97.
- Arniatika, S. (2017). *Improving Speaking Performance Through Pecha Kucha Presentation Method Among The Tenth Graders of SMA Muhammadiyah Pekalongan East Lampung* (Doctoral dissertation, IAIN Metro).
- Artyushina, G., Sheypak, O., & Khovrin, A. (2011, April). Developing student presentation skills at the English language classes through pechakucha. In *2011 IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference (EDUCON)* (pp. 91-93). IEEE.
- Azieb, S. (2021). The critical period hypothesis in second language acquisition: A review of the literature. *iJARS International Journal Of Humanities and Social Studies*, 8(4), 20. DOI:10.22259/2694-6296.0804001
- Bailey, K. M. (2006). Issues in teaching speaking skills to adult ESOL learners. *Review of adult learning and literacy*, 6, 113-164.
- Bailey, K. M., & Nunan, D. (2005). *Practical English language teaching: speaking*.
- Bataineh, K. B., & Tasnimi, M. Available at: www.express-journal.com.
- Beyer, A. M. (2011). Improving student presentations: Pecha Kucha and just plain PowerPoint. *Teaching of Psychology*, 38(2), 122-126.
- Brown, A. L., & Campione, J. C. (1994). *Guided discovery in a community of learners*. The MIT Press.

- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1982). *Teaching the spoken Language: An Approach based on the analysis of conversational English.*
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Teaching*, Englewood Cliff.
- Burns, A., & Joyce, H. (1997). *Focus on Speaking*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia 2109.
- Byram, M., Nichols, A., & Stevens, D. (Eds.). (2001). *Developing intercultural competence in practice* (Vol. 1). Multilingual Matters.
- Cameron, K. (Ed.). (1989). *Computer assisted language learning: Program structure and principles*. Intellect Books.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Carrasquillo, A. L. (2013). *Teaching English as a second language: A resource guide*. Routledge.
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1995). Grammar and the spoken language. *Applied linguistics*, 16(2), 141-158.
- Christianson, M., & Payne, S. (2011). Helping students develop skills for better presentations: Using the 20x20 format for presentation training. *Language Research Bulletin*, 26, 1-15.
- Coskun, A. (2017). The Effect of pecha kucha presentations on students' English public speaking anxiety. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 19, 11-22.

Definition of PK from

<http://www.pechakucha.com/about>

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Eves, R. L., & Davis, L. E. (2008). Death by PowerPoint?. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 37(5), 8.

Fillmore, C. J. (1979). On Fluency. In Fillmore, C. J., Kempler, D., & Wang, W. S. J. (Eds.), *Individual Differences in Language Ability and Language Behavior* (203-228).

New York: Academic Press.

Florez, M. C. (1999). Improving adult English language learners' speaking skills.

Gerard, A., & Goldstein, B. (2005). *Going visual: Using images to enhance productivity, decision-making and profits*. John Wiley & Sons.

Goh, C. C., & Burns, A. (2012). *Teaching speaking: A holistic approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Harris, David. 1974. *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: Mc. Graw. Hill Book Company.

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English: new edition*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

H. Douglas Brown, *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (4th Edition)*, (New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 2000), p. 262.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. *sociolinguistics*, 269293, 269-293.

- Leong, L. M., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). An Analysis of Factors Influencing Learners' English Speaking Skill.
- Levin, M. A., & Peterson, L. T. (2013). Use of Pecha Kucha in marketing students' presentations. *Marketing Education Review*, 23(1), 59-64.
- Lewis, M. (2000). Language in the lexical approach. In Teaching Collocation: Further Developments In The Lexical Approach, Michael Lewis (ed.).
- Mendelsohn, D. J., & Rubin, J. (1995). *A guide for the teaching of second language listening*. San Diego, CA: Dominic Press.
- Murugaiah, P. (2016). Pecha Kucha style PowerPoint presentation: An innovative CALL approach to developing oral presentation skills of tertiary students. *Teaching english with technology*, 16(1), 88-104.
- Nguyen, T. (2015). The effectiveness of online learning: Beyond no significant difference and future horizons. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 11(2), 309-319.
- Nuarsih, R. U. (2018). Simulation Strategy and Oral Skill: A Classroom Action Research at SMPN 1 Citeureup. *JET (Journal of English Teaching)*, 4(2), 132-142.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D., & David, N. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Paivio, A. (1971). *Imagery and verbal processes*. New York, NY.

- Pratama, Y., & Awaliyah, Y. (2015). Teacher's Strategies in Teaching Speaking to Young Learners. *English Journal of Ibnu Khaldun university*, 17(2).
- Reynolds, G. (2011). *Presentation Zen: Simple ideas on presentation design and delivery*. New Riders.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rokhaniyah, H. (2019). Exploring Pecha Kucha in EFL learners' speaking fluency. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 9(2), 146-162.
- Solmaz, O. (2019). Developing EFL Learners' Speaking and Oral Presentation Skills through Pecha Kucha Presentation Technique. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(4), 542-565.
- Susikaran, R. (2012). The role of a teacher in improving speaking skills through classroom activities.
- Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Longman.
- Thornbury, S. (2006). *How to teach vocabulary*. Pearson Education India.
- Tomsett, P. M., & Shaw, M. R. (2014). Creative classroom experience using pechakucha to encourage ESL use in undergraduate business courses: A pilot study. *International Multilingual Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(2), 89-108.

- Trask, R. (1996). *A Dictionary of Phonetics and Phonology*. London: Routledge.
- Tuan, V. V. (2017). Communicative Competence of the Fourth Year Students: Basis for Proposed English Language Program. *English Language Teaching*, 10(7), 104-122.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Ernst Klett Sprache
- Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford university press.

Appendices

Appendix A: The Assessment of Speaking Performance

Assessed elements	Levels	Characteristics of assessed elements
Grammar	1	Errors in grammar are frequent, but speaker still can be understood.
	2	Could usually handle the elementary constructions quite accurately, but does not have thorough or confident control of the grammar.
	3	Control of the grammar is good and able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy.
	4	Control of the grammar is good and able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy.
	5	Equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.
Vocabulary	1	Speaking vocabulary is inadequate to express anything.
	2	Speaking vocabulary is sufficient to express simply with some circumlocutions.
	3	Speaking vocabulary is broad enough and able to speak the language with sufficient vocabulary.
	4	Speaking vocabulary is in a high degree of precision and could understand also participate in any conversation.
	5	Speech on all levels is fully accepted by educated native speakers in all its features.
Comprehension	1	Could understand the simple questions and statements if delivered with slowed speech, repetition, or paraphrase.
	2	Could get the gist for most conversations of non-technical subjects (topics that require no specialized knowledge).
	3	Comprehension is quite complete at a normal rate of speech.
	4	Could understand any conversation within the range of speaker's experience
	5	Equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.
Fluency	1	No specific fluency description.
	2	Could handle with confidence but not with facility most social situations
	3	Could discuss particular interests of competence with reasonable words.
	4	Able to use language fluently on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs and could participate in any conversation with a high degree of fluency.
	5	Has complete fluency in the language and accepted by educated native speaker.
Pronunciation	1	Errors in pronunciation are frequent but still could be understood.
	2	Accent is intelligible though quite faulty.
	3	Errors in pronunciation are rare, never interfere with understanding and the accent may be obviously foreign.
	4	Errors in pronunciation are quite rare.
	5	Equivalent to and fully accepted by educated native speaker.
Task	1	Could ask and answer the questions topic which is familiar to the speaker.
	2	Able to satisfy routine social demands and work requirements.
	3	Could participate effectively in most formal and informal conversation on practical, social, and professional topics.
	4	Could handle informal interpreting from and into language.
	5	Speaking proficiency equivalent to that of educated native speaker.

Source: H. Douglas Brown, *Teaching by Principle an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy Second Edition*, (New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 2001), P. 406-407.

Appendix B

Students' Speaking Performance Assessment in Pre-test

Rater: Researchers

Participants	Aspect						Total score
	Grammar	Vocabulary	Comprehension	Fluency	Pronunciation	Task	
Participant 1	2	2	3	2	2	2	13
Participant 2	2	2	1	1	1	1	8
Participant 3	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Participant 4	1	1	2	1	1	1	7
Participant 5	2	2	1	2	2	1	10
Participant 6	1	1	1	1	1	2	7
Participant 7	2	1	2	1	1	1	8
Participant 8	2	2	3	2	2	3	14
Participant 9	2	2	3	2	2	3	14
Participant 10	2	3	3	2	2	3	15
Participant 11	2	3	3	2	2	3	15
Participant 12	2	3	4	2	2	4	17
Participant 13	2	3	3	2	2	3	15
Participant 14	1	1	2	1	1	2	8
Participant 15	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
Participant 16	2	2	4	3	3	4	18
Participant 17	2	2	3	2	3	2	14
Participant 18	2	2	3	2	2	3	14
Participant 19	1	1	2	1	1	2	8
Participant 20	1	1	2	1	1	2	8

Appendix C

Questions for Students in the pre-test Speaking Performance Assessment

Answer the following questions:

Q1: Introduce yourself.

Q2: Who was your teacher of English last year?

Q3: How long have you been studying English?

Q4: What are the positive and the negative aspects of technology?

Appendix D

Treatment 1

Oral Presentation Checklist and Scores

Observer: The researchers.

Date: April 26th, 2021

Treatment: 1

Group: 1

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.	0				4
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.		1			
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.		1			
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.		1			
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.		1			
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.	0				4
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.	0				
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.		1			
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.	0				
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.	0				
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.		1			
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.	0				
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.		1			
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well	0				
Total						8

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: April 26th, 2021

Treatment: 1

Group: 2

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.		1			5
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.		1			
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.		1			
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.		1			
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.		1			
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.	0				8
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.	0				
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.		1			
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.		1			
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.		1			
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.		1			
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.		1			
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.		1			
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well		1			
Total						13

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: April 26th, 2021

Treatment: 1

Group: 3

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.		1			7
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.		1			
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.			2		
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.			2		
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.		1			
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.		1			9
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.		1			
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.		1			
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.	0				
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.		1			
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.		1			
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.		1			
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well		1			
Total						16

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: April 26th, 2021

Treatment: 1

Group: 4

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.	0				1
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.	0				
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.		1			
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.	0				
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.	0				
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.	0				3
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.	0				
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.	0				
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.	0				
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.	0				
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.		1			
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.	0				
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.	0				
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well		1			
Total						4

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: April 26th, 2021

Treatment: 1

Group: 5

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.		1			4
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.		1			
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.		1			
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.	0				
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.		1			
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.		1			10
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.		1			
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.		1			
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.		1			
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.			2		
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.		1			
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.		1			
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well		1			
Total						15

Appendix E

Treatment 2

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 4th, 2021

Treatment: 2

Group: 1

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.		1		5	
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.		1			
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.		1			
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.		1			
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.		1			
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.		1		7	
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.		1			
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.	0				
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.	0				
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.		1			
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.	0				
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.		1			
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well		1			
Total					12	

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 4th, 2021

Treatment: 2

Group: 2

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.			2		8
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.		1			
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.			2		
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.		1			
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.			2		
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.		1			14
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.		1			
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.		1			
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.		1			
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.		1			
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.			2		
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.			2		
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.			2		
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well			2		
Total						22

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 4th, 2021

Treatment: 2

Group: 3

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.		1			9
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.			2		
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.			2		
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.			2		
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.			2		
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.		1			14
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.			2		
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.		1			
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.		1			
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.			2		
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.		1			
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.			2		
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well			2		
Total						23

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 4th, 2021

Treatment: 2

Group: 4

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.		1			5
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.		1			
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.		1			
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.		1			
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.		1			
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.		1			5
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.	0				
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.	0				
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.	0				
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.	0				
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.		1			
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.		1			
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.		1			
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well	0				
Total						10

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 4th, 2021

Treatment: 2

Group: 5

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.		1			9
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.			2		
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.			2		
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.			2		
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.			2		
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.		1			13
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.			2		
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.			2		
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.		1			
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.		1			
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.		1			
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.			2		
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well		1			
Total						22

Appendix F

Treatment 3

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 11th, 2021

Treatment: 3

Group: 1

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.		1			5
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.		1			
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.		1			
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.		1			
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.		1			
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.		1			9
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.		1			
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.		1			
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.	0				
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.		1			
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.		1			
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.		1			
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well		1			
Total						14

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 9th, 2021

Treatment: 3

Group: 2

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.		1			8
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.			2		
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.			2		
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.		1			
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.			2		
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.		1			16
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.			2		
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.			2		
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.		1			
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.			2		
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.			2		
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.			2		
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.			2		
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well		1			
Total						24

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 9th, 2021

Treatment: 3

Group: 3

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.		1			7
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.			2		
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.		1			
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.		1			
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.			2		
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.			2		16
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.		1			
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.			2		
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.			2		
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.			2		
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.			2		
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.			2		
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well		1			
Total						23

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 9th, 2021

Treatment: 3

Group: 4

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.		1			5
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.		1			
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.		1			
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.		1			
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.		1			
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.		1			9
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.	0				
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.	0				
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.		1			
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.		1			
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.		1			
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.			2		
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well		1			
Total						14

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 9th, 2021

Treatment: 3

Group: 5

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.			2		
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.		1			
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.			2		
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.			2		
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.			2		9
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.			2		17
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.			2		
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.			2		
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.			2		
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.			2		
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.			2		
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.			2		
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well		1			
Total						25

Appendix G

Treatment 4

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 17th, 2021*

Treatment: 4

Group: 1

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.		1			5
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.		1			
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.		1			
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.		1			
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.		1			
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.		1			12
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.		1			
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.			2		
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.		1			
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.		1			
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.		1			
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.			2		
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well		1			
Total						17

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 17th, 2021

Treatment: 4

Group: 2

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.			2		10
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.			2		
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.			2		
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.			2		
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.			2		
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.			2		20
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.			2		
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.			2		
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.			2		
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.			2		
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.			2		
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.			2		
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.				3	
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well			2		
Total						30

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 17th, 2021

Treatment: 4

Group: 3

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.			2		10
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.			2		
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.			2		
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.			2		
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.			2		
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.			2		21
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.			2		
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.			2		
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.			2		
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.			2		
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.			2		
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.			2		
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.				3	
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well			2		
Total						31

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 17th, 2021

Treatment: 4

Group: 4

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.		1			5
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.		1			
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.		1			
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.		1			
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.		1			
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.		1			13
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.		1			
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.		1			
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.		1			
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.			2		
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.		1			
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.			2		
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.			2		
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well		1			
Total						18

Oral Presentation Checklist

Observer: The researchers.

Date: May 17th, 2021

Treatment: 4

Group: 5

No	Aspect	Score				Total
		0	1	2	3	
Content						
1	The objective of the presentation was accomplished.			2		11
2	The introduction was lively and got the attention.				3	
3	The main idea or point was clearly stated at the beginning.			2		
4	The supporting points were clearly expressed and supported well by fact/ arguments.			2		
5	The conclusion restated the main idea or purpose.			2		
Delivery						
6	The speakers used gestures and body language well.		1			18
7	The speakers maintained body language with the audience.		1			
8	The speakers' language was natural and fluent.			2		
9	The speakers' volume of speech was appropriate.			2		
10	The speakers' rate of speech was appropriate.			2		
11	The speakers' pronunciation was clear and comprehensible.			2		
12	The speakers' grammar was correct and did not prevent understanding.			2		
13	The speakers used visual aids, handouts, etc. Effectively.			2		
14	The speakers showed enthusiasm and interest.			2		
15	The speakers responded to audience questions well			2		
Total						29

Appendix H

Students' Speaking Performance Assessment in Post-test Rater: Researchers

Participants	Aspect						Total score
	Grammar	Vocabulary	Comprehension	Fluency	Pronunciation	Task	
Participant 1	3	3	4	2	3	3	18
Participant 2	1	2	1	1	1	1	8
Participant 3	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Participant 4	2	1	3	1	1	2	10
Participant 5	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
Participant 6	2	2	2	1	1	2	10
Participant 7	2	2	3	1	1	2	11
Participant 8	3	4	4	3	4	4	22
Participant 9	3	3	3	3	3	4	19
Participant 10	3	3	4	3	3	3	19
Participant 11	3	3	4	3	3	4	20
Participant 12	4	3	4	3	3	4	21
Participant 13	3	3	4	3	3	4	20
Participant 14	1	2	3	1	1	2	10
Participant 15	2	3	2	2	2	3	14
Participant 16	3	4	4	3	4	4	22
Participant 17	2	2	3	2	3	2	14
Participant 18	3	3	4	3	3	4	20
Participant 19	1	2	3	1	1	2	10
Participant 20	2	2	3	1	1	2	11

Appendix I

Questions for Students in the post-test Speaking Performance Assessment

Answer the following questions:

Q1: Who is your best friend? Describe her/ him.

Q2: What is your favourite dish? Why ?

Q3 :Can you live without your mobile ? Why, why not ?

Q4 : You are about to finish your school-year, where will you spend your holidays ?

Résumé

La présente étude a essentiellement pour objectif d'explorer la technique Pecha Kucha sur l'amélioration du parlé des élèves en Anglais à travers l'utilisation de la technique Pecha Kucha. Par conséquent, on émet l'hypothèse que si les enseignants l'intègre dans leurs classes, l'expression orale des apprenants de l'Anglais comme langue étrangère sera développée. Pratiquement, l'étude a adopté un modèle de recherche quasi-expérimental basé sur un groupe de 20 élèves du secondaire au lycée Francis Ahmed de Sidi-Abdelaziz à Jijel à travers le modèle d'évaluation de la performance orale (H. Douglas Brown, 2001). Par conséquent, les participants ont été exposés à un pré et post test pour évaluer le degré de leur maîtrise de l'expression orale et de leur développement. Toutefois, pour tester leur progrès, il fallait administrer une évaluation immédiate à la fin de chaque session. Les résultats ont montré que 17 apprenants ont développé leurs capacités de l'expression orale est qui était illustré par une augmentation dans la moyenne des apprenants. Donc, l'hypothèse de recherche a été confirmée. Compte tenu de ces résultats, il est suggéré aux enseignants d'Anglais comme langue étrangère d'adopter la technique PK dans leurs classes.

Mots clés : Apprenants Algériens EFL, PK, Performance Orale.

ملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى اكتشاف مدى فعالية تقنية "البيتشاكوتشا" في تطوير الجانب الشفوي للتلاميذ بالجزائر. وبغرض اختبار ذلك افترضنا انه إذا تم دمج التقنية من طرف أساتذة اللغة الانكليزية فانه سيتم تطوير الجانب الشفوي لمتعلمي اللغة الانجليزية كلغة أجنبية في التعليم الثانوي. عمليا الدراسة شملت فوج يضم 20 تلميذا من ثانوية احمد فرانسيس بسيدي عبد العزيز بجيجل من خلال نموذج تقييم الأداء الشفوي . لهذا تم تقييم التلاميذ عن طريق تقويم تشخيصي في بداية التجربة وآخر في نهايتها لمعرفة مدى تحكم التلاميذ في الشفوي وقدرتهم على التطور. ولمعرفة مدى تحسن التلاميذ تم إعطاء تقييم فوري في نهاية كل حصة. و في نهاية العملية أظهرت النتائج أن 17 مشاركا قد طوروا الجانب الشفوي بمستويات متفاوتة. إذا الفرضية أثبتت. وبناء على هذه النتيجة يقترح على الأساتذة دمج هذه التقنية في أقسامهم مستقبلا.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المتعلمين الجزائريين للغة الانجليزية كلغة اجنبية, البيتشا كوتشا, الاداء الشفوي.