

**Islamic University of Gaza  
Deanery of Graduate Studies  
Faculty of Education  
English Teaching Methods Department**



**Difficulties Encountering English Majors in Giving  
Academic Oral Presentations during Class  
at Al-Aqsa University**

Submitted by

**Ayman Hassan Abu El Enein**

Supervised by

**Dr. Awad Sulaiman Keshta**

A Thesis Submitted In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
of the M.ED Degree in Curricula and ELTeaching Methodology.

July 2011



## نتيجة الحكم على أطروحة ماجستير

بناءً على موافقة عمادة الدراسات العليا بالجامعة الإسلامية بغزة على تشكيل لجنة الحكم على أطروحة الباحث/ أيمن حسن أحمد أبو العنين لنيل درجة الماجستير في كلية التربية/ قسم المناهج وطرق التدريس- اللغة الإنجليزية وموضوعها:

### Difficulties Encountering English Majors in Giving Academic Oral Presentations during Class at Al-Aqsa University

وبعد المناقشة العلنية التي تمت اليوم الأربعاء 18 شعبان 1432هـ، الموافق 2011/07/20م الساعة العاشرة صباحاً، اجتمعت لجنة الحكم على الأطروحة والمكونة من:

د. عوض سليمان قشطة	مشرفاً ورئيساً
أ.د. عزو إسماعيل عفانة	مناقشاً داخلياً
د. محمد عطية عبد الرحيم	مناقشاً خارجياً

وبعد المداولة أوصت اللجنة بمنح الباحث درجة الماجستير في كلية التربية/ قسم المناهج وطرق التدريس- اللغة الإنجليزية.

واللجنة إذ تمنحه هذه الدرجة فإنها توصيه بتقوى الله ولزوم طاعته وأن يسخر علمه في خدمة دينه ووطنه.

والله ولي التوفيق ،،،

عميد الدراسات العليا

د. زياد إبراهيم مقداد

## ***Dedication***

***To the candle that enlightens my way towards success, my kind mother, Umm Ayman, Haleema Hussein Abu El Enein who deserves my great love, respect and my whole life for her long encouragement and sacrifice at every stage.***

***To my acute sisters, Nahed, Hayam and Eman who motivated and encouraged me to finish this work.***

***To my father, Abu Nedal, and my uncle Abu Ashraf for their encouragements.***

***To the souls of martyrs, who sacrificed their lives for Al-Aqsa Mosque and Palestine.***

## **Acknowledgment**

**In the Name of Allah, The Most Gracious, The Most Merciful.**

All praise to Almighty Allah, the one to whom all dignity, honor and glory are due. Peace and blessing of Allah be upon all the prophets and messengers. As prophet Mohammad, peace of Allah be upon him, said" Who does not thank people, will not thank Allah".

I would like to acknowledge my sincere thanks and gratitude to my advisor: Dr. Awad Suleiman Keshta for his steadfast support, guidance and dedicated labour. His enthusiasm and professional expertise have provided tremendous guidance throughout carrying out my thesis.

I am indebted to Dr. Rafat Abu Ghali, who supported and helped me to bring this work to light. His amazing support has been a blessing to me. His encouragement and professional insight has inspired both my personal and professional development. He has made me think even more about how education can make a better world. Moreover, he is a great role model for all educators, scholars, and educational administrators.

I am very thankful to Dr. Mohammad Abed El Raheem for his thoughtful care, advice and insightful comments. He also helped me tremendously with synthesizing ideas and clarifying concepts.

My limitless appreciation and gratitude go to Drs. Ahmad Al-Nakhalla, Walid Amer, Mohammad Hamdan, Jaber Abu Shawesh, Mohammad Shqeir, Mohammad Al Hajj, Mahmoud Shaqfa and Nabhan Abu Jamous for their support, assistance and caring.

My deepest appreciation goes to professor Ezzo Afana and Dr. Mohammad Abed El Raheem for accepting to discuss this research study.

In addition, I am deeply grateful to English department staff at Al Aqsa University of Gaza for all the facilities, help, cooperation and advice they offered.

Thanks to all my friends, and colleagues, who have shown interest and encouragement in my work, especially, Mrs. Nada El Hamss, Mr. Yusuf Sheikh El Eid , Hassan Abu Hasna, Akram Saleh, Alaa Muamer and Alaa El Zatma

I also extend my thanks to senior and junior students at Al Aqsa University for their cooperation and help in applying the questionnaire and interview card honestly.

## **Difficulties Encountering English Majors in Giving Academic Oral Presentations during Class at Al-Aqsa University**

### **Abstract**

This study aimed to identify the main difficulties encountering English majors at Al Aqsa University of Gaza while giving academic oral presentations. To achieve the aim of the study, the researcher applied two tools, a questionnaire and an interview card. Through the interview card, the researcher elicited difficulties from forty seven English majors throughout using main criteria of academic oral presentations. More difficulties were deduced from 154 students under three domains through the questionnaire.

The sample of the study consisted of one hundred and fifty four junior and senior English major students forming (40%) of the population of the study. These subjects were randomly selected to participate in the study.

According to the questionnaire, the following results were reached: More than 58% of the students were in consensus that " Speakers don't act cheerfully and smile when speaking", " Presenter is unable to use tools such LCD and power point effectively", " Speakers don't keep eye-contact with audience", "Speakers don't stick to the objectives of the speech " and " Speakers don't use appropriate transitional words and clear signals " were serious difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentation. In light of the interview card, these findings were found: " purpose statement of the presentation isn't explicit", " there isn't a good choice of the topic", " objectives aren't clear", " there isn't a good connection of ideas", "there aren't well structured and clear conclusions" and "the presenter doesn't use suitable gestures to keep audience's attention" were major difficulties encountering students in giving academic oral presentations through the main criteria of academic oral presentation of the interview card.

Moreover, results showed, according to the two tools, that there were no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) due to classification. But there were statistically significant differences in favor of females due to gender through interview card.

In conclusion, the researcher recommended carrying out further researches on the difficulties encountering Al Aqsa University junior and senior students in giving academic oral presentations and concentrating firstly on organization of the academic presentation in light of effective main criteria to produce a good presentation.

## الصعوبات التي تواجه طلاب اللغة الانجليزية بجامعة الأقصى في توصيل العروض الشفوية الأكاديمية في القاعة الدراسية

### ملخص الدراسة

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى التعرف على أهم الصعوبات التي تواجه طلاب قسم اللغة الانجليزية في المستويين الثالث والرابع بجامعة الأقصى في توصيل التقديم الشفوي الأكاديمي في القاعة الدراسية، ولقد طبق الباحث أداتين هما الاستبانة وبطاقة المقابلة لتحقيق هدف الدراسة، حصل الباحث من خلال بطاقة المقابلة على لصعوبات من طلاب اللغة الانجليزية لمعايير الستة الأساسية للتقديم الشفوي الأكاديمي. تم استخلاص صعوبات عديدة من طلاب اللغة الانجليزية تحت ثلاثة أبعاد من خلال الاستبانة. تتكون عينة الدراسة من مئة وأربعة عشر مشاركاً، يشكلون نسبة ٤٠% من مجتمع الدراسة، بحيث تم اختيار العينة المشاركة في الدراسة عشوائياً. توصل الباحث إلى النتائج التالية: بقا للاستبانة أكثر من ٥٨% من الطلاب كانوا مجمعين على أن "المقدمين لا يبتسمون أثناء التحدث"، "عدم قدرة المقدم على استخدام البوربوينت وجهاز العرض بكفاءة"، "عدم استخدام الاتصال بالعين مع الجمهور"، "المتحدث لا يلتزم بأهداف التقديم" و"عدم استخدام الكلمات الانتقالية والإشارات"، وهذه كانت الصعوبات الأكثر جدية في ضوء الاستبانة.

: "الغرض من التقديم غير واضح"، "عدم الاختيار الجيد للموضوع"، "الأهداف غير واضحة" "لا يوجد ترابط قوي للأفكار"، "عدم وضوح الخاتمة"، "عدم استخدام الإيماءات لإثارة انتباه الجمهور" وهذه كانت صعوبات كبيرة تواجه طلاب اللغة الانجليزية في توصيل النظم الدراسي من خلال المعايير الأساسية للتقديم الشفوي الأكاديمي. أظهرت النتائج انه طبقاً لكلتا الأداتين عدم وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية تعزوي لمتغير المستوى الدراسي. ولكنها أشارت إلى وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية لصالح الإناث تعزوي لمتغير الجنس فقط طبقاً لبطاقة المقابلة. وفي الختام أوصي الباحث بإجراء المزيد من الأبحاث على الصعوبات التي تواجه طلاب المستويين الثالث والرابع في جامعة الأقصى في توصيل التقديم الشفوي الأكاديمي.

أيضاً بالتركيز في البداية على كيفية تنظيم الأكاديمي في ضوء معايير الأساسية لإنتاج التقديم الجيد.

## Table of Contents

Dedication .....	I
Acknowledgment .....	II
Abstract .....	IV
Table of contents .....	VI
List of tables .....	X

### Chapter I

1.1 Introduction .....	2
1.2. Statement of the problem .....	5
1.3. Research questions .....	6
1.4. Purpose of the study .....	6
1.5. Significance of the study .....	7
1.6. scope of the study .....	7
1.7. Limitations of study .....	7
1.7. Definition of terms .....	8
1.8. Abbreviations .....	10

### Chapter II

2. Literature review .....	11
2.1. Theoretical framework .....	12
2.1.1 Introduction .....	12
2.1.2. Learning difficulties and disabilities .....	14
2.1.3. Classification of learning difficulties .....	16
2.1.4. Reasons and causes of learning difficulties .....	18
2.1.5. Diagnosis of learning difficulties .....	18
2.1.6. Steps of diagnosing learning difficulties .....	18
2.1.7. Learning difficulties of university students .....	19
2.1.8. Nature of learning difficulties of university students .....	20
2.1.9. features of learning difficulties university students .....	20
2.1.10. Academic oral presentation .....	21



2.1.11 Academic oral presentation as a form of assessment .....	23
2.1.12. The three essential ingredients of a presentation .....	24
2.1.13. What Constitutes a Professional Presentation? .....	25
2.1.14. Purposes of student presentations .....	25
2.1.15. Benefits of student presentations .....	27
2.1.16. Examples of student presentations .....	28
2.1.17. Why Seminar presentations .....	29
2.1.18. Ten Steps for Preparing your Presentation .....	30
2.1.19. Different styles of learning .....	30
2.1.20. Good communication skills .....	31
2.1.21. Conclusion .....	34
2.2. An Overview of Previous studies .....	35
2.2.1. Previous studies related to oral performance .....	35
2.2.2. Previous studies related to oral presentation .....	42
2.2.3. Commentary on previous studies .....	50

### **Chapter III**

3. The Methodology of the study .....	52
3.1. Introduction .....	53
3.2. Type of research .....	53
3.3. The population of the study .....	53
3.4. The sample of the study .....	54
3.5. The instrumentations .....	55
3.5.1. The questionnaire .....	56
3.6. Validity of the questionnaire .....	57
3.7. Reliability of the questionnaire .....	61
3.8. The interview card .....	62
3.9. The sample of the study .....	63
3.10. Validity of the interview card .....	64
3.11. Reliability of the interview card .....	66
3.12. Description of content analysis card .....	67
3.12. Statistical treatment and analysis .....	69

## Chapter IV

4. The Results of the study .....	70
4.1. The answer of the first question .....	71
4.2. The answer of the second question .....	82
4.3. The answer of the third question .....	84
4.4. The answer of the fourth question .....	86
4.5. The answer of the fifth question .....	97
4.6. The answer of the sixth question .....	99

## Chapter V

5. Findings, Discussion, Pedagogical Implications, Conclusion and Recommendations	
5.1. Introduction .....	104
5.2. Findings .....	104
5.3. Discussion of the results of the first question .....	108
5.4. Discussion of the results of the second question .....	114
5.5. Discussion of the results of the third question .....	115
5.6. Discussion of the results of the fourth question .....	116
5.7. Discussion of the results of the fifth question .....	119
5.8. Discussion of the results of the sixth question .....	120
5.9. Pedagogical Implications for Teaching .....	121
5.10. Conclusion .....	123
5.11. Recommendations .....	126
5.12. Recommendations for Further Research .....	129
References .....	130
Appendices .....	139

### Appendix A:

Questionnaire on difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentation at Al Aqsa University.

Appendix B:

Interview card designed in light of the main criteria of academic oral presentation to elicit difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentation.

Appendix C:

Content analysis card

Appendix D:

Referees list

Appendix E:

The request from the deanship of post graduate studies of the Islamic University to Al Aqsa University for facilitating the researcher's mission to distribute the questionnaires and implement the interview card

## List of Tables

<b>Table (3.1)</b> The distribution of the population of the study according to gender	54
-----	
<b>Table (3.2)</b> The distribution of the pilot sample according to gender in light of The questionnaire	54
-----	
<b>Table (3.3)</b> The distribution of the sample according to gender	55
-----	
<b>Table (3.4)</b> The distribution of the sample according to classification	55
-----	
<b>Table (3.5)</b> The number of items according to the domains	57
-----	
<b>Table (3.6)</b> Correlation coefficient of the items in the first domain	58
-----	
<b>Table (3.7)</b> Correlation coefficient of the items in the second domain	58
-----	
<b>Table (3.8)</b> Correlation coefficient of the items in the third domain	59
-----	
<b>Table (3.9)</b> Correlation between the three domains with the total degree of the questionnaire	60
-----	
<b>(Table 3.10)</b> Correlation coefficient between the three domains of each domain before modification and the reliability after modification	61
-----	
<b>Table (3.11)</b> Alpha Correlation Coefficient of the questionnaire Reliability	62
-----	
<b>Table (3.12)</b> The distribution of the pilot sample according to gender in light of the interview card	63

## List of Tables

<b>Table (3.13)</b> The distribution of the sample according to gender in light of the interview card	64
-----	
<b>Table (3.14)</b> The number of items according to the domains	65
-----	
<b>Table (3.15)</b> Pearson Correlation coefficient at the whole items with the total score of this scope	65
-----	
<b>Table (3.16)</b> The number of items in each domain of the analysis card	67
-----	
<b>Table (4.1)</b> The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the first domain from the questionnaire	72
-----	
<b>Table (4.2)</b> The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the second domain from the questionnaire	73
-----	
<b>Table (4.3)</b> The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the third domain from the questionnaire	75
-----	
<b>Table (4.4)</b> The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each domain from and all questionnaire	77
-----	
<b>Table (4.5)</b> The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the interview dimensions	78

## List of Tables

<b>Table (4.6)</b> The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each domain from and all interview	81
-----	
<b>Table (4.7)</b> Means, std. div, t value, sig. value and sig. level for the questionnaire dimensions	82
-----	
<b>Table (4.8 )</b> Means, std. div, value, sig. value and sig. level for interview card dimension	83
-----	
<b>Table (4.9)</b> Means, std. div, t value, sig. value and sig. level for the questionnaire dimensions	84
-----	
<b>Table (4.10)</b> Means, std. div, t value, sig. value and sig. level for interview card dimension	85
-----	
<b>Table (4.11)</b> The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the first dimension from the questionnaire	86
-----	
<b>Table (4.12)</b> The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the second dimension from the questionnaire	88
-----	
<b>Table (4.13)</b> The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the third dimension from the questionnaire	90

## List of Tables

<b>Table (4.14)</b> The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each dimension of the whole questionnaire	92
-----	
<b>Table (4.15)</b> The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the interview dimensions	93
-----	
<b>Table (4.16)</b> The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each dimension from and all interview	95
-----	
<b>Table (4.17)</b> Means, , Mann-Whitney U value, sig. value and sig. level for the questionnaire dimension	97
-----	
<b>Table (4.18)</b> Means, Mann-Whitney U value, sig. value and sig. level for interview card dimension	98
-----	
<b>Table (4.19)</b> Frequency & percentage of the items in the written text paper (The First Domain)	99
-----	
<b>Table (4.20)</b> Frequency & percentage of the items in the written text paper (The Second Domain)	101
-----	

# Chapter I

## Introduction



# Chapter I

## 1.1. Introduction

English language is considered the world language and it is the only foreign language that is being taught to all students in the UNRWA and the governmental schools and also in the Gaza universities.

Keshta (2000:1) states that "English is a universal language: the language of communication among countries in the international world of trade, business, communications, air transportation and technology."

Consequently, English as a language has become an essential demand for all levels and fields. That is why, Palestine is one of the countries which paid attention to teaching English as a second or foreign language to secure the interest and benefit of its people.

Mourtaga (2004:16) explains that the motivation is very important in learning English. However, this didn't mean that all of the Palestinian students were motivated and good at English in spite of its importance. In fact, the learners need to be motivated in learning English, not only to pass the exams, but also to use English in communicating orally with others. Many school and university students wrongly believed that English is a difficult language to learn. The important issue for students was to pass the final exams in order to move to the next level. To do so, students would memorize questions and answers and successfully regurgitate them word by word on the final exam. Worse than that, teachers praise, appreciate and encourage their students to do so.

That's why the majority of the students lost the main aim of the language which is to speak English language and develop themselves to communicate orally with others. Moreover, the importance of speaking English language stems from the fact that new trends of the whole institutions and organizations stipulate speaking English language

fluently and communicating orally with others as necessary requirements to get high-rank jobs in them.

Al Mashharawi (2006:4) notes that speaking is fundamental and basic to human communication. If the goal of a language course is truly to communicate in English, then speaking skill should be taught and practiced in the language classroom. When the communication is included in the classroom, it will definitely raise general learner motivation and making the classroom a dynamic and effective environment.

Scott (2005:12) states that learning to speak a foreign language requires more than knowing its grammatical and semantic rules. Students should know how native speakers use language in real life situations and have the ability to communicate with others effectively. Diversity in interaction involves not only verbal communication but also paralinguistic elements of speech such as pitch, stress and intonation.

Bygate (1995:3) asserts that one of the basic problems in foreign language teaching is to prepare learners to be able to use the language effectively in real life situations. How this preparation is done, and how successful it is, depends very much on how we as teachers understand our aims.

Johnson & Morrow (1987:71) clarify that the role of the learner noting that the focus changes from the accurate production of isolated utterances to the fluent selection of appropriate utterances in communication. The learner is now concerned with using language, not English usage. In order to do this, learners take on roles and interact with other learners who also have roles and that will results in developing his speaking abilities with the other learners.

My interest in English language learning/teaching comes from the personal experience of learning English. When the researcher was in a high school, where he was engaged in passive learning and instructed mostly about grammar rules for English, he lost interest in English, feeling it was just too hard for him. Even though the researcher had a good understanding of English grammar, it did not help much. After the researcher entered the university, he took a survival English class. There, the researcher found another way of learning English. He became interested in speaking in English to

communicate with others. It seems that English specialists in Gaza universities, particularly those at Al Aqsa University now believe learning language to communicate is more important than learning about the language. Recently the categories and contents of the TOFEL test, one of the most popular and reliable English tests for foreigners, have been changed by making an effort to test more communicative abilities than before. Recently, a new technique is used in Gaza universities that is the academic oral presentation. It is considered a main step in developing the students ability to communicate with each other in a good way.

Emden and Becker (2004:1) state that developing learners' ability to speak in front of an audience is one of the greatest benefits they'll ever get from their time in further or higher education. The word 'developing, because it's likely that they've already had some experience of giving a talk, perhaps at school.

At Al-Aqsa university of Gaza, speaking fluent English is the primary requirement for students to be successful in their field of study, but some students who speak English as their foreign language are not meeting this requirement. "Great presenters all share one quality that is the desire to communicate." (Bradbury,2006:2). This problem begins to attract the researcher's attention since there is an evident weakness in the oral presentations of the English majors at Al Aqsa University. When people learn a language; communication is the purpose, not the language itself.

As Bradbury, (2006:2) points out "In order to produce a successful presentation you must have a clear idea of what the presentation is to be about. Furthermore, your understanding must be both precise and accurate." Thus, a good English language learner needs also to learn how to present their tasks correctly and accurately as well as they ought to learn self-expression, accent, and communication habits or they will lose the meaning of learning English.

As Emden and Becker, (2004:1) assert that Many learners are worried about talking to an audience and this is understandable – they may feel both nervous and vulnerable when they look for the first time at a roomful of people waiting to listen to them. It's a natural reaction."

That's why, when the students are required to give their presentations, they usually feel that the most difficult aspect is giving their academic presentation in front of the class. That's because of many factors, one of these is the confusion and the fear from making errors. English Majors at Al Aqsa University currently do not have the ability to express themselves fully and freely which causes poor oral performance and communication.

Siddons (2008:1) states that in order to deliver the academic oral presentation, EFL students are required to know and clearly understand the main ingredients of the presentation which are three: the audience, the presenter and the presentation itself.

## **1.2. Statement of the problem**

The researcher observed that most English majors at Al Aqsa University who are studying and studied courses that required academic oral presentation encounter many difficulties in particular, linguistic difficulties. The researcher thinks that this problem is researchable because the researcher was one of those who suffered and encountered a lot of difficulties in giving his academic oral presentations. Thus, the academic oral presentation reflects the students' proficiency in using English language correctly and practically. Moreover, the researcher interviewed, in this first semester (2010 – 2011) (10), English majors at Al Aqsa university (7) females and (3) males. All of them assured that they encountered and are still encountering many difficulties in giving the academic oral presentation because of many linguistic and psychological factors.

Horwitz (2002:562) explains that the inability of the learners to express themselves fully and freely or to understand what another person says can easily lead to more anxiety and frustration, less confidence, that it is impossible for them to communicate easily.

Above all, English majors at Al Aqsa University are not prepared well for effective communication, and they don't have sufficient abilities to speak and communicate orally in front of their colleagues and professors or any native English speakers due to different linguistic, social and psychological difficulties encountering them.

### 1.3. Research questions

This study will be framed by the following questions:

- 1- What are the difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentations during class at Al-Aqsa university from students' perspectives?
- 2- Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between male and female students?
- 3- Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentation between junior and senior students?
- 4- What are the difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentations during class at Al-Aqsa university from instructors' perspectives?
- 5- Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentation from instructors' perspectives and students' perspectives?
- 6- What are the difficulties encountering English majors at Al Aqsa university in giving academic oral presentations as reflected in the written aspect of the academic oral presentation?

### 1.4. Purpose of the study

The purpose of this research is to investigate the various difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations at Al Aqsa University from both the students' perspectives and instructors' perspectives. It is expected from this study to inform the educators that they could help these students at Al Aqsa university by making them aware of their different language difficulties from the professors' perspectives and English majors' perspectives. In addition, the study aims to find the expected differences in the difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentations between males and females and also between senior and junior students. The research will help students to find the effective criteria for the academic oral presentations and a variety of strategies in presenting their tasks effectively and prepare English majors to attain successful ways in presenting their

academic oral tasks. It also will suggest many solutions and recommendations to find the possible academic remedy for these difficulties.

### **1.5. Significance of the study**

This study is significant because:

- 1- It could be a guide for lecturers in developing the academic oral presentation for the English majors at Al Aqsa University.
- 2- It may help students to find out their difficulties in giving academic oral presentations from their perspectives and also from instructors' perspectives and avoid them.
- 3- It seeks to remove the psychological and linguistic obstacles during the presentation.
- 4- This study is driven by the need to identify the various difficulties encountering the Palestinian English majors at Al Aqsa University in giving their academic oral presentations in the class at Al Aqsa University of Gaza from both instructors' perspectives and students' perspectives.

### **1.6. Scope of the study**

This investigation was conducted under the following points:

1. The sample of this study consisted of male and female students attending Al Aqsa University.
2. The students selected for this study were all English majors who enrolled in the second term 2010/2011.
3. The sample consisted only of senior and junior students enrolled at Al Aqsa University of Gaza during the second term of 2010/2011.

### **1.7. Limitations of the study**

The study is limited with the difficulties encountering the students in giving the academic oral presentation. Thus, the researcher used the written analysis card in order to elicit difficulties encountering English majors at Al Aqsa university in giving academic oral presentations as reflected in the written aspect of the academic presentation. In addition, the researcher also used the interview card and questionnaire tools.

## **1.8. Definition of terms**

### **1.8.1. Academic Oral Presentations**

Academic oral presentation is an activity through which the presenters communicate with the audience. In EFL context, it involves oral communication using English as a foreign language. (Horwitz et al., 1986)

An academic oral presentation is a form of public speaking in which students orally present academic contents to the class. (The researcher)

### **1.8.2. Difficulties:**

It is defined as a factor causing trouble in achieving a positive result or tending to produce a negative result, or as the level of resistance to successful performance. (OD)

Othman (1990:11) defines the difficulties as those which may hinder the student from reaching the correct answer, bearing in mind that the common errors at 25% are an indicator of error existence.

Al Qassim (2000) defines difficulties as a case which leads to a continuous failing and decrease in student learning, in spite of his ordinary or extraordinary mental ability, and that is not due to eyesight or hearing or physical movement or social circumstances.

Learning problems refers to the students or children who have problems due to internal causes not related to the percentage of intelligence. (Al Sayyed 2002)

### **1.8.3. English Major:**

He is a college or university student and his main field of specialization is English or it is a term for an undergraduate university student in English degree. (The researcher)

**1.8.4. Collaborative Reasoning:** An approach designed to facilitate critical reading and thinking skills in an environment that is openly structured, such that many students have opportunities to speak and to share their opinions on a central question.

(Chinn, Anderson and Waggoner, 2001)

**1.8.5. Junior**

Students of the third level at Al Aqsa University of Gaza.

**1.8.6. Senior**

Students of the fourth level at Al Aqsa University of Gaza.

**1.8.7. Classification**

The classification of the students whether they are junior or senior.

**1.8.8. Lecturers**

They are Ph.D. holders or M.A. holders in the departments of English at The Islamic University of Gaza and Al Aqsa University who teach undergraduate students.



## **1.9. Abbreviations**

**SPSS:** Statistical programe for social sciences

**EFL:** English as a Foreign Language.

**ESL:** English as a Second Language

**CR:** Collaborative Reasoning

**UNRWA:** United Nations for Relief and Working Agency

**TOFEL:** Test Of English as a Foreign Language.

**MOEHE:** It refers to Ministry of Education and Higher Education.

**TEFL:** Teaching English as a Foreign Language

**LCD:** Liquid Crystal Display

**ASR:** Automatic Speech Recognition

**OD:** Oxford Dictionary

# Chapter II

## Literature Review

## **Chapter II**

### **Literature Review**

#### **2.1. Theoretical framework**

##### **2.1.1 Introduction**

The purpose of this study is to identify difficulties encountering English majors at Al Aqsa University in giving the academic oral presentations. It is hoped that the results of the study may help English majors in developing their abilities in giving academic oral presentations and as a result, they will particularly improve their speaking skill and academic achievement in general. Thus, this study will assist English learners not only in improving the speaking skill but also developing the oral communication skills including academic oral presentations.

English language is a powerful tool for communication. It is a global language that people of different languages use to communicate and engage in business and other fields. It also provides access to much of the world's knowledge. Thus, having a good command of the language is likely to bring many advantages because it allows one to communicate with people around the world and have first-hand access to the latest knowledge. Many countries have carried out educational reforms in recent years by lowering the age of first exposure to English language. In Palestinian territories, for instance, the age for learning English language has been lowered from 11 to 6. In China, for example, the age for compulsory English instruction has been lowered from 11 to 9.

(Lin, 2007) adds that "Not only were younger learners involved, the impact of English as a global language has extended upwards to reach elder learners at the tertiary level. About 1,700 universities from around the world have added about 3,300 courses taught in English from 2004 to 2007."

Moreover, English is used as the medium of communication in many international conferences (Nunan, 2003). Therefore, students in tertiary education, especially graduate students, have an increasing chance to use English as their working

language, either in graduate seminars or in conferences. They are required to read books, journal articles that are written in English and use English as a tool for scholarly discussion in classrooms or in conferences. More importantly, the English learners, in general, need to improve their capabilities in speaking English language and communicating orally with others. English majors want to develop their speaking skill and academic oral presentations abilities, but they are encountering many difficulties.

Among the difficulties that Al Aqsa university English students are still encountering with EFL learning is their speaking skill that has always brought considerable difficulty for majority of students. This is not at all surprising because English speaking has always been the most neglected skill, compared to reading, writing and listening in primary, prep and secondary education in Gaza strip. The teachers in schools usually focused on reading, grammar and vocabulary. Students seldom have the opportunity to practise speaking.

Due to globalization and the awareness that English brings social and economic advantages, a population of students who are in need of developing advanced English academic skills is emerging. These are the students who do not speak English as their mother tongue or as their second language but learn through the medium of English. These students would need to have a certain level of English proficiency which allows them to think critically and express their ideas. It can be expected that they face many challenges. A recent study on the oral communication needs of East Asian international students in the US indicated that students find leading class discussions the most difficult, followed by whole-class discussion, small-group discussion, then fourthly, formal oral presentations. Although giving oral presentation was not ranked as the most difficult task in graduate seminar, it was suggested by the students as the most important skill to grasp (Kim, 2006).

Therefore, it is important to study the levels and sources of difficulties that encounter EFL learners in general and particularly English majors at Al Aqsa in order to get rid of them and offer possible positive steps of improving their academic oral skills.

### **2.1.2. Learning Difficulties and disabilities:**

Experts, specialists and educationalists take interest in learning difficulties because the learners encounter several difficulties in learning different subjects that may hinder realizing the required aims during their educational career. Consequently, educationalists were interested greatly in looking for and solving the causes of such difficulties

#### **First: learning difficulties:**

Learning is a self activity performed and carried out by the learner for the purpose of obtaining responses and forming attitudes to face the life problems. Learning is not directly observed, it is composed by chance. Any scientific concept is hypothetical, and it is deduced and included through its results and effects in the conduct. (Al Zayat 2000:287)

The education process is meant to enable the learner to obtain the suitable responses and attitudes. It is difficult to define learning because it can not be observed directly and considered as a separate unit.

Camille B. (1992) mentioned that the only thing that can be studied is the conduct and behavior which depends on other processes, except learning. Thus, learning is considered as a hypothetical process, concluded and deduced by the conduct and behavior itself. Moreover, it is impossible to isolate learning process directly from other conduct and behavior aspects. Thus, learning is a relatively permanent change in performance potential that arises from experience.

#### **Many researchers defined learning difficulties in different ways:**

Maximos (1968:11), for instance, believes that difficulties are those which hinder students from reaching the right and true answer of the exercises. He also thinks that the difficulty can be measured through common errors which are repeated by the student at 25 % and more.

Othman (1990:11) defines the difficulties as those which may hinder the student from reaching the correct answer, bearing in mind that the common errors at 25% are an indicator of error existence.

Learning difficulties are the case that is shown or suffered by the learner from the problems in the ability of using, understanding and realizing the language. It is expected that such a thing resulted from difficulties in perception and realization of students because of brain and encephalon infection or defect in brain function or reading and talking disability. (Jerjawi 2002)

Al Qassim (2000) defined learning difficulties as a case which leads to a continuous falling and decrease in student learning, in spite of his ordinary or extraordinary mental ability, and that is not due to eyesight or hearing or physical movement or social circumstances.

Upon reviewing previous definitions, the researcher concluded that learning difficulties are the obstacles and hinders which prevent the learners from reaching and fulfilling the true answer in any educational subject.

### **Second: Learning Difficulties and Disabilities:-**

Learning disabilities are considered one of the new topics in the field of special education. They witnessed rapid development and obtained great interest, when it became a focus for studies.

Learning difficulties involve a number of sciences which contribute into studying such as Psychology, Neurology, Seep Chpathogers Medicine, Audiology, Optometry, special education and remedial teaching. Each science has a clear role in learning difficulties. (Rossan 2001:172)

### **Differences between learning difficulties and learning problems**

There is no psychological difference between the two idioms, but the difference is only idiomatic and technical.

Al Sayyed (2002) states that learning difficulties are a group of children who have a slight decrease in intelligence. Their learning difficulties are due to the environment. Whereas, learning problems refers to the children who have problems due to internal causes not related to the percentage of intelligence.

The researcher concludes that the individuals who suffer from learning difficulties are the same individuals who suffer from learning problems due to the similarity of difficult curriculum content which is not suitable for the learners.

The concern in learning difficulties is a step towards diagnosing the different difficulties and problems encountering learners. The teacher has a great contribution in solving these difficulties and problems. The studies of many researchers in learning difficulties discovered that many students suffer from learning difficulties in any subjects such as English.

Othman (1990:18) believes that stress, large numbers in class and competition affect parents, teachers and officials. It is therefore advised that the difficulties should be treated early in the students' educational career. Treating difficulties will benefit both teachers and learners.

### **2.1.3. Classification of learning difficulties:**

Learning difficulties problem is considered one of the confusing and ambiguous problems for specialists. Students have ordinary mental abilities, but they fail in one or more in academic aspects. Learning difficulties are classified into the following:

#### **1. Developmental learning difficulties:**

The difficulties that deal with the processes before the academic life . They are related to functions, mental, educational and knowledge processes which are necessary for a student in his academic studies, such as perception, attention, thinking, language and memory. Developmental learning difficulties refer to functional disorders in the central nervous system. (Al Zarad 1991:129) .Al Zarad divides these difficulties into two categories:

a- **Primary difficulties:** such as attention, memory and perception.

b- **Secondary difficulties:** such as thinking, understanding and verbal language.

In light of the mentioned points, primary developmental learning difficulties are basic mental processes. They are overlapping, and they influence each other. Secondary developmental learning difficulties deal with thinking and verbal language. Thinking and verbal language are influenced directly by primary difficulties.

(Al Qassim 2000:21)

Arter and Jenkins (1979:517) state that developmental learning difficulties lead to academic learning difficulties. So, the developmental learning difficulties are the base of academic learning difficulties. It is important to qualify the brain function and mental processes to be suitable for receiving the academic learning because the developmental learning difficulties are the source of academic learning difficulties.

## **2- Academic learning difficulties:**

Academic learning difficulties are related to the basic subjects, i.e. the problems which are shown by students such as reading, writing, speaking and spelling difficulties.

Academic learning difficulties are relevant to and result from developmental learning difficulties. (Al Zarad 1991:129) . They may be of quality difficulties which appear when the student fails to fulfill the skills of success in more than one subject.

Al Sarttawi (1996:492) wrote in his study that learning difficulties refer to the children who suffer from obvious difficulty in one of academic subjects, although they enjoy ordinary mental abilities in other subjects.

Thus, the researcher concludes that it is necessary to pay attention to the developmental learning difficulties in order to discover and solve the problems of academic difficulties.



#### **2.1.4. Reasons and causes of learning difficulties:**

Clements (1993) states that Learning difficulties originate from psychological inability and weakness or sharp failure in using the verbal and communicative language. The symptoms of learning difficulties are:

- 1- There is no harmony between learning and behavior.
- 2- The student does not learn by methods, ways and materials in which most students learn, but he needs special procedures.

Many studies dealt with learning difficulties. Most of these refer to the learning difficulties in terms of the learner and his tendency for learning, education system and the difficulty of the subject. Some difficulties refer to curricula and text books, or to the psychological, social and emotional sides.

Al Da'ada'a and Abu Mghali (1992:20) believe that psychological disorder and lagging behind and failure in education cause learning difficulty. Anxiety and disquiet in the class, fear and alarm reflect directly on individual learning ability and study progress.

#### **2.1.5. Diagnosis of learning difficulties:**

It is important to diagnose the learning difficulties early in order to analyze and overcome them. Diagnosing the learning difficulties of the students is considered one of the main stages to construct the remedial educational programs, since it determines the kind of learning difficulty that each student face and the remedial method for this kind of difficulty. Generally, the teacher suspects that the student has learning difficulty when he notices a practical failure in doing school homework accompanied with difficulty in learning and acquisition if compared to other students. (Zarad 1991:229)

#### **2.1.6. Steps of diagnosing learning difficulties:**

Lerner (1993:42) believed that there are important steps and measures to diagnose the aspects of learning difficulties and the causes of decreasing the level of student acquisition. The steps are the following:

- a- determining whether the student suffers from definite difficulty in learning, although the learner is of normal intelligence and his performance is low.
- b- Identifying whether there is deficit in growing balance.
- c- Measuring the existing study to diagnose the failure fields.
- d- Discovering the reasons of the students' learning disability.
- e- Collecting developmental historical data and carrying out comprehensive evaluation to determine the elements properly.

### **Learning difficulties and other related concepts:**

In fact, there is a confusion between some concepts as learning problems and slow learning. So, it is necessary to shed the light on them to know the difference.

#### **1- Learning problems:**

Khatter (1999:7) defines them as a challenge which requires studying and searching.

#### **2- Slow learning:**

Zaqoot (2004:13) believes that slow learning is students' failure in studying. Such failure clearly appears in low acquisition that is lower than the medium level.

The researcher believes that slow learning is a result of many causes that are interdependent such as the teacher, student himself, teaching methodology, curriculum and the whole environment.

#### **2.1.7. Learning difficulties of university students:**

Westberry (1994:45) clarifies that although technology provides easy access to knowledge, it has some demerits. Today, culture imposed on individuals specific life-style. Such culture can be accepted in food and clothes field, but it is not acceptable in education, training and skill acquisition. Consequently the ready-made culture caused the following:

1. Weakness in the level of students' preparation and qualification.
2. Decreasing student acquisition in different kinds of basic education skills, thinking and problem solving.
3. Miss of credibility of scientific degrees obtained by all kinds of students. And such degrees do not reflect true qualification.

4. Spread of learning difficulties in all different kinds of educational levels from preparatory school up to university level, even in higher studies level.
5. Providing adequate prequalification and training.

#### **2.1.8. Nature Of Learning Difficulties Of University Students:-**

Some individuals believe that learning difficulties refer to disorder in the function of the central nervous system, But (Zayat 2002) believes that Learning difficulties refer to weakness and bad learning inputs and cognition processes.

Learning difficulties are not limited to a certain culture. They occur in different ages and levels. Learning causes many problems which result from frustration for those who suffer from learning difficulties, because they are invisible, which leads the teachers to believe that the students are disabled.

#### **2.1.9. The Main Features And Characteristics Of Learning Difficulties of University Students:-**

1. Lack of basic academic skills necessary to meet academic demands. (Bender, 1995)
2. Lack of knowledge of basic skills that are in academic life which enable them to use these skills in problem solving.
3. Lack of effective use of efficient learning performance strategies because they do not know them. (Ellis, Lenz and Deshler 1996)
4. failure to use learning strategies which help in analyzing a problem , solving and reflecting the best approach for the task,(Wong, 1985)
5. Lack of pre-requisite knowledge which enables the students to continue their studies. It was found that students with learning difficulties have relatively weak knowledge. (Wong, 1985)
6. Failure to innovate, extract and acquire the existing knowledge (semantic knowledge). (Zayat 2000).
7. Continuous failure to utilize acquired education condition. They also refer their failure to false reasons such as test, teacher, and difficult curriculums. (Lens, Alley, & Schumaker 1987).

The researcher agrees with the above mentioned ideas. Many students who have learning difficulty refer their failure to:

1. Difficult courses and exams.
2. The siege imposed by Israeli occupation.
3. Unqualified English teachers.
4. Intifada.

Bender (1995:76) explains that there are such difficulties are in the following fields:-

- Oral expression and communication.
- Listening comprehension.
- Written expression.
- Basic reading skills.
- Reading comprehension.
- Mathematical calculation.
- Problem solving
- Cognitive representation.
- Remembering verbal information.
- Information processing.
- Sustained attention.
- Time management.
- Social skill.

Research concerning learning difficulties shows the spread of learning difficulties phenomena among the students of university.

### **2.1.10. Academic oral presentation**

Academic oral presentation is an activity through which the presenters communicate with the audience. It is called academic because these presentations deal with college or university life. They also deal with courses that are taught in the universities sections and academics.

In EFL context, academic oral presentation involves oral communication using English as a foreign language. It has been noted that people who have difficulty in communicating with people are likely to experience more anxiety in a foreign language class because these people encounter many various difficulties that negatively affect their ability during the oral presentation. (Horwitz et al., 1986).

It was found that native and nonnative speakers reported experiencing linguistic and psychological difficulties with academic oral presentations (Morita, 2000) Thus, it is not surprising that Al Aqsa English students find oral activities difficult because they encounter many difficulties using a foreign language to think, express and communicate orally.

Public speaking, in various contexts, was reported as one of the most anxious experiences one could encounter (Jackson & Latane, 1981). Therefore, EFL graduate students face a dual task, of learning English and using it to present ideas. Both of these tasks can be anxiety-provoking, and it is likely that EFL students experience considerable stress with academic speaking. Moreover, speaking activities have been identified as the most anxiety-provoking activity in a foreign language classroom (Hilleson, 1996).

Academic oral presentations involve complex and constant decision-makings for the students from the beginning – the preparation stage, to the final stage – the presenting stage. The presenting stage is likely the most anxiety- provoking stage because much of the decision-making is required immediately.

Moreover, it was found that a discrepancy existed between the instructor and the students about what constitutes an academic oral presentation and its goal. This may also contribute to students' anxiety about oral presentations because students were likely uncertain about the quality of their preparation and performance. Oral presentation is a common task in graduate seminars in which presenters lead seminar discussion. An oral presentation may seem to be a straightforward activity, involving understanding the assigned material, summarizing it and presenting it to the instructor

and classmates. However, it has been shown that oral presentation requires constant negotiation and decision making for it to be successful. (Wu, 2008)

### **2.1.11. Academic oral presentation as a form of assessment**

An alternative form of assessment, peer assessment has been utilized in oral presentation activities in various educational contexts (Boud et al., 1999; Patri, 2002). Echoing with the concept of a student-centered approach to instruction, students can take an active role in their own language learning through the use of peer assessment activities. Opposed to teacher-only assessment, oral performances can also be evaluated from the views of learners' peers. Obtaining feedback from peers is vital to communicative language learning situations like oral presentations because of the notion of interaction between learners (Rust et al., 2003).

Furthermore, students can achieve a higher level of learning through interaction with their peers and instructors (Earl, 1986). Thus, academic oral presentation is considered an important activity to develop students' learning and to facilitate autonomy among learners. In most classrooms, however, the assessment criteria are already established by the classroom teacher, with students' ideas not incorporated into these pre-existing rubrics. This lack of student input might lead to a low reliability of peer assessment. Because students are not well aware of the description of each evaluation criterion, some students might not be able to assess their peers' performances properly. As a result, their views might be different from those of their instructor. Additionally, pre-existing criteria might deprive students of the aforementioned benefit of increased autonomy from peer assessment activities because they are not involved with establishing the criteria. (Rust et al., 2003)

Therefore, it is useful to explore students' views of which aspects of oral presentations are most effective which, as a result, will become the criteria of peer assessment activities. In doing so, instructors will find out what aspects of oral presentation students consider important. Thus, it is very necessary that teachers create their own criteria to assist the learners, but instructors themselves ought to give their students the assessment criteria in advance in order to get ready for the presentation and

know exactly the points of weakness and strength in their presentations. However, defining and creating the evaluation rubric together with their instructor, learners will gain more responsibility for their learning as well as to improve the reliability of the peer assessment activities themselves. The present study explores exactly which aspects of oral presentations Al Aqsa university students view to be most effective. Incorporating students' ideas while establishing the criteria for presentations is an important factor when considering a learner-centered approach in EFL classes. the primary focus of this research is as follows: to make learners more cognizant of the importance of presentation skills in English; to get learners more involved in the evaluation process; to urge learners to think about the criteria that form an effective presentation; to have learners involved in the formulation of the evaluation criteria; and have learners receive evaluation from their peers as well as reflect critically on this method of measurement and how it affects their own oral presentations. Thus, Student academic presentations are used increasingly on educational courses to encourage students to be more active in their own learning. (Earl, 1986)

### **2.1.12. The three essential ingredients of a presentation**

Siddons (2008:1-2) states three essential ingredients of a presentation

- 1-The audience
- 2-You – the presenter
- 3- The presentation itself

Each of these three ingredients is vital to a successful presentation – like a three-legged stool, when all the legs are there it is stable, but remove or shorten one of them and the whole thing collapses. No matter how well-constructed the presentation is, if it is badly delivered it will fail; no matter how well-delivered the presentation is, if it doesn't make sense then it will fail. Most importantly of all, even if the presentation is perfect and the presenter inspired and charismatic, if the audience isn't interested or engaged, then the presentation will certainly fail. (Wallwork, 2010)

Thus, it is important to prepare the presentation in advance to get the best results from it. Jacobi cited in Siddons (2008:1) wrote about the necessity for preparation,

"Ninety per cent or more of preparation is typically devoted to content. Countless hours go into creating and fine-tuning the presentation materials, and whatever time there is if there is any time left over—is reserved for practice how you practice can literally make or break your presentation. Keep in mind that a lot of presentations die on the vine because they aren't rehearsed properly, or they're never rehearsed at all."

### **2.1.13. What Constitutes a Professional Presentation?**

Wallwork (2010:4) clarifies that "A 'professional' presentation is one where the learner puts the audience first. The learner thinks about how the audience would most like to receive the information he is giving. The key to an effective presentation is that the presenter has a few main points that he wants the audience to remember and that he highlights these points during the presentation in an interesting way, and if possible, enthusiastic way. The important thing is to be relaxed. To become more relaxed, the key is to prepare well and concentrate on the content, not on your English. The student presentation is not an English examination—his English does not have to be perfect. The student ought to be realistic and doesn't aim for 100% accuracy, otherwise he will be more worried about his English than about communicating the value of his academic presentation."

### **2.1.14. Purposes of student presentations**

Chivers and Shoolbred (2007:14) state that "There are many reasons why students are asked to give presentations and these will be influenced by your academic course and situational and organizational factors. The purpose and circumstances of the presentation will influence its style, content and structure."



They also explain that "Most presentations will involve a combination of purposes but it may be helpful to think about the different features of each of these presentations. Student presentations may be given for the purposes of":

### **1- Advocacy/persuasion**

This presentation usually involves persuading members of the audience to take some action or make a decision. Examples could include:

- a- support a cause
- b- join a student society

### **2- Training**

This type of presentation includes examples where students may demonstrate their skills in the use of equipment and also their skills as a trainer or teacher. These types of presentations may be used to practise, demonstrate and eventually assess the level of these skills and techniques.

### **3- Teaching and learning**

Almost all presentations should have some elements of teaching and learning as part of the academic life of the students. This type is very common in the universities and the majority of the professors and students use the presentations for this purpose. So, it includes:

- a- Developing a deeper understanding of a topic or text.
- b- Covering specific areas of the curriculum in more detail.

### **4- Informing**

In some circumstances this type of presentation could be seen as similar to teaching, but the aim of this type of presentation could be to communicate as much information as possible in the time available. The purpose of the presentation may be to:

- a- Describe a new policy
- b- Outline a set of instructions
- c- Give a progress report on some research or development

## **5- Assessment**

Student presentations are frequently assessed and may be awarded a percentage of the marks that contribute to the overall module mark and credits. However, some presentations may not be assessed but used as an opportunity for students to practise and further develop their presentation skills.

### **2.1.15. Benefits of student presentations**

Emden and Becker (2004:23) state a variety of purposes. The benefits of student presentations will be influenced by the situation but they can be summarized as providing opportunities for:

#### **1- Student-centered participation in their learning**

Presentations offer a variety and challenges that contrast with regular delivery by an academic lecturer. Students can sometimes be more willing to learn from the poor and good performances of their peers than from their tutors. Presentations can also be used as an effective form of peer learning.

#### **2- Develop new knowledge and perspectives on a topic**

Presentations offer opportunities for developing skills and knowledge together. The topic of the presentation can strengthen learning and enthusiasm for further knowledge. If the presentation is effective, the audience should have learned something new and increased their interest about the topic.

#### **3-Practise in a known environment/situation**

Presentations offer opportunities for students to practise performing in a fairly safe environment. When the learner has to prepare several presentations on a course, the student will begin to develop the essential skills and transfer these from presentation to presentation. The academic environment will probably be familiar to him.

#### **4- Increasing confidence to speak and present in front of an audience**

Well-managed presentations, as part of academic courses, can be used developmentally to improve both skills and confidence levels. The learner may be able

to demonstrate his personality in a way that is not possible as a passive listener in a lecture. Presentations can help learner to be noticed and stand out from the rest of the group. The presentation will enable him to show his individuality. He can learn to deal with nervousness in a positive way that can help to reduce his fears and anxieties.

### **5- Improving marks earned for a module assessment**

Sometimes, the presentations give the student opportunities for earning a higher percentage of marks than for written work alone. Students who prefer to speak rather than write, may be better communicators and presenters in their use of speech or visuals than in a written mode.

### **6- Developing a wide range of communication and presentation skills**

The learner may need to think about his own skills and preferences for how he communicates. Presentations can help him to communicate using different media formats. They also give him opportunities to practise performing in public and develop his speech.

### **7- Preparation for skills needed in the workplace**

Many organizations and schools seek confident candidates and use presentations as a part of their selection procedures. Preparing and delivering presentations, this can help student to be a more competent and confident candidate for interviews. They offer opportunities to develop his team working and project management skills.

#### **2.1.16. Examples of student presentations**

Chivers and Shoolbred (2007:10) found it useful to read through the examples to provide learners some useful tips for delivering effective presentations. These examples are:

- a- A Viva to present an overview of one's research
- b- A seminar presentation
- c- A group presentation on a topic allocated to the group
- d- A demonstration of one's skills in using equipment
- e- Non-assessed presentations to report research progress.
- f- An individual presentation for a job interview

### 2.1.17. Why Seminar presentations

Wallwork (2010:15) states that a student may be asked to give a seminar presentation, either individually or as one of a pair of students. In either case, the student or presenter will be marked not only on his subject matter but also on the way in which he delivers his talk, principally the way in which the presenter creates a rapport with the audience, his voice and body language. Thus, there will be many basic criteria that will assess the effectiveness of the learner presentation.

Siddons (2008:36) indicates that in a seminar presentation, the presenter may be asked to prepare an introduction to a topic, or put forward a point of view. The student may prepare his own material without reference to his partner, but it's as well to think together about questions and which aspects of your material are most likely to be controversial. In this kind of presentation (and indeed in all kinds) the learner must remain calm and rational. Thus, the presenter ought to deliver his presentation in a controlled and courteous way, although not necessarily without personal feeling. However the presenter always dislikes the points put forward by the other speaker, so the presenter has to treat them seriously and thoughtfully. In making this type of presentation, the student may have to speak for 15–20 minutes and he will be using notes rather than a full script.

Chivers and Shoolbred (21: 2007) explain that these characteristics are given in the order of preparing and delivering the presentation rather than in any order of importance.

- a- Careful planning and preparation
- b- Good time management
- c- Relevant and interesting content
- d- Clear structure
- e- Good communication skills
- f- Appropriate use of technologies
- g- Clear supporting documentation
- h- Suitable audience participation

### **2.1.18. Ten Steps for Preparing your Presentation**

Emden and Becker (2004:67) show that "Good preparation and planning are essential for successful presentations. The quality of your presentation usually reflects the amount of preparation the student has done. Many students feel overwhelmed with the work needed for a presentation and may not know how to approach the task. Some students underestimate the amount of preparation needed to give their academic presentations". Thus, the researcher explained that students should follow the ten-step plan:-

- 1- Read and re-read the briefing details for the presentation.
- 2- Create a task list or mind map.
- 3- Create a time chart.
- 4- Review your existing knowledge of the topic.
- 5- Research and read to gain new knowledge.
- 6- Decide on the balance of the content.
- 7- Find relevant examples.
- 8- Identify your audience.
- 9- Create the content, visual aids and documentation.
- 10- Rehearse the presentation.

### **2.1.19. Different styles of learners**

Chivers and Shoolbred (2007:137) mention that learning theory is a fast evolving area. The majority of students experience the world in different ways and they are likely to be inclined to use one of their senses more than the others. The following are different sorts of learners.

#### **1- Visual learners**

Wallwork (2010:123) clarifies that some of students are highly visual. Visual students and thinkers need to see visual explanations, for instance using PowerPoint, charts or diagrams. They are very aware of what is going on around them, and the room in which they are learning. They enjoy seeing colours being used, for example, with posters, a flipchart or videos.

## **2- Auditory learners**

Wallwork (2010:125) states that some of learners are auditory, that is, their first reaction is likely to be through their sense of hearing. So they remember sounds, they enjoy having explanations told to other students and the learners react really well to discussion, conversation and certain kinds of background music in the classroom. They often react very badly to external noises.

## **3- Read/write learners**

Siddons (2008:76) shows that these learners like words. They make lists, take notes, underline, and they actually read the handouts. They enjoy working from manuals and work-books. They feel disturbed when they are told that they cannot take notes. When they are presented with visual representations, they might want to change diagrams into words to make understanding easier.

## **4- Kinaesthetic learners**

Chivers and Shoolbred (2007:140) explain that some students are primarily kinaesthetic, that is, they are very physical and aware of their bodies. They might be very active in class and want to do things to move, to touch, to experiment, to learn by doing. The learners appreciate any kind of tactile activity in the presentation. Some students will be more energetic learners than others.

### **2.1.20. Good communication skills**

#### **Communicative Competence**

Language is different from other subjects because language is basically used to communicate with other people in order to explain people's language ability. Hymes (1972:4) distinguishes between the term 'competence' and 'performance'. In his view, competence refers to "the speaker-hearer's knowledge of his language" while performance refers to "the actual use of language in concrete situations".

Canale and Swain (1980:32) suggest four components of communicative competence:

1. Grammatical competence. Knowledge of the sentence structure of a language.
2. Sociolinguistic competence. Ability to use language appropriate to a given context, taking into account the roles of the participants, the setting and the purpose of the interaction.
3. Discourse competence. Ability to recognize different patterns of discourse, to connect sentences of utterances to an overall theme to topic; the ability to infer the meaning of large units of spoken or written texts.
4. Strategic competence. Ability to compensate for imperfect knowledge of linguistic, sociolinguistic, and discourse rules or limiting factors in their application such as fatigue, distraction or inattention.

Savignon (1984:249) defines the communicative competence as "the expression, interpretation and negotiation of meaning involving interaction between two or more persons or between one person and a written or oral text". She believes that the goal of any language teaching program needs to be the development of this communicative competence of learners: the expression, interpretation and negotiation of meaning.

Chivers and Shoolbred (25: 2007) state that for communication to be effective, the content needs to be clearly understood, meaningful and interesting to the audience. Effective communication in presentations needs a combination of content that fits the purpose, and good presentation and communication skills. There are many influences on how well students communicate and on how well they are understood by our audience. It is useful to consider these influences under three broad areas:

#### **1- Verbal communications:**

- a- Limit one's use of jargon.
- b- Explain new or complex terms.
- c- Speak clearly.
- d- Use an interesting tone of voice.
- e- Finish sentences.

## **2- Visual communications**

(Savignon, 1984:46).stated that when the student thinks about what makes presentations effective, it will be useful to consider how the learner can use images to communicate more effectively. At this stage it will be useful to remember these principles:

- a- Use images to improve understanding.
- b- Use images to save time.
- c- Use images for interest.
- d- Use images for impact.

## **3- Non-verbal communications**

The learner will also need to think about non-verbal communication, that is how the student communicates using body language. The student may not have the time to read about it while preparing your presentation. However, there are some key principles that the students can use to improve their non-verbal communication during the presentation.

- a- Choose whether to stand or sit.
- b- Keep still.
- c- Keep their hands still.



### **1.1.21. Conclusion**

The researcher discussed in the first part of this chapter the theoretical framework of related literature that dealt with necessary issues related to learning difficulties and the classification of learning difficulties and the difference between learning difficulties and learning problems. Then, the researcher talked about academic oral presentation and communication skills. The researcher discussed academic oral presentation as a type of assessment, constituents of the presentation and what constitutes a professional presentation. Then, the researcher shed light on the purposes of student presentations, examples of student presentations, benefits of student presentations, steps for preparing one's presentation and what are effective presentations. Finally, the researcher explained the different styles of learning and good communication skills to give English majors a comprehensive vision of the academic oral presentation of English university students.

## **Review of Previous studies**

### **2.2. An Overview of Previous studies**

EFL oral presentations do play an important role in foreign language learning. On the one hand, it requires EFL learners to have a mastery of the language required for presentation. At the same time, one still cannot make high-quality oral presentations only with high linguistic proficiency. One also needs to be familiar with criteria of the academic oral presentation because oral presentation has specific criteria that any presenter should follow. Therefore, studies on oral presentations will enable researchers to investigate both the linguistic and the cultural development of EFL learners. So far, only a few studies have been conducted on English majors' oral presentations. Most of these studies mainly focus on how to teach the students effective oral presentation skills. Thus, this chapter deals with some previous studies that were conducted to recognize the importance of academic oral presentation. Most of these studies are presented under two titles:

- The previous studies related to oral performance
- The previous studies related to academic oral presentation.

#### **2.2.1. Previous studies related to the oral performance**

##### **2.2.1.1 Kidder, (2008)**

This study investigates the viability of the Collaborative Reasoning (CR) approach to discussion as a way to foster advanced oral proficiency and performance via use of the target language. Thus, another aspect of this study was its attempt, through Collaborative Reasoning, to bridge the long-standing gap between language and the use of the language in oral communicative way. The results of this study suggest that the CR framework is a viable means of providing opportunities for authentic communication between students and provide opportunities for students to state and defend opinions using the target language. An additional finding was that the CR discussions elicited examples of students supporting each other linguistically. This occurred during discussions when a speaker struggled to find the right vocabulary word or grammatical form. This study also examines the students' responses to CR. The

study findings suggest that the students appreciated the opportunity to share their thoughts and opinions with their classmates. Specifically, the students appreciated having specific expressions to use when expressing their ideas in CR discussions. Most of the students responded positively to the comprehensive nature of the CR discussion framework. The study extends the knowledge theoretically by highlighting that collaboration through active discourse in a foreign language literature course and providing opportunities for students to develop their ability to formulate and express ideas in the target language.

#### **2.2.1.2. Galloway (2007)**

Since the field of computer assisted language learning (CALL) has expanded rapidly over the last few years, this study focuses on guidelines regarding oral proficiency because much of the research has been aimed at improving written communication skills and little has been done to address the issue of increasing oral proficiency. The research suggests a set of guidelines so that rational choices can be made from the various technologies available. It identifies the requirements for effective multimedia and introduces solutions. The study attempts to demonstrate the potential of multimedia for improving the speaking skills and oral performance of second language learners. It also confirms that well designed and used multimedia can assist language instructors to bring learners together so that they can improve their speaking skills. This study provides teachers and designers alike with a set of preliminary guidelines for using or developing multimedia to improve the speaking and oral skills of their own second language learners.

#### **2.2.1.3. Chiu et al (2007)**

This study attempts to examine the effects of the very developed and sophisticated multimedia technologies in an EFL learners oral competence. The research states that one of the promising tech in computer-assisted language learning is the application of Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) technology that assist learners to engage in meaningful speech interactions. The study suggests that simulated real-life conversation supported by the application of ASR is helpful for speaking. In this study, a web-based conversation environment called Candle Talk, which allows learners to talk with the computer, was developed to help EFL learners receive explicit speech acts training that leads to better oral competence. The study clarifies that Candle Talk is equipped with an

ASR engine that judges whether learners provide appropriate input. In this study, six speech acts are presented as the core of the materials with local cultural information incorporated as the content of the dialogues to enhance student motivation. The participants were 29 English major and 20 non-English major students in order to investigate their learning outcome and perception in an EFL context. The study used two instruments for data collection. The first is oral proficiency assessment using the format of the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) given before and after the use of Candle Talk. The other is an evaluation questionnaire. The results of the study showed that the application of ASR was helpful for the college freshmen, particularly for the non-English major students. Most learners perceived positively toward the instruction supported with speech recognition.

#### **2.2.1.4. Tanveer (2007)**

The study shows that feelings of anxiety, apprehension and nervousness are commonly expressed by second/foreign language learners in learning to speak a second/foreign language. These feelings are considered to exert a potentially negative and detrimental effect on the oral communication in the target language. The study explains that the use of modern communicative language teaching approaches in the language classrooms and the wide-spread use of English Language have increased the demand to learn good oral communication skills. This study has attempted to investigate the factors that language anxiety can possibly stem from, both within the classroom environment and out of classroom in the wider social context, and has recommended a variety of strategies to cope with it. This study used a qualitative semi-structured interview format and focus-group discussion technique to investigate the issue. The findings of this study suggest that language difficulty and anxiety can originate from learners' own sense of 'self', their self-related cognitions, language learning difficulties, differences in learners' and target language cultures, differences in social status of the speakers and interlocutors. The study recommends that teachers ought to find the factors causing anxiety and difficulty through the oral communication in order to remove them, then enhance learners' communication abilities in the target language.

### **2.2.1.5. Hong (2006)**

This study suggests that using CMC (Computer Mediated Communication) in teaching pronunciation and conversation can improve students' oral skill at the universities in Vietnam. The study finds that the problems emerge in a large number of graduates who have difficulty with communicating in English. So, utilizing technology, where it is available and accessible, in teaching EFL can contribute in solving these problems. The study comes after the findings from recent research at the university which shows that over three quarters of graduate students can not communicate verbally in English because of shyness, inadequate vocabulary, or simply lacking the necessary knowledge. The study shows that most of them wish that they had been taught speaking skills more properly at university. In this study, students list a number of reasons for this. For example, during lectures, Vietnamese rather than English is mostly spoken, both by teachers and students. The study also shows that students do not have opportunities to communicate in English and they may be shy because the others cannot understand what they wish to communicate. The study calls teachers at the university to get advantage of using CMC/ CALL in order to teach standard spoken English to their students. The study suggests that teachers also should be aware of the fast development of technology and discover the latest application of CALL in their teaching contexts. The research claims CALL (Computer Assisted Language Learning) to be the best choice for training in pronunciation. Moreover, the study sheds light on other technologies to improve students' communication skills. When students can start to communicate verbally in English, internet conferences like Skype can be the place where they can meet and talk with foreigners to improve their communication ability and oral performance in English as well as open their knowledge horizons.

### **2.2.1.6. Woodrow (2006)**

The research studies 275 EFL students who participated in an English-for-Academic-Purpose course in an Australian university. The study finds that anxiety that occurs when the learners speak foreign language correlated negatively with oral performance. The study shows that there was negative relationship between anxiety and speaking performance. The study explains that speaking English in front of the class can arouse fairly high levels of anxiety in students. The study also shows that presenters showed significantly higher levels of anxiety when audience showing negative or

unfavorable response. The study explains that anxiety has been found to correlate negatively with performance variables such as language classroom oral performance. In this study, Task characteristics also play a role in foreign language classroom anxiety and communicative anxiety. It is commonly found that those tasks require individual performance from the students. The study recommends that instructors should remove the sources of anxiety and difficulties to enable the students to do effective oral performance.

#### **2.2.1.7. Barr et al (2005)**

This research reports on a pilot project delivered to first year undergraduate French students. The project aim was to deliver a blend of collaborative and individual learning through a combination of CALL programs and online activities alongside traditional face-to-face conversation classes. The study used both quantitative and qualitative methods (including four different ways of data collection: questionnaire, ICT-use survey, journals and pre-and posttest) to examine the following questions: (1) Does computer technology enhance significantly progress in students' oral language development? (2) What factors may affect students' oral language development when using computers? (3) How do staff and students react to the use of computer technology for oral language development? The study shows that using quantitative analysis of a pre- and posttest and a variety of questionnaires, contribute in developing oral skills and students' progress across two groups of students. The results in this study show that the comparison group made significantly more progress than the treatment group, which also made progress. The researcher comments on the results saying that they cannot be generalized due to the small sample used in the study and other reasons. Despite the inconclusive findings of the paper, the results show that students in general welcome the use of computer technology to enhance oral skills and they saw the benefits of using computer technology for drilling oral skills such as pronunciation.

#### **2.2.1.8. Tsutsui (2004)**

This study suggests using multimedia software as a better solution for interactive feedback in oral performance. The researcher claims that the most common feedback method for oral performance cannot be used in activities that do not allow for instructor-student interaction, such as speeches and presentations where feedback should occur after the performance. The conventional ways of providing post-performance or delayed

feedback, however, are neither efficient nor effective due to a variety of problems, for example, the time lag from performance to performance review by the instructor and the student. Recognizing that a multimedia tool could significantly enhance delayed feedback, the Technical Japanese Program at the University of Washington developed a software tool to provide such feedback. This study first identifies the requirements for an effective delayed feedback tool, and then introduces this software tool and discusses the theoretical basis for its development to demonstrate the potential of multimedia technology for use in delayed feedback.

The researcher concludes that the multimedia application discussed in the paper not only satisfies the requirements identified as fundamental for a delayed feedback tool to be effective and usable, it also appears theoretically sound, exhibiting a number of merits for L2 learning from a theoretical point of view. Moreover, the study indicates that multimedia technology has great potential in enabling us to create tools which can significantly enhance delayed feedback and oral communicative ability and multimedia tools can provide the means for much needed empirical research on delayed feedback.

#### **2.2.1.9. Cheng et al. (1999),**

The researchers study a group of Taiwanese university students and found a significant negative correlation between self-perceived speaking competence and foreign language classroom anxiety. The study shows that the significant negative correlation found between foreign language classroom anxiety and speaking performance. The study indicates that an anxious individual tends to have poorer speaking and oral performance. The researchers explain the relationship between second language classroom anxiety and second language writing anxiety and their relationships with speaking and writing achievements. The study finds that the statistical results correlate with both the speaking and writing course grades. However, the findings correlate with the speaking course grades more strongly than with the writing course grades. The study clarifies that self-perceived language competence has also been found to predict anxiety consistently. The researchers recommend that teachers ought to develop the students' abilities in speaking and oral performance. This may take place when the teachers find possible ways to reduce anxiety and psychological barriers.

#### **2.2.1.10. Saito and Samimy (1996),**

The researchers study a group of learners in a Japanese university. Participants at three proficiency levels, that of beginners, intermediate and the advanced level, were studied for their levels of foreign language classroom anxiety and oral performance. The study finds that language anxiety is the best predictor of course performance for the intermediate and the advanced students, but not for the beginners. The researchers explain that this finding in terms of the experience with learning the foreign language. The study show that beginning students have not had much experience, either positive or negative, for anxiety to play a role in affecting their emotion. Therefore, the study suggests that language anxiety is a significant predictor in decreasing the oral performance level of the students in intermediate and advanced learners of language.

#### **2.2.1.11. Richmond and McCroskey (1995),**

This study investigates American students' public speaking anxiety. In this study, students generally have a tendency to avoid public speaking, and for them, although some public speaking situations may be manageable, most situations will be very problematic. In this study, the second year students show moderately low level of anxiety, suggesting that most situations won't be anxiety-provoking for them. The researchers show that students generally feel anxious when they speak in public and also deliver a presentation in front of other students and their professors and this leads to poor oral performance. The study suggests that the instructors have to prepare their students psychologically by giving them frequent chances to deliver the presentations in front of their colleagues, and get them familiar with the oral tasks as a good type of public speech.

#### **2.2.1.12. Young (1990),**

The researcher shows that professor's non-threatening error correction approach and friendly personality might have served to reduce the students' anxiety. The study surveyed students' views towards instructor's characteristics and behaviour that reduce their foreign language classroom anxiety. The study shows that the top three characteristics were good sense of humour, friendly, and relaxed might have served to reduce the students' anxiety. The study also shows that there were many various difficulties in the oral performance such as giving a presentation. Moreover, the study



indicates that speaking activities, such as giving a presentation or creating a dialogue have been identified as the most anxiety-provoking activity in a foreign language classroom. The study explains that students ought to prepare their oral tasks in light of specific criteria. The study finds that 58% of all responses of the participants in the study were related to error correction. Within the error correction category, the two most frequently commented behaviour was the instructors attitude towards student mistakes, instructor has attitude that mistakes are no big deal and instructor has attitude that mistakes are made by everyone. The researcher clarifies that a non-harsh error correction approach and a friendly, patient manner were regarded as major stress-reducing characteristics of an instructor. The study finds that students felt more relaxed when they had prepared a great deal.

## **2.2.2. Previous studies related to academic oral presentation**

### **2.2.2.1. Chen (2009)**

This study aims to investigate graduate students' anxiety level and identify sources of difficulties and anxiety for academic oral presentation. The researcher shows that the students were moderately anxious, suggesting that the anxiety level was not too severe for the students to cope with. The study clarifies that there were two clusters of difficulties found to contribute to students' anxiety – social and psychological. Social factors included peers' response and audience familiarity; whereas psychological factors included self-perceived oral proficiency, self-perceived accuracy of pronunciation, and self-perceived personality. Moreover, the study shows that first year students in TEFL program of the university were found to be more anxious than the second year students and factors such as peers' response and preparedness played a more important role for them. The study suggests that it is important for teachers to reduce first year students' anxiety by creating a supportive and low-threat classroom so that the students may feel more at ease. The researcher recommends that teachers may also inform students of the importance of preparation as a stress-coping strategy to get rid of the anxiety and difficulty in the process of giving the academic oral presentation.

#### **2.2.2.2. Wang (2009)**

The study shows that in recent years, researchers have started to address the under-researched issues of academic oral language development. In this study, Chinese students find themselves facing a significant challenge when English becomes the medium of instruction in their new academic community not only for written but also for spoken tasks. The study focuses on one particular oral activity-oral presentations. This study explores how Chinese graduate students are socialized into the academic community of which they are to become members, what language difficulties these students have, and how these students improve their language use during this discourse socialization process. The results of the study indicate that Chinese graduate students' prior academic experience did not prepare them for this particular activity of oral presentations; and participants were socialized into the academic community through observations, peer support, expert assistance and practice. However, the socialization process for individual participants varied greatly depending on both their individual agency and assistance available to them. The study explains that oral presentations, as a complex activity, requires the participants to learn the linguistic rules of English language and relevant culture embedded within it to perform the task.

#### **2.2.2.3. Otoshi and Heffernen (2008)**

This study outlines and explores what factors EFL learners consider to be important when making presentations. A questionnaire was used to discover what components were considered to be important to learners in doing effective English presentations. The results of the study indicate that the participants consider the following three factors as the major criteria for effective English oral presentations: clarity of speech and voice quality; correctness of language; and interaction with the audience. The researchers explore which aspects of oral presentations Japanese university students view to be most effective. Incorporating students' ideas while establishing the criteria for presentations is an important factor when considering a learner-centered approach in EFL classes. Therefore, this study suggests specific ideas as to how to carry out oral presentation activities using student-established evaluation criteria. One aim of the study suggests a set of specific recommendations such as using specific criteria of the presentation to improve peer assessment activities for oral presentations. The researchers recommend peer evaluation can be a valuable method in assisting EFL learners in how to properly structure English oral presentations. The study

shows that learners gain a firm knowledge of the form and process of what makes an effective oral presentation. By involving them in the process of actually creating the rubrics to be used in evaluating their peers, the study suggests that teachers should give their learners an opportunity to gain independence while learning more about exactly what makes a successful presentation.

#### **2.2.2.4. Wu (2008)**

This study is an exploratory study that was conducted on students' behavior and belief about academic oral presentations. The study shows that five Taiwanese TESOL graduate students were studied. The study finds that academic oral presentations involved complex and constant decision-makings for the students from the beginning – the preparation stage, to the final stage – the presenting stage. The study indicates that based on a student's account, the presenting stage was likely the most anxiety-provoking stage because much of the decision-making was required immediately. Moreover, the study also shows that a discrepancy existed between the instructor and the students about what constitutes an academic oral presentation and its goal. This may also contribute to students' anxiety about oral presentations because students were likely uncertain about the quality of their preparation and performance. The researcher explains that Oral presentation is a common task in graduate seminars in which presenters lead seminar discussion. In this study, an oral presentation may seem to be a straightforward activity involving understanding the assigned material, summarizing it and presenting it to the instructor and classmates. However, the research shows that oral presentation requires frequent practice and decision making for it to be successful.

#### **2.2.2.5. Zappa-Hollman (2007)**

The researcher explores the discourse socialization of six non-native graduate students in their disciplines at a Canadian university. Using a qualitative multiple-case approach, the author extended the studies conducted by Morita (2000) and Kobayashi (2003). The study finds that non-native graduate students considered their academic discourse socialization a complex process and therefore challenging. This was the case even for some highly English proficient students. Some other students resisted this kind of activity. However, so far, there are almost no language socialization studies carried out with Chinese graduate students who comprise a big part of the international student population except Morita (2000) who has only 2 Chinese students among her 21

participants and Zappa-Hollman (2007) with 2 among her 6 participants. The study shows that the researcher is not sure whether different populations in different contexts would still yield similar socialization process. Other studies with Chinese graduate students as participants can expand research in this area. These studies would contribute in the study of language socialization through oral presentations and build on the present theories.

#### **2.2.2.6. Cheng & Warren (2005)**

The study focuses on the use of an integrated method of feedback: one in which learners write an outline for their presentations first, evaluate each others' work, and then make their presentations based on the corrections given by their peers in order to overcome the difficulties facing students in giving the academic oral presentations. After that, the study shows that Learners then do their presentations in-class while the teacher and the other students evaluate that presentation using rubrics they have had. The researchers suggest that if teachers take time to demonstrate, use eye contact, organize a presentation, connect with an audience, use body language and manage time, and how to construct an effective PowerPoint presentation they will give excellent academic presentations.. Thus, the researchers ensure that teachers expend the correct amount of time and energy into giving our learners the steps and criteria they need to become effective presenters in the target language. The learners can build upon their existing knowledge to use in future presentations. The study clarifies that there has been a marked increase in the popularity of peer-evaluation activities in EFL classes. So a more thorough look at peer assessment for EFL oral presentations is warranted. Advocates of peer assessment highlight learner autonomy as one of the benefits of conducting this type of evaluation. Thus, the study indicates that learners can become more cognizant of exactly what they are learning through peer assessment activities. In addition, there is a general consensus that involving students in their own correction is helpful in developing skills of academic presentation that are useful in academic life. The researchers recommend that peer-evaluation gives the benefit of learners learning from their peers while being actively involved in their classmates' work.

### **2.2.2.7. Kobayashi (2005)**

The study clarifies a more comprehensive version of students' collaboration in accomplishing academic tasks through oral presentations. In this study, the researcher explores a group of Japanese undergraduate ESL students' language socialization through group project work during their yearlong academic studies in a content-based ESL program at a Canadian University. The study also shows that the researcher not only documented the students' participation and growth within the classroom but his study went beyond the classroom and gathered data from students' preparation of the tasks after class. The study focuses mainly on the students' participation in the community, collaboration with peers and personal transformation; that is, the main focus of the study was the socialization part of the language socialization process. The researcher finds that a "good" oral presentation should have the following features: critical reflection; relevance to the course; references; new information; audience engagement and involvement; performance; clarity of speech; organization; presentation aids and transitions between aids. All of these are some macro-level features of a good oral presentation. This study is the only study so far that analyzed some linguistic data of the participants. The researcher examines oral presentations from a functional linguistic perspective to involve the audience and how the students manage their presentation discourse. The researcher touches on the textual aspects of participants and he examined the students' preparation of the presentations and also he discussed the students' oral presentation performance.

### **2.2.2.8. Zhou (2004)**

This research studies some students from China who speak English as their second language. These students are not proficient enough to meet the standard college requirement. The study shows that students from China describe their experiences of frustrations and anxiety during presentations. In this study, interviews and data collection were conducted with 30 students who enrolled in a course titled "English as a Second Language" at Marietta College. The study explains that pronunciation, unfamiliar cultural content, heavy accents and anxiety because of speaking a second language play roles in their communication and presentation problems and difficulties. The researcher believes that learning English as a second language is the most difficult obstacle to overcome during their academic studies, especially in the Business and Marketing majors. The study suggests some speaking strategies such simulation, role

play, academic presentations and dialogues. These strategies will develop the learners' abilities in oral communication in general and the oral presentations in particular. The students should practice using these techniques in order to develop their abilities in giving the presentation in front of class

#### **2.2.2.9. Derwing (2003)**

The researcher clarifies that how to represent oneself to others is voluntary. The study explains that people tend to hold biases with regard to accented speech; the further the accent is from their own, the more likely they are to experience negative reaction to it. Listeners judge people to be less educated and less intelligent based on their poor language speaking. The study clarifies that there are two reasons that indicate why students from China are afraid of giving presentations and feeling with some difficulties during the class. These reasons are the fear of negative evaluations and making errors. The study shows that it is very common that foreign or second language learners are afraid of negative evaluation which is likely to cause frustration and anxiety to students that will affect their academic and personal performances and competencies. The researcher also shows that second language learners keep making all kinds of errors whether these errors are psychological or linguistic during the presentation. Thus, the study explains that errors can be the source of anxiety in some individuals because they draw attention to the difficulty of making positive social impression when speaking a new language.

#### **2.2.2.10. Kobayashi (2003)**

The researcher examines how three Japanese undergraduates collaborated with each other after class to accomplish the task of academic oral presentations. The study shows that data sources of the study included taped observations of project work, interviews, and student journals and papers. The findings show that in preparation for their academic task after class, students negotiated a task definition, that is the students' ability to know the oral activity details they are going to present, and teacher expectations, and collaborated with each other in preparing materials and rehearsal. The study finds that both spoken and written language was employed in fulfilling the task requirement. The study clarifies that students ought to prepare the academic oral presentation in advance to present it effectively in front of the other students. The

researcher suggests that the cooperation and participation from the other students to each other develop their ability in preparing a good oral presentation.

#### **2.2.2.11. Orsmond, Merry & Reiling, (2000)**

The study shows that the first step is for teachers and learners to establish marking criteria for the presentation. Involving learners in this process will be of great benefit to them in preparing for their own presentations. The researchers explain that learners must clearly understand the criteria set out for evaluating presentations. The study recommends that teachers need to monitor that learners are using the criteria correctly and applying the tenets of the rubric in an accurate manner. The study indicates that students are able to comprehend and critically assess marking criteria that they have a hand in making, and have more difficulty in comprehending marking criteria that are imposed on them by teachers. The study explains that teachers can carry out practice sessions with their learners by having them watch and evaluate past presentations on video. Then, after the appropriate training has been completed (which may take two to three class periods), students prepare their presentations (individually or in groups) with the criteria they helped create firmly in mind. Next, learners evaluate their peer's presentations with the rubric they helped create. Finally, after the presentations are completed, learners receive their evaluation from their peers and reflect on their performance and how to improve on it. All of this can serve to be extremely useful not only to the learners in the classes, but also for the teachers.

#### **2.2.2.12. Morita (2000)**

This study is an ethnographic study conducted in a Canadian university. This study finds that academic oral presentation was challenging for both native and non-native speakers, for different reasons. The study shows that for native speakers, they experienced psychological difficulty. This refers to low confidence as a presenter. For non-native speakers, they reported experiencing three types of difficulties – linguistic, sociocultural, and psychological. The study indicates that although the non-native speakers were perceived to have displayed advanced English proficiency, the speakers themselves regarded their own English skills as the main source of difficulty. Sociocultural difficulty refers to the quick-paced, less controlled classroom interaction, compared to the one in the non-native speakers' home country. Lastly, the psychological difficulty was their own inferiority complex, and this was related with the

linguistic and sociocultural difficulties. Thus, it is not surprising that these EFL students find oral activities difficult because they are required to use a foreign language to think and to express themselves. Not only was speaking difficult, such difficulty may well accompany anxiety. The study clarifies that nonnative speakers reported experiencing linguistic, sociocultural and psychological difficulties with academic oral presentations. Therefore, it is reasonable to suspect that English foreign language speakers who engage in academic oral presentations may experience anxiety and difficulty that stems from the linguistics, the language and the complex task of communicating in public.



### **2.2.3. Commentary on previous studies related to the oral performance and also academic oral presentation**

In the second part of chapter two, the researcher reviewed twelve previous studies that were related to the oral performance of EFL learners. Then the researcher reviewed thirteen previous studies that were closely related to difficulties of the academic oral presentation. The second part of the previous studies that were related to academic oral presentation sheds lights on some essential issues that seek to pinpoint the difficulties of the academic presentation and find the possible solutions. Some studies focus on the role of psychological and social factors that contributed to students' ability in giving academic oral presentation such: peers' response, audience familiarity, self-perceived oral proficiency, self-perceived accuracy of pronunciation, and self-perceived personality. The other studies concentrate on the importance of establishing effective basic criteria for academic oral presentation in order to judge the presentation in light of these criteria and the effects of multimedia technologies on improving the oral performance and presentation of English as a Foreign Language Learners (EFL) or English as a second Language Learners (ESLL).

Almost all of the previous studies agreed on the same idea that psychological and social difficulties have more influence in giving academic oral presentation than linguistic difficulties, even to native speakers of English language. Unlike other researchers, the researcher in his study tried to shed light on the difficulties encountering junior and senior students at Al Aqsa University in giving academic oral presentation, whether these difficulties psychological, social or linguistic, so a questionnaire and interview card were specifically designed for this purpose. Moreover, first-hand data were collected to find out points of weakness and strength in order to avoid them and get rid of these difficulties and to achieve an active giving of the academic oral presentation.

This study showed that psychological difficulties played an important role in giving the academic oral presentations. In addition, linguistic difficulties also were considered as a part from the whole difficulties encountering English majors at Al Aqsa University.

The researcher, to some extent, made use of the previous studies in expecting different difficulties encountering EFL learners in giving academic oral presentations. The majority of the previous studied showed that psychological difficulties were the serious difficulties encountering English majors. These previous studies were compatible with results of this study in which psychological difficulties were the most important ones. This study was applied and administered in a completely different context that is Palestinian territories of Gaza strip. The researcher explained in his study that there were different kinds of difficulties encountering English specialists in giving academic oral presentations. The study tried to shed light on the various difficulties encountering junior and senior students at Al Aqsa university. This study tackled these difficulties encountering Palestinian EFL students at Al Aqsa university in the field of speaking English language practically, but not theoretically. The study highlighted the importance of giving academic oral presentations for EFL learners at Al Aqsa university. Therefore, the researcher recommended to increase the courses that develop the students' abilities in speaking skill which could be a key factor to improve English majors in oral communication skills in general.

The results of this study indicate that both English majors and their instructors at Al Aqsa University agree that the psychological difficulties play a significant role in the difficulties encountering the learners in giving their academic oral presentations. Also both are in consensus that it is very important to set up or create specific criteria for the academic presentation that are accepted and agreed from both the English students and their lecturers. That's why, this study examines various difficulties whether social, linguistic or psychological in order to get overlook about them and find the suitable solution and recommendation for these difficulties.

# Chapter III

## The Methodology

## Chapter III

### The Methodology

#### 3.1. Introduction

This chapter includes the procedures followed throughout the study. It introduces a complete description of the methodology of the study, the population, the sample, the instrumentation, the pilot study, a description of the questionnaire and interview card used in the study, the research design and the limitations to the study. Moreover, it introduces the statistical treatment for the study findings.

#### 3.2. Type of research design

The researcher used the descriptive approach of research to carry out the study. Brown and Rodgers (2002:117) define the descriptive research as "A research that describes group characteristics or behaviors in numerical terms". They maintain that "the descriptive statistics are those statistics used to analyze descriptive research data, usually in terms of central tendency and dispersion". This helps tackling the difficulties encountering students in giving academic oral presentation at Al Aqsa university.

#### 3.3. The population of the study

The population of the study consisted of all male or female students of English department at Al Aqsa university who registered in the second term (2010–2011). All the students of the population gave academic oral presentation in many courses such as TEFL1 and TEFL2 courses.

The population of the study was (340) students (67) males and (273) females. Table (3.1) shows the distribution of the population of the study according to gender.

**Table (3.1)**

**The distribution of the population of the study according to gender**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Male</b>	<b>67</b>	19.71%
<b>Female</b>	<b>273</b>	80.29%
<b>total</b>	<b>340</b>	100%

### **3.4. The sample of the study**

#### **3.4.1. The pilot study**

The pilot sample of the study consisted of (50) students out of the population of the study. The pilot study aims to ensure the stability of the questionnaire in the study. Table (3.2) shows the distribution of the pilot sample according to gender.

**Table (3.2)**

**The distribution of the pilot sample according to gender  
In light of the questionnaire**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Male</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>76%</b>
<b>total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### **3.4.2. Sample of the study**

The sample of the study consisted of (154) students constituting (45%) of the population of the study. These subjects were stratified random sample selected to participate in the study. The population included both male and female students who

enrolled in the second term (2010- 2011). All the students gave and are still giving academic oral presentation in many courses, so they had a previous experience delivering the academic oral presentation. Table (3.3) shows the distribution of the sample according to gender.

**Table (3.3)**

The distribution of the sample according to gender

<b>Gender</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Male</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>26.62%</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>73.38%</b>
<b>total</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>100%</b>

The students were enrolled in the academic year (2010-2011) in the third and fourth levels. Table (3.4) shows the distribution of the sample according to Classification.

**Table (3.4)**

The distribution of the sample according to classification

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Junior</b>	<b>Senior</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Male</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>total</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>154</b>

### **3.5. Instrumentation**

The researcher believes that the most suitable tool for achieving the purpose of the study is implementing a questionnaire for collecting, describing and analyzing data concerning the difficulties encountering the students in giving the academic oral presentations. Moreover, the researcher used another instrument that is the interview card in order to identify difficulties encountering students in giving academic oral presentation.

### 3.5.1. The questionnaire

The researcher used a questionnaire as a main instrument to achieve the aims of the study. Therefore, the researcher depended on different sources to construct the questionnaire:

- a) Previous studies in general.
- b) Asking an open question to students to express the difficulties encountering them in giving the academic oral presentations.
- c) Theoretical framework.

The questionnaire was developed to identify the main problems encountering students in giving the academic oral presentation. The questionnaire consisted of 35 items classified into three domains:

The first domain included difficulties related to the clarity of speech and voice quality, the second domain included difficulties related to the correctness of Language and the third domain included difficulties related to interaction with audience. The stated expressions fell in five ranks: Strongly disagree(1), disagree(2), No Opinion (3), agree(4), and Strongly agree (5). As a result, the marks of items became restricted between (35-175).

The researcher introduced the questionnaire to a panel of 9 educational referees. The referees are lecturers in the IUG, Al-Aqsa University, Al-Quds Open University and The University College of Applied sciences. The researcher also invited the referees to examine and check the interview card which was specifically designed to survey and collect data on the difficulties encountering the students of English department in giving academic oral presentation at Al Aqsa University.

The first draft of the questionnaire consisted of 38 items. The researcher modified some items in the light of the modification of referees. After modification, the number of items became 35 divided into three domains. The researcher omitted three items.

### 3.6. Validity of the questionnaire

Al Agha (1996: 118) states that a valid test is the test that measures what it is designed to measure. To validate the questionnaire, the researcher applied two types of validity: the referee validity and the internal consistency validity.

#### 3.6.1. The referee validity

The questionnaire was checked by 11 referees from the IUG, Al-Aqsa university, Al-Quds Open University and from the Ministry of Education to ensure its clarity and relevance. Ambiguous items were modified and clarified according to their suggestions. Consequently, the number of items became (35) distributed as shown in table(3.5).

**Table (3.5)**

The number of items according to the domains

Scopes	No. of items
First: Clarity of speech and voice quality:	11
Second: Correctness of language:	11
Third: Interaction with audience:	13
Total	35

#### 3.6.2. Internal consistency

Al Agha (1996:121) states that the internal consistency indicates the correlation of the degree of each item with the total average of the test. The internal validity coefficient was computed by using Pearson formula. The following tables (3.6,3.7) show the data analysis of the correlation coefficient of each item with the domain it belongs to compare the whole degree of the questionnaire by using the SPSS.



**Table (3.6)**

Correlation coefficient of the items in the first domain

No.	item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. level
1	A presentation is given in a disorganized way	0.432	sig. at 0.05
2	A presentation includes many examples and details	0.372	sig. at 0.05
3	Speakers don't outline the presentation objectives to audience	0.419	sig. at 0.05
4	Speakers don't stick to the objectives of the speech	0.382	sig. at 0.05
5	Presenter delivers the presentation with unclear and low voice	0.641	sig. at 0.01
6	Speakers speak with lack of confidence	0.685	sig. at 0.01
7	presenter hesitates while speaking and presenting	0.690	sig. at 0.01
8	presentation lacks a good connection of ideas	0.516	sig. at 0.01
9	Speakers don't use appropriate transitional words and clear signals	0.414	sig. at 0.05
10	Student is unfamiliar with the criteria of effective oral presentation	0.637	sig. at 0.01
11	Students fear negative evaluation and comments	0.664	sig. at 0.01

r table value at df (28) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.361

r table value at df (28) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.463

**Table (3.7)**

Correlation coefficient of the items in the second domain

No.	item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. level
12	A presentation is delivered with incorrect pronunciation.	0.723	sig. at 0.01
13	Lack of appropriate vocabulary and expressions used in a presentation.	0.507	sig. at 0.01
14	Students make grammar mistakes during the presentation.	0.493	sig. at 0.01
15	Students rarely speak English in social interactions	0.566	sig. at 0.01

No.	item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. level
	and contexts.		
16	The communicative competence of the students is low.	0.658	sig. at 0.01
17	Speaking proficiency of the Students' is weak.	0.589	sig. at 0.01
18	Student focuses on the grammar accuracy more than fluency.	0.540	sig. at 0.01
19	Lack of appropriate structures and discourse markers to express ideas.	0.427	sig. at 0.05
20	Student suffers from interlingual mistakes while presenting.	0.521	sig. at 0.01
21	Students are unfamiliar with free oral and speaking activities.	0.414	sig. at 0.05
22	Weakness of student knowledge in comparative linguistics.	0.456	sig. at 0.05

r table value at df (28) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.361

r table value at df (28) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.463

**Table (3.8)**

Correlation coefficient of the items in the third domain

No.	item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. level
23	Student rarely interacts orally with their instructors in many courses	0.500	sig. at 0.01
24	Presenter is unable to use tools such LCD and powerpoint effectively	0.404	sig. at 0.05
25	Lack of courses that develop the speaking and conversational skills	0.464	sig. at 0.01
26	Speakers don't act cheerfully and smile when speaking	0.615	sig. at 0.01
27	Speakers don't keep eye-contact with audience	0.519	sig. at 0.01
28	Lack of using body language and gestures while speaking	0.463	sig. at 0.01
29	Weakness of rapport between the students	0.471	sig. at 0.01

30	Interruption from audience during presentation	0.486	sig. at 0.01
31	Lack of motivation towards giving the academic oral presentation	0.386	sig. at 0.01
32	Students don't use English language in their real-life situations	0.540	sig. at 0.01
33	Student doesn't practice giving the presentation solo or with peers	0.369	sig. at 0.05
34	Student doesn't have the right to choose the topics in certain courses	0.464	sig. at 0.01
35	Weakness of academic interaction between students outside the class	0.534	sig. at 0.01

r table value at df (28) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.361

r table value at df (28) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.463

The results of tables (3,6,3,7,3,8) show that the value of these items were suitable and highly consistent and valid for conducting this study.

The researcher also made sure of the correlation between the three domains with the total score of the questionnaire as shown in table (3.9).

**Table (3.9)**

Correlation between the three domains with the total score of the questionnaire

Domains	SUM	First	Second	Third
First: Clarity of speech and voice quality	0.828	1		
Second: Correctness of Language	0.935	0.694	1	
Third: Interaction with audience	0.872	0.508	0.771	1

r table value at df (28) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.361

r table value at df (28) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.463

As shown in the table (3.9), there is a correlation between the three domains and the total degree and each domain with the other domain at sig. level (0.01) that shows a high internal consistency of the questionnaire which reinforces the validity of the questionnaire.

### 3.7. Reliability of the questionnaire

The test is reliable when it gives the same results if it is reapplied in the same conditions ( Al-Agha,1996:118). The researcher used the pilot study to calculate the reliability of the questionnaire which was measured by Alpha Cronbck and split-half methods.

#### 3.7.1. Split-half method

The researcher calculated the correlation between the first, second and third field of each domain of the questionnaire and the whole of the questionnaire. Then, the researcher used Gutman Formula to modify the length of the questionnaire to find out the reliability coefficient as shown in table (3.10).

(Table 3.10)

Correlation coefficient between the three domains of each domain before modification and the reliability after modification

Scope	Number of items	Correlation	Reliability after modification
First: Clarity of speech and voice quality	11	0.633	0.638
Second: Correctness of Language	11	0.772	0.797
Third: Interaction with audience	13	0.690	0.705
Total	35	0.794	0.801

The table shows that the reliability coefficient by using split- half after modification more than (0.540) and this indicates that the questionnaire is reliable and the researcher is satisfied to apply it on the sample of the study.

### 3.7.2. Alpha Cronback Method

A total sample of 50 students participated in testing the reliability of the questionnaire, Alpha formula was used to determine the reliability of the questionnaire as shown in table (3.11).

**Table (3.11)**

Alpha Correlation Coefficient of the questionnaire Reliability

Scope	Number of Items	Alpha kronbach
First: Clarity of speech and voice quality	11	0.623
Second: Correctness of Language	11	0.743
Third: Interaction with audience	13	0.647
Total	35	0.857

The results of table (3.11) show that the ranges of reliability of the three domains were above 0.0688. Those results indicate that the questionnaire was suitable for conducting such study. The reliability of the questionnaire was measured by Alpha Cronback and the split-half methods.

### 3.8. The interview card

The researcher used an interview card as another instrument to achieve the aims of the study. Therefore, the researcher depended on different sources to construct the interview card:

- a) Previous studies in general.
- b) Theoretical framework.

The interview card was developed in light of the main criteria of the academic oral presentation and the researcher used some minor criteria derived from the main ones to identify and elicit the main difficulties encountering English department students in delivering the academic oral presentation. The interview card consisted of 18

items classified in light of the 6 basic criteria of the academic oral presentation. The researcher will elicit difficulties through the 6 main criteria of giving the academic presentation. The stated expressions fell in three ranks: excellent (1), good (2), poor (3). The researcher introduced the interview card to a panel of nine educational referees. The referees are lecturers in the IUG, Al-Aqsa University, Al-Quds Open University and the Ministry of Education.

The researcher also invited the referees to examine and check the interview card which was specifically designed to survey and elicit data on the difficulties encountering the students of English department in delivering the academic presentations at Al Aqsa University.

The first draft of the interview card consisted of 20 items. The researcher modified some items according to the guidance of referees. After modification, the number of items became 18 items that are closely related to the 6 basic criteria of the academic oral presentation.

### 3.9. The sample of the study

#### 3.9.1. The pilot study

The pilot sample of the study consisted of (15) students out of the same population of the study. The pilot study aims to ensure the reliability and the stability of the interview card in the study. Table (3.2) shows the distribution of the pilot sample according to gender.

**Table (3.12)**

The distribution of the pilot sample according to gender

In light of the interview card

Gender	No.	%
Male	5	33.5%
Female	10	66.5%
total	15	100%

### 3.9.2. Sample of the study

The sample of the study consisted of (47) students from the same sample of the questionnaire of the study. These subjects were stratified random sample selected to participate in the study. The population included both male and female students who enrolled in the second term (2010- 2011). All the students gave and are still giving academic oral presentation in many courses ,so they had experience with delivering the academic oral presentation. Table (3.13) shows the distribution of the sample according to gender.

**Table (3.13)**

The distribution of the sample according to gender  
In light of the interview card

<b>Gender</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Male</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>Female</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>62%</b>
<b>total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>

### 3.10. Validity of the interview card

Al Agha (1996: 118) states that valid test is the test that measures what it is designed to measure. To validate the interview card, the researcher applied two types of validity: the referee validity and the internal consistency validity.

#### 3.10.1. The referee validity

The interview card was checked by 9 referees from the IUG, Al-Aqsa university, The University College of Applied Sciences, Al-Quds Open University and from the Ministry of Education to ensure its clarity and relevance. Ambiguous minor items were modified and clarified according to their suggestions and in the light of the main criteria. Consequently, the number of items became (18) distributed as shown in table(3.14).

**Table (3.14)**

The number of items according to the domains

Scopes	No. of items
Originality of content	3
Correctness of language	4
Clarity of speech	3
Visual aids	3
Body language	3
Time management	2
SUM	18

### 3.10.2 Internal consistency:

Al Agha (1996: 110) refers that the internal consistency indicates the correlation of the degree of each item with the total of the interview card. The internal validity coefficient was computed by using Pearson formula. The following table (3.15) show the data analysis of the correlation coefficient of each item with the scope it belongs to compare the whole degree of the interview card by using the SPSS.

**Table (3.15)**

Pearson Correlation coefficient of the whole items with the total score of the whole domains

Item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. level
1- Is there a good choice of the topic?	0.604	sig. at 0.05
2- Are the objectives clear?	0.826	sig. at 0.01
3- Is the purpose statement of the presentation explicit?	0.579	sig. at 0.05
1- Is there a clear pronunciation?	0.698	sig. at 0.01
2- Is there an appropriate use of vocabulary?	0.567	sig. at 0.05
3- Is there good structures and registers?	0.674	sig. at 0.01
4- Clarity of expressions.	0.625	sig. at 0.05
1- Is there a good connection of ideas?	0.906	sig. at 0.01



Item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. level
2- Is there an appropriate use of signal words?	0.713	sig. at 0.01
3- Is there well structured and clear conclusions?	0.627	sig. at 0.05
1- Does the presenter use technological aids?	0.553	sig. at 0.05
2- Are the aids various?	0.554	sig. at 0.05
3- Does the presenter use the aids effectively?	0.543	sig. at 0.05
1- Does he use suitable gestures to keep audience's attention?	0.656	sig. at 0.01
2- Does he use eye-contact technique to keep the audience attention?	0.576	sig. at 0.05
3- Does he use various techniques of body language?	0.625	sig. at 0.05
1- Does he stick to the time of the presentation?	0.781	sig. at 0.01
2- Does he distribute the time to a presentation parts effectively?	0.723	sig. at 0.01

r table value at df (13) and sig. level (0.05) = 0.514

r table value at df (13) and sig. level (0.01) = 0.641

The researcher also made sure of the correlation between the six scopes with the total score of the interview card, and the six scopes with others as shown in table (12).

### 3.11. Reliability of the interview card

The test is reliable when it gives the same results if it is reapplied in the same conditions The reliability of the test was measured by Alpha Kronbach and the Spilt-half techniques

#### 3.11.1. Alpha Cronback:

The interview card is proved to be reliable. Alpha Cronbach coefficient is (0.917), so the researcher made sure that the interview card has a good reliability.

### **3.11.2 Split half:**

The Spilt- half coefficient is (0.916) and that indicates the interview card can be applied in the study and also this affirms to the researcher that the interview card has a good reliability.

## **3.12. Description of the content analysis card**

### **3.12.1. Purpose of the analysis:**

The analysis aims at identifying to what extent these written texts of the same topic, English language learning, match two of the suggested criteria of academic oral presentation.

### **3.12.2. Sample of the analysis:**

All the (40) written texts of male and female students in English department at Al Aqsa university of Gaza.

### **3.12.3. Elements of Analysis:**

The researcher chose the two criteria and designed them in light of the interview card in which it included the six criteria of academic oral presentation. These two criteria are the elements of analysis.

### **3.12.4. Validity of the content analysis card:**

Al Agha (1996:118) states that valid test is the test that measures what it is designed to measure. To validate the content analysis card, it was shown to four experts from different institutes in the field of education such Al Quds Open university, Al Aqsa university and Ministry of education.

**Table (3.16)**

The number of items in each domain of the analysis card

No.	Criterion	No. of items
1.	Originality of the content	5
2.	Correctness of language	5
Total		10

### 3.12.5. Applying the analysis card

The researcher held three workshops to train three other colleagues researchers so as to conduct the analysis through the content analysis card. The researcher provided the researchers with the criteria for evaluating the written texts and discussed with them how to conduct the analysis. The researchers were asked to start analysis for six written texts papers to check the understanding of the colleague researchers. There was relative approximation among the researchers' collected data. After assuring the researchers' involvement, they were asked to complete the analysis for all the (40) written papers. The analysis is conducted through using a tick to indicate the presence of the criterion or a cross which shows its absence.

### 3.12.6. Reliability of the analysis card

Mackey and Gass (2005:364) state that reliability is the degree to which there is consistency of scores students would receive on alternate forms of the same test. To examine the reliability of the analysis card, the researcher asked for the cooperation of three colleagues. The researcher and the three colleagues conducted the analysis by making a survey to 10 written papers.

### 3.13. Statistical treatment and analysis

In order to analyze the data, the researcher used the SPSS statistical packages as a statistical technique. The following statistics was used:

1. The data were collected and computed by using Pearson correlation, Alpha Cronback and Split-half techniques to confirm the validity and reliability.
2. Means and percentages were used to determine the main difficulties encountering students in giving the academic oral presentation.
3. T-test independent sample was used to measure the statistical differences in mean between gender, classification.
- 4- The researcher also used Mann-Whitney U to measure the statistical differences in means between the instructors and Al Aqsa English students.

# Chapter IV

**The Results of the study**

## Chapter IV

### The Results of the study

The purpose of this study was to identify the difficulties encountering Al Aqsa university junior and senior students in giving the academic oral presentation. The sample consisted of 154 students majoring in English at Al Aqsa university. This chapter aims at presenting the results of the study by answering the research questions. The main question of the study is: "What are the difficulties encountering Al Aqsa university junior and senior students in delivering academic oral presentations?"

#### The following are the answers of the research questions

##### 4.1. The answer of the first question

The first question is: **What are the difficulties encountering Al Aqsa university junior and senior students in giving academic oral presentations during class from students' perspectives?**

To answer this question the researcher used two tools and used the frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from the questionnaire and interview card. The following tables (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6) show the results.

To answer this question in light of the questionnaire the researcher used the frequencies, sum of responses, means, the percentage weight and rank of each item of the questionnaire. Tables (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4) shows this:

##### 4.1.1. The questionnaire:

**First: Clarity of speech and voice quality:**

Table (4.1)

The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the first domain from the questionnaire

No.	difficulties	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope	General rank
1	A presentation is given in a disorganized way	437	2.838	1.813	56.75	4	8
2	A presentation includes many examples and details	400	2.597	1.766	51.95	10	16
3	Speakers don't outline the presentation objectives to audience	424	2.753	1.697	55.06	6	11
4	Speakers don't stick to the objectives of the speech	454	2.948	1.680	58.96	1	2
5	Presenter delivers the presentation with unclear and low voice	429	2.786	1.680	55.71	5	9
6	Speakers speak with lack of confidence	417	2.708	1.653	54.16	8	13
7	presenter hesitates while speaking and presenting	424	2.753	1.622	55.06	7	12
8	presentation lacks a good connection of ideas	447	2.903	1.733	58.05	3	6
9	Speakers don't use appropriate transitional words and clear signals	451	2.929	1.629	58.57	2	5
10	Student is unfamiliar with the criteria of effective oral presentation	409	2.656	1.670	53.12	9	15
11	Students fear negative evaluation and comments	344	2.234	1.450	44.68	11	30

From table (4.1) we can see that:

- Item no. (4) " Speakers don't stick to the objectives of the speech" occupied the first rank with percent weight (%58.96).
- Item no. (9) " Speakers don't use appropriate transitional words and clear signals" occupied the second rank with percent weight (%58.57).
- Item no. (8) " Presentation lacks a good connection of ideas" occupied the third rank with percent weight (%58.05).
- Item no. (11) " Students fear negative evaluation and comments" occupied the eleventh and the last rank with percent weight (%44.68).

**Second: correctness of language:**

**Table (4.2)**

The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the second domain from the questionnaire

No.	difficulties	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope	General rank
1	A presentation is delivered with incorrect pronunciation	376	2.442	1.657	48.83	3	21
2	Lack of appropriate vocabulary and expressions used in a presentation	348	2.260	1.558	45.19	7	28
3	Students make grammar mistakes during the presentation	346	2.247	1.479	44.94	8	29
4	Students rarely speak English in social interactions and contexts	353	2.292	1.495	45.84	5	26
5	The communicative competence of the students is low	342	2.221	1.474	44.42	9	31



6	Speaking proficiency of the Students' is weak	349	2.266	1.500	45.32	6	27
7	Student focuses on the grammar accuracy more than fluency	445	2.890	1.647	57.79	1	7
8	Lack of appropriate structures and discourse markers to express ideas	340	2.208	1.520	44.16	10	32
9	Student suffers from interlingual mistakes while presenting	291	1.890	1.208	37.79	11	35
10	Students are unfamiliar with free oral and speaking activities	384	2.494	1.642	49.87	2	20
11	Weakness of student knowledge in comparative linguistics	362	2.351	1.545	47.01	4	23

As shown in table (4.2) we can observe the difficulties from the most to the least arranged in order according to the percentage weight and rank:

- Item no. (7) " Student focuses on the grammar accuracy more than fluency" occupied the first rank with percent weight (%57.79).
- Additionally, over 45% of the students were in agreement that " A presentation is delivered with incorrect pronunciation", "Lack of appropriate vocabulary and expressions used in a presentation", "Students rarely speak English in social interactions and contexts", "Speaking proficiency of the Students' is weak", " Students are unfamiliar with free oral and speaking activities" and "Weakness of student's knowledge in comparative linguistics" were serious difficulties encountering students in giving academic oral presentations.
- Item no. (9) " Student suffers from interlingual mistakes while presenting" occupied the eleventh and the last rank with percent weight (%37.79).

### Third : Interaction with audience :

Table (4.3)

The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the third domain from the questionnaire

No.	difficulties	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope	General rank
1	Student rarely interacts orally with their instructors in many courses	360	2.338	1.543	46.75	10	24
2	Presenter is unable to use tools such LCD and powerpoint effectively	454	2.948	1.624	58.96	2	3
3	Lack of courses that develop the speaking and conversational skills	371	2.409	1.506	48.18	9	22
4	Speakers don't act cheerfully and smile when speaking	471	3.058	1.646	61.17	1	1
5	Speakers don't keep eye-contact with audience	454	2.948	1.664	58.96	3	4
6	Lack of using body language and gestures while speaking	400	2.597	1.709	51.95	6	17
7	Weakness of rapport between the students	414	2.688	1.607	53.77	5	14
8	Interruption from audience during presentation	427	2.773	1.651	55.45	4	10
9	Lack of motivation towards giving the academic oral presentation	338	2.195	1.504	43.90	12	33
10	Students don't use English language in their real-life situations	321	2.084	1.288	41.69	13	34

No.	difficulties	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope	General rank
11	Student doesn't practice giving the presentation solo or with peers	397	2.578	1.554	51.56	7	18
12	Student doesn't have the right to choose the topics in certain courses	395	2.565	1.508	51.30	8	19
13	Weakness of academic interaction between students outside the class	356	2.312	1.417	46.23	11	25

From table (4.3) we can see that the difficulties are:

Item no. (4) " Speakers don't act cheerfully and smile when speaking" occupied the first rank with percent weight (%61.17).

Item no. (2) and Item no. (5) " Presenter is unable to use tools such LCD and power point effectively" and " Speakers don't keep eye-contact with audience" occupied the second rank with percent weight (%58.96).

Additionally, over 50% of the students were in agreement that "Lack of using body language and gestures while speaking", "Weakness of rapport between the students", "Interruption from audience during presentation", "Student doesn't practice giving the presentation solo or with peers" and " Student doesn't have the right to choose the topics in certain courses" were serious difficulties encountering students in giving academic oral presentation.

Furthermore, over 43% of the students were in agreement that "Student rarely interacts orally with their instructors in many courses", " Lack of courses that develop the speaking and conversational skills", " Lack of motivation towards giving the academic oral presentation" and " Weakness of academic interaction between students outside the class" were difficulties encountering students in giving academic oral presentation.

Item no. (10) "Students don't use English language in their real-life situations" occupied the thirteenth and the last rank with percent weight (%41.69).

#### Fourth: The whole scope of the questionnaire:

To conclude the results, the researcher used the sum of responses, means, standard deviation, the percentage weight and the rank of each field of the questionnaire. Table (4.4) shows this:

Table (4.4)

The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each domain from and all questionnaire

Field	No. of items	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope
First: Clarity of speech and voice quality	11	4636	30.104	8.421	54.73	1
Second: Correctness of Language	11	3936	25.558	8.290	46.47	3
Third: Interaction with audience	13	5158	33.494	9.282	51.53	2
SUM	35	13730	89.156	21.953	50.95	

From table (4.4) we notice that the first field "Clarity of speech and voice quality" occupied the first rank with percent weight (54.73%), and the third field "Interaction with audience" occupied the second rank with a percent weight of (51.53%), whereas the second field "Correctness of Language" occupied the third rank with percent weight (46.47%) That indicates that "Clarity of speech and voice quality" constitutes the most serious difficulty encountering students in the process of delivering academic oral presentation due to psychological and linguistic factors that affect the presenter during the presentation. Consequently, the instructors and lecturers should take in consideration improving the Clarity of speech and voice quality as far as possible before asking students to prepare their oral presentations.

The researcher also observes that the total score of the difficulties of the questionnaire had a percentage weight of (50.95%) that indicates these difficulties have a serious effect on the level of students and also their academic achievement.

#### 4.1.2. The Interview card:

**Table (4.5)**

The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the interview domains

No.	Main criteria	difficulties	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope	General rank
1	<b>Originality of content</b>	1- Is there a good choice of the topic?	110	2.340	0.522	78.01	2	2
2		2- Are the objectives clear?	106	2.255	0.736	75.18	3	6
3		3- Is the purpose statement of the presentation explicit?	117	2.489	0.547	82.98	1	1
4	<b>Correctness of language</b>	1- Is there a clear pronunciation?	101	2.149	0.659	71.63	2	12
5		2- Is there an appropriate use of vocabulary?	102	2.170	0.433	72.34	4	10
6		3- Are there good structures and registers?	103	2.191	0.680	73.05	1	7
7		4- Clarity of expressions	101	2.149	0.625	71.63	2	11
8	<b>Clarity of speech</b>	1- Is there a good connection of ideas?	108	2.298	0.623	76.60	1	3
9		2- Is there an appropriate use of signal words?	99	2.106	0.634	70.21	3	13
10		3- Are there well structured and clear conclusions?	107	2.277	0.682	75.89	2	5
11	<b>Visual aids</b>	1- Does the presenter use technological aids?	88	1.872	0.850	62.41	2	17

No.	Main criteria	difficulties	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope	General rank
12		2- Are the aids various?	81	1.723	0.772	57.45	3	18
13		3- Does the presenter use the aids effectively?	90	1.915	0.747	63.83	1	16
14	<b>Body language</b>	1- Does he use suitable gestures to keep audience's attention?	108	2.298	0.587	76.60	1	4
15		2- Does he use eye-contact technique to keep the audience attention?	103	2.191	0.741	73.05	2	8
16		3- Does he use various techniques of body language?	103	2.191	0.613	73.05	2	9
17	<b>Time management</b>	1- Does he stick to the time of the presentation?	96	2.043	0.658	68.09	1	14
18		2- Does he distribute the time to a presentation parts effectively?	94	2.000	0.722	66.67	2	15

From this table (4.5) we can see the difficulties from the most to the least arranged in order according to the percentage weight and rank:

Item no. (3) " Is the purpose statement of the presentation explicit?" occupied the first rank with percent weight (%82.98).

Item no. (1) " Is there a good choice of the topic?" occupied the second rank with percent weight (%78.01).

Moreover, over 75% of the students were in agreement that " Are the objectives clear ?", " Is there a good connection of ideas?", " Are there well structured and clear conclusions?" and " Does he use suitable gestures to keep audience's attention?" were difficulties encountering students in giving academic oral presentation in light of the main criteria of academic oral presentation.

Additionally, over 70% of the students were in agreement that "Is there a clear pronunciation?", "- Is there an appropriate use of vocabulary?", " Is there good structures and registers?", " Clarity of expressions", " Is there an appropriate use of signal words?", " Does he use eye-contact technique to keep the audience attention?" and " Does he use various techniques of body language?"

Furthermore, over 60% of the students were in agreement that "- Does the presenter use technological aids?", "- Does the presenter use the aids effectively? ", "Does he stick to the time of the presentation?" and "Does he distribute the time to a presentation parts effectively?"

Item no. (12) " Are the aids various?" occupied the eighteenth and last rank with percent weight (%57.45).

To sum up the results, the researcher used the sum of responses, means, the percentage weight and the rank of each criterion of the interview card. Table (4.6) shows this:

### The whole scope of the interview card:

**Table (4.6)**

The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each domain from and all interview

strategies	No. of items	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope
<b>Originality of content</b>	3	333	7.085	1.380	78.72	1
<b>Correctness of language</b>	4	407	8.660	1.478	72.16	4
<b>Clarity of speech</b>	3	314	6.681	1.491	74.23	2
<b>Visual aids</b>	3	259	5.511	1.743	61.23	6
<b>Body language</b>	3	314	6.681	1.461	74.23	3
<b>Time management</b>	2	190	4.043	1.233	67.38	5
<b>SUM</b>	18	1817	38.660	5.482	71.59	

As clarified in table (4.6) we notice that the first criterion " Originality of content " occupied the first rank with percent weight (78.72%), and the third criterion "Clarity of speech " and the fifth criterion " Body language" occupied the second rank with a percent weight of (74.23%), while the second criterion "Correctness of Language" occupied the third rank with percent weight (72.16%), whereas the sixth criterion occupied the fourth rank with percent weight (67.38%). The fourth criterion occupied the fifth and the last rank with percent weight (61.23%).

That indicates that the first main criterion of academic oral presentation and its minor criteria "Originality of content " constitute the most serious difficulty encountering students in the process of delivering academic oral presentations. Whereas, the fourth criterion and its minor criteria constitute the least difficulty encountering students in the process of delivering academic oral presentations in light of the basic criteria of academic oral presentation.



#### 4.2. To answer the second Question:

The second question is: **Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between male and female students?**

To answer this question in light of the questionnaire the researcher used T-Test. Table (4.7) shows this:

##### 4.2.1: the questionnaire:

**Table (4.7)**

Means, std. div, t value, sig. value and sig. level for the questionnaire domains

variable	Gender	No.	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig. value	sig. level
<b>First: Clarity of speech and voice quality</b>	male	41	28.000	8.666	1.883	0.062	not sig.
	female	113	30.867	8.237			
<b>Second: Correctness of Language</b>	male	41	25.171	7.768	0.349	0.728	not sig.
	female	113	25.699	8.501			
<b>Third: Interaction with audience</b>	male	41	31.439	10.218	1.664	0.098	not sig.
	female	113	34.239	8.848			
<b>SUMB</b>	male	41	84.610	22.074	1.555	0.122	not sig.
	female	113	90.805	21.773			

t table value at df (152) and sig. level (0.05) = 2.58

t table value at df (152) and sig. level (0.05) = 1.96

The previous table shows that computed T value is less than the critical ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) and that proves that there are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) due to the gender.

The second question is: **Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between males and females students?**

To answer the second question according to the interview card the researcher used T-Test. Table (4.8) shows this:

#### 4.2.2. The Interview card:

**Table (4.8)**

**Means, std. div, value, sig. value and sig. level for interview card dimension**

The main criterion	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig. value	sig. level
<b>Originality of content</b>	male	17	6.765	1.522	1.204	0.235	not sig.
	female	30	7.267	1.285			
<b>Correctness of language</b>	male	17	8.353	1.498	1.072	0.289	not sig.
	female	30	8.833	1.464			
<b>Clarity of speech</b>	male	17	5.824	1.468	3.265	0.002	sig. at 0.01
	female	30	7.167	1.289			
<b>Visual aids</b>	male	17	4.882	1.764	1.913	0.062	not sig.
	female	30	5.867	1.655			
<b>Body language</b>	male	17	6.588	1.502	0.324	0.748	not sig.
	female	30	6.733	1.461			
<b>Time management</b>	male	17	3.647	1.272	1.689	0.098	not sig.
	female	30	4.267	1.172			
<b>SUM</b>	male	17	36.059	5.836	2.597	0.013	sig. at 0.05
	female	30	40.133	4.761			

t table value at df (45) and sig. level (0.05) = 2.00

t table value at df (45) and sig. level (0.05) = 2.66

Table (4.8) shows that computed T value is more than the critical ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) and that proves that there are statistically significant differences for the females at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) due to the gender in light of the interview card.

### 4.3. To answer the third Question:

The third question is: **Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between junior and senior students?**

To answer this question according to the questionnaire the researcher used T-Test table (4.9) shows this:

#### 4.3.1. The questionnaire:

**Table (4.9)**

Means, std. div, t value, sig. value and sig. level for the questionnaire domains

Domain	classification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig. value	sig. level
<b>First: Clarity of speech and voice quality</b>	Junior	77	30.390	9.108	0.420	0.675	not sig.
	Senior	77	29.818	7.723			
<b>Second: Correctness of Language</b>	Junior	77	26.247	8.808	1.031	0.304	not sig.
	Senior	77	24.870	7.735			
<b>Third: Interaction with audience</b>	Junior	77	33.792	9.387	0.398	0.691	not sig.
	Senior	77	33.195	9.227			
<b>SUMB</b>	Junior	77	90.429	22.935	0.718	0.474	not sig.
	Senior	77	87.883	20.999			

t table value at df (152) and sig. level (0.05) = 1.96

t table value at df (152) and sig. level (0.05) = 2.58

The previous table shows that computed T value is less than the critical ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) and that proves that there are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) due to the classification.

The third question is: **Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between junior and senior students?**

To answer this question according to the interview card, the researcher used T-Test table (4.10) shows this:

#### 4.3.2. The Interview card:

**Table (4.10)**

Means, std. div, t value, sig. value and sig. level for interview card domains

variable	classification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig. value	sig. level
Originality of content	Junior	21	6.619	1.499	2.162	0.036	sig. at 0.05
	Senior	26	7.462	1.174			
Correctness of language	Junior	21	8.714	1.586	0.226	0.823	not sig.
	Senior	26	8.615	1.416			
Clarity of speech	Junior	21	6.810	1.365	0.528	0.600	not sig.
	Senior	26	6.577	1.604			
Visual aids	Junior	21	5.190	1.965	1.135	0.262	not sig.
	Senior	26	5.769	1.531			
Body language	Junior	21	6.667	1.461	0.059	0.953	not sig.
	Senior	26	6.692	1.490			
Time management	Junior	21	3.810	1.250	1.169	0.248	not sig.
	Senior	26	4.231	1.210			
SUM	Junior	21	37.810	5.645	0.954	0.345	not sig.
	Senior	26	39.346	5.359			

t table value at df (45) and sig. level (0.05) = 2.00

t table value at df (45) and sig. level (0.05) = 2.66

The previous table shows that computed T value is less than the critical ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) and that proves that there are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) due to the classification.

#### 4.4. The answer of the fourth question

The fourth question is: **What are the difficulties encountering Al Aqsa university junior and senior students in giving academic oral presentations during class from instructors' perspectives?**

To answer this question the researcher used two tools and used the frequencies, the sum of responses, means, std. deviation. And the % weight and rank of each item from the questionnaire and interview card. The following tables (4.11, 4.12, 4.13, 4.14, 4.15, 4.16) show the results.

To answer this question according the questionnaire the researcher used the frequencies, sum of responses, means, the percentage weight and rank of each item of the questionnaire. Tables (4.11, 4.12, 4.13, 4.14) shows this:

##### 4.4.1. The questionnaire:

##### First: Clarity of speech and voice quality:

**Table (4.11)**

The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the first domain from the questionnaire

No.	difficulties	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope	General rank
1	A presentation is given in a disorganized way	44	4.400	0.516	88.0	1	1
2	A presentation includes many examples and details	32	3.200	1.549	64.0	4	11
3	Speakers don't outline the presentation objectives to audience	31	3.100	1.449	62.0	5	13
4	Speakers don't stick to the objectives of the speech	34	3.400	1.265	68.0	3	8

No.	difficulties	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope	General rank
5	Presenter delivers the presentation with unclear and low voice	26	2.600	1.265	52.0	8	20
6	Speakers speak with lack of confidence	29	2.900	1.449	58.0	6	17
7	presenter hesitates while speaking and presenting	22	2.200	1.549	44.0	11	26
8	presentation lacks a good connection of ideas	24	2.400	1.430	48.0	10	24
9	Speakers don't use appropriate transitional words and clear signals	25	2.500	1.080	50.0	9	22
10	Student is unfamiliar with the criteria of effective oral presentation	38	3.800	1.033	76.0	2	3
11	Students fear negative evaluation and comments	27	2.700	1.160	54.0	7	19

From table (4.11) one can see that:

- Item no. (1) " A presentation is given in a disorganized way" occupied the first rank with percent weight (88%).
- Item no. (10) " Student is unfamiliar with the criteria of effective oral presentation" occupied the second rank with percent weight (76%).
- Item no. (4) " Speakers don't stick to the objectives of the speech" occupied the third rank with percent weight (68%).
- Item no. (2) " A presentation includes many examples and details" occupied the fourth rank with percent weight (64%).
- Item no. (3) " Speakers don't outline the presentation objectives to audience" occupied the fifth rank with percent weight (62%).
- Item no. (6) " Speakers speak with lack of confidence" occupied the sixth rank with percent weight (%58).

- Item no. (7) " Speakers speak with lack of confidence" occupied the eleventh and last rank with percent weight (%44).

**Second: correctness of language:**

**Table (4.12)**

The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the second domain from the questionnaire

No.	difficulties	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope	General rank
1	A presentation is delivered with incorrect pronunciation	39	3.900	1.101	78.0	1	2
2	Lack of appropriate vocabulary and expressions used in a presentation	38	3.800	1.317	76.0	2	4
3	Students make grammar mistakes during the presentation	30	3.000	1.563	60.0	4	15
4	Students rarely speak English in social interactions and contexts	30	3.000	1.333	60.0	5	16
5	The communicative competence of the students is low	20	2.000	1.155	40.0	7	27
6	Speaking proficiency of the Students' is weak	29	2.900	1.449	58.0	6	18
7	Student focuses on the grammar accuracy more than fluency	37	3.700	1.252	74.0	3	5
8	Lack of appropriate structures and discourse markers to express ideas	13	1.300	0.483	26.0	11	34

No.	difficulties	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope	General rank
9	Student suffers from interlingual mistakes while presenting	15	1.500	0.527	30.0	10	33
10	Students are unfamiliar with free oral and speaking activities	20	2.000	1.155	40.0	8	28
11	Weakness of student knowledge in comparative linguistics	19	1.900	1.197	38.0	9	30

From table (4.12) one can observe the difficulties from the most to the least arranged in order according to the percentage weight and rank:

- Item no. (1) " A presentation is delivered with incorrect pronunciation" occupied the first rank with percent weight (78%).
- Item no. (2) " Lack of appropriate vocabulary and expressions used in a presentation" occupied the second rank with percent weight (76%).
- Item no. (7) " Student focuses on the grammar accuracy more than fluency" occupied the third rank with percent weight (74%).
- Item no. (3) " Students make grammar mistakes during the presentation" occupied the fourth rank with percent weight (60%).
- Item no. (4) " Students rarely speak English in social interactions and contexts" occupied the fifth rank with percent weight (%60%).
- Item no. (6) " Speaking proficiency of the Students' is weak" occupied the sixth rank with percent weight (58%).
- Item no. (8) " Lack of appropriate structures and discourse markers to express ideas" occupied the eleventh and last rank with percent weight (%26).



**Third: Interaction with audience:**

**Table (4.13)**

The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the third domain from the questionnaire

No.	difficulties	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope	General rank
1	Student rarely interacts orally with their instructors in many courses	31	3.100	1.197	62.0	6	14
2	Presenter is unable to use tools such LCD and powerpoint effectively	36	3.600	0.843	72.0	2	7
3	Lack of courses that develop the speaking and conversational skills	33	3.300	1.418	66.0	4	10
4	Speakers don't act cheerfully and smile when speaking	26	2.600	1.713	52.0	7	21
5	Speakers don't keep eye-contact with audience	32	3.200	1.751	64.0	5	12
6	Lack of using body language and gestures while speaking	37	3.700	1.494	74.0	1	6
7	Weakness of rapport between the students	34	3.400	1.713	68.0	3	9
8	Interruption from audience during presentation	20	2.000	1.155	40.0	10	29
9	Lack of motivation towards giving the academic oral presentation	16	1.600	1.265	32.0	12	32

No.	difficulties	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope	General rank
10	Students don't use English language in their real-life situations	12	1.200	0.422	24.0	13	35
11	Student doesn't practice giving the presentation solo or with peers	17	1.700	0.949	34.0	11	31
12	Student doesn't have the right to choose the topics in certain courses	23	2.300	0.949	46.0	9	25
13	Weakness of academic interaction between students outside the class	25	2.500	1.581	50.0	8	23

From table (4.3) one can see that the difficulties are:

- Item no. (6) " Lack of using body language and gestures while speaking" occupied the first rank with percent weight (74%).
- Item no. (2) " Presenter is unable to use tools such LCD and powerpoint effectively" occupied the second rank with percent weight (72%).
- Item no. (7) " Weakness of rapport between the students" occupied the third rank with percent weight (68%).
- Item no. (3) " Lack of courses that develop the speaking and conversational skills" occupied the fourth rank with percent weight (66%).
- Item no. (5) " Speakers don't keep eye-contact with audience" occupied the fifth rank with percent weight (64%).
- Item no. (1) " Student rarely interacts orally with their instructors in many courses" occupied the sixth rank with percent weight (62%).
- Item no. (10) " Students don't use English language in their real-life situations" occupied the thirteenth and last rank with percent weight (24%).

#### Fourth: The whole dimensions of the questionnaire:

To conclude the results, the researcher used the sum of responses, means, standard deviation, the percentage weight and the rank of each field of the questionnaire. Table (4.14) shows this:

**Table (4.14)**

The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each domain of the whole questionnaire

Field	No. of items	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope
First: Clarity of speech and voice quality	11	332	33.200	5.203	60.4	1
Second: Correctness of Language	11	290	29.000	6.782	52.7	2
Third: Interaction with audience	13	342	34.200	5.884	52.6	3
SUM	35	964	96.400	8.834	55.1	

As shown in table (4.14) one notices that the first field " Clarity of speech and voice quality " occupied the first rank with percent weight (60.4%), and the second field " Correctness of Language " occupied the second rank with a percent weight of (52.7%) ,whereas the third field " Interaction with audience " occupied the third rank with percent weight (52.6%) That shows that the first domain: " Clarity of speech and voice quality " constitutes the most serious difficulty encountering students in the process of giving academic oral presentation from the instructors' perspectives. Consequently, the instructors ought to take in account developing the Clarity of speech and voice quality as far as possible when asking students to prepare their academic oral presentation. one also observes that the total degree of the difficulties of the questionnaire from instructors' perspectives had a percentage weight of (55.10%), that indicates these difficulties have clear and serious effects on the level of students.

#### 4.4.2. The Interview card:

**Table (4.15)**

The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % weight and rank of each item from of the interview domains

No.	Main criteria	difficulties	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope	General rank
1	Originality of content	1- Is there a good choice of the topic?	16	1.6	0.966	53.33	1	9
2		2- Are the objectives clear?	13	1.3	0.675	43.33	3	14
3		3- Is the purpose statement of the presentation explicit?	14	1.4	0.843	46.67	2	11
4	Correctness of language	1- Is there a clear pronunciation?	11	1.1	0.316	36.67	4	18
5		2- Is there an appropriate use of vocabulary?	14	1.4	0.699	46.67	3	12
6		3- Are there good structures and registers?	24	2.4	0.699	80	2	5
7		4- Clarity of expressions	25	2.5	0.527	83.33	1	4
8	Clarity of speech	1- Is there a good connection of ideas?	19	1.9	0.876	63.33	3	8
9		2- Is there an appropriate use of signal words?	26	2.6	0.516	86.67	2	3
10		3- Are there well structured and clear conclusions?	27	2.7	0.483	90	1	1
11	Visual aids	1- Does the presenter use technological aids?	27	2.7	0.483	90	1	2

No.	Main criteria	difficulties	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% weight	rank in the scope	General rank
12		2- Are the aids various?	23	2.3	0.675	76.67	2	6
13		3- Does the presenter use the aids effectively?	12	1.2	0.422	40	3	15
14	Body language	1- Does he use suitable gestures to keep audience's attention?	20	2	0.943	66.67	1	7
15		2- Does he use eye-contact technique to keep the audience attention?	15	1.5	0.85	50	2	10
16		3- Does he use various techniques of body language?	14	1.4	0.699	46.67	3	13
17	Time management	1- Does he stick to the time of the presentation?	12	1.2	0.632	40	1	16
18		2- Does he distribute the time to a presentation parts effectively?	12	1.2	0.632	40	2	17

From table (4.15) one can see that the difficulties from the most to the least arranged in order according to the percentage weight and rank:

- Item no. (10) " There are no well structured and clear conclusions" occupied the first rank with percent weight (90%).
- Item no. (11) " The presenter doesn't use technological aids" occupied the second rank with percent weight (90%).
- Item no. (9) " There isn't an appropriate use of signal words" occupied the third rank with percent weight (86.67%).
- Item no. (7) " Clarity of expressions" occupied the fourth rank with percent weight (%83.33%).

- Item no. (6) " There aren't good structures and registers" occupied the fifth rank with percent weight (80%).
- Item no. (12) " The aids aren't various" occupied the sixth rank with percent weight (76.67%).
- Item no. (14) " Presenter doesn't use suitable gestures to keep audience's attention" occupied the seventh rank with percent weight (66.76%).
- Item no. (4) " There is no a good connection of ideas " occupied the eighteenth and last rank with percent weight (36.67%).

#### **The whole domains of the interview card:**

As a conclusion for the results, the researcher used the sum of responses, means, the percentage weight and the rank of each criterion of the interview card. Table (4.16) shows this:

**Table (4.16)**

The sum of responses, means, std. deviation, and the % percentage weight and rank of each domain from and all interview card

<b>Main criteria</b>	<b>No. of items</b>	<b>Sum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>% weight</b>	<b>rank in the scope</b>
<b>Originality of content</b>	3	43	4.300	1.889	47.78	5
<b>Correctness of language</b>	4	74	7.400	0.843	61.67	3
<b>Clarity of speech</b>	3	72	7.200	0.919	80.00	1
<b>Visual aids</b>	3	62	6.200	0.919	68.89	2
<b>Body language</b>	3	49	4.900	1.729	54.44	4
<b>Time management</b>	2	24	2.400	0.843	40.00	6
<b>SUM</b>	18	324	32.400	2.011	60.00	

As clarified in table (4.16) one notices that the third criterion "Clarity of speech" occupied the first rank with percent weight (80%), the fourth criterion "Visual aids" occupied the second rank with a percent weight (68.89), the second criterion "Correctness of language" occupied the third rank with a percent weight of (61.67%) ,while the fifth criterion " Body Language" occupied the fourth rank with percent weight (54.44%) ,whereas the first criterion occupied the fifth rank with percent weight

(47.78%). The sixth criterion occupied the sixth and the last rank with percent weight (40%).

That clarifies that the third main criterion of academic oral presentation " Clarity of speech" and its minor criteria constitute the most serious difficulty encountering students in the process of delivering academic oral presentation.

Whereas, the sixth criterion and its minor criteria constitute the least difficulty encountering students in the process of delivering academic oral presentation according basic criteria of academic oral presentation.

That's why, the instructors should take into consideration explaining the basic criteria of academic oral presentation to enable them to be ready to prepare their oral presentation.

The researcher also notices that the total degree of the difficulties of the interview card from instructors' perspectives had a percentage weight of (60%), that indicates these difficulties have an explicit influence on the level of students.

#### 4.5. To answer the fifth question:

**The fifth question is: Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations from instructors' perspectives and students' perspectives?**

To answer this question according to the questionnaire the researcher used means, Mann-Whitney U value, sig. value and sig. level. Table (4.17) shows this:

##### 4.5.1: the questionnaire:

**Table (4.17)**

Means, Mann-Whitney U value, sig. value and sig. level for the questionnaire domains

Fields	classification	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Sig. value	sig. level
Clarity of speech and voice quality	students	154	81.305	12521.000	586.000	1.266	0.206	not sig.
	instructors	10	100.900	1009.000				
Correctness of language	students	154	80.994	12473.000	538.000	1.596	0.110	not sig.
	instructors	10	105.700	1057.000				
Interaction with audience	students	154	81.945	12619.500	684.500	0.588	0.556	not sig.
	instructors	10	91.050	910.500				
SUM	students	154	80.886	12456.500	521.500	1.708	0.088	not sig.
	instructors	10	107.350	1073.500				

The table (4.17) shows that computed Z value is less than the critical ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) and that proves that there are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in all domains and the total domain of the questionnaire in the difficulties encountering English majors from students' perspectives and instructors' perspectives according to academic classification .



#### 4.5.2: The interview card:

To answer the fifth question according to the interview card the researcher used means, Mann Whitney U value, sig. value and sig. level. Table (4.18) shows this:

**Table (4.18)**

Means, Mann-Whitney U value, sig. value and sig. level for interview card domain

Main criteria	classification	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Sig. value	sig. level
Originality of content	students	47	32.809	1542.000	56.000	3.846	0.000	sig. at 0.01
	instructors	10	11.100	111.000				
Correctness of language	students	47	31.511	1481.000	117.000	2.526	0.012	sig. at 0.05
	instructors	10	17.200	172.000				
Clarity of speech	students	47	28.138	1322.500	194.500	0.874	0.382	not sig.
	instructors	10	33.050	330.500				
Visual aids	students	47	27.957	1314.000	186.000	1.051	0.293	not sig.
	instructors	10	33.900	339.000				
Body language	students	47	31.660	1488.000	110.000	2.668	0.008	sig. at 0.01
	instructors	10	16.500	165.000				
Time management	students	47	32.511	1528.000	70.000	3.563	0.000	sig. at 0.01
	instructors	10	12.500	125.000				
SUM	students	47	32.479	1526.500	71.500	3.439	0.001	sig. at 0.01
	instructors	10	12.650	126.500				

z table value at df (55) and sig. level (0.05) = 2.00

z table value at df (55) and sig. level (0.05) = 2.66

The previous table (4.18) shows that computed Z value is more than the critical ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ), and that proves that there are statistically significant differences in the difficulties encountering English majors for English students at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) due to academic classification from students' perspectives and instructors' perspectives. in first, second, fifth and sixth criteria and the total criteria of the interview card.

### To answer the sixth question:

The sixth question is: **what are the difficulties encountering English majors at Al Aqsa university in giving academic oral presentations as reflected in the written aspect of the academic oral presentation?**

To answer this question according to analysis card the researcher used means of frequency and percentage. Table (4.18) shows this:

**Table (4.19)**

Frequency & percentage of the items in the written text paper  
(The First Domain)

No.	Criteria	Means of Frequency	percentage
<b>1. Originality of Content</b>			
1	A written topic is given in a disorganized way	11.33	69.7%
2	The written text lacks a good connection of ideas	14.6	87.9%
3	The text has clear objectives of the speech	4	25%
4	The written text doesn't show appropriate transitional words and clear signals	12.67	72.6%
5	The text includes examples that help to clarify the meaning	6.43	46.8%
<b>Total</b>		48.47	60.4

As noted in this table, very high percentages are scored for many items as follows:

#### 1- The written text lacks a good connection of ideas

With the respect to the criterion "connection of ideas". It got 87.9%. This shows that the majority of English majors don't have the ability to connect their ideas in their written topics, and this also leads to weakness in connection of ideas in the oral presentation. Thus, "connection of ideas" is considered an important difficulty encountering English majors in the written aspect of the academic oral presentation.

## **2- The written text doesn't show appropriate transitional words and clear signals**

In regard to "using appropriate transitional words and clear signals", it is indicated that it got percentage of 72.6%. This reveals that English students don't use transitional words and signals that enrich their written text and make the topic clear and meaningful. That's why, "using appropriate transitional words and clear signals" is considered a difficulty in the written aspect of the oral presentation.

## **3- A written topic is given in a disorganized way**

In relation to "organization of the written topic", the results show that it got 69.7%. This means that English students don't have enough knowledge about organization of the topic and this confirmed that their writing skills aren't good, and this affects the organization of the oral presentation as well, so "organization of the written text" is considered a difficulty encountering students in the written aspect of the oral presentation.

## **4- The text includes examples that help to clarify the meaning**

Concerning the item "inclusion of examples in the text", this got also 46.8% . this shows that English students used examples in their written texts to make the sentences meaningful and clarify the intended meaning. Thus, "using examples in the written aspect of the oral presentation" isn't considered a difficulty.

## **5- The text has clear objectives of the speech**

As regards the criterion "The text has clear objectives of the speech", it got 25%. This means that the written texts of the students don't reflect the objectives of the text clearly, so students aren't able to specify their aims in the written text, so "clarity of the objectives reflected in the text" is considered a difficulty in the written aspect of the academic oral presentation.

**Table (4.20)**

Frequency & percentage of the items in the written text paper  
(The Second Domain)

No.	Criteria	Means of Frequency	percentage
<b>2. Correctness of Language</b>			
1	The text reflects using appropriate vocabulary and expressions	10.2	62.3%
2	The written topic shows grammar mistakes	3.66	22.9%
3	The text discloses interlingual errors	12.34	78%
4	The text lacks appropriate structures and discourse markers to express ideas.	8.12	53.6%
5	The text shows the student weakness in comparative linguistics.	13.7	84%
<b>Total</b>		47.21	60.16%

The above table shows the percentages for the following items:

**1- The text shows the student weakness in comparative linguistics**

Referring to " The text shows the student weakness in comparative linguistics.", it got 84%. This reveals that there are many frequent errors that come from the student's weakness in comparative linguistics courses and they don't know the basic differences between their language and English language, so knowledge of comparative linguistic is considered a serious difficulty encountering English majors in the written aspect of the academic oral presentation.

**2- The text discloses interlingual errors**

The item "The text discloses interlingual errors" got 78%. This confirms the result of the previous items that is the student's weakness in the comparative linguistic leads to many interlingual errors in the written texts of English students. That's why, interlingual errors are considered a difficulty encountering English students in the written aspect of the oral presentation.

### **3- The text reflects using appropriate vocabulary and expressions**

In regard to "The text reflects using appropriate vocabulary and expressions", it got 62.3%. This shows that English majors have good ability to use appropriate vocabulary and expressions in the written texts. Thus this item cannot be a serious difficulty encountering English students in the written aspect of the academic oral presentation.

### **4- The text lacks appropriate structures and discourse markers to express ideas**

With respect to "The text lacks appropriate structures and discourse markers to express ideas", it got 53.6%. This reveals that many students don't use suitable structures and discourse markers to enrich their written texts and topics. That's why, it is a difficulty encountering students in the written aspect of academic oral presentation.

### **5- The written topic shows grammar mistakes**

Concerning the item "The written topic shows grammar mistakes", it got 22.9%. This means that English majors are very good in grammar, and they have good basics in courses that related to grammar, so the grammar errors and mistakes cannot be difficulty in the written aspect of the academic oral presentation.

# Chapter V

**Findings, Discussion, Pedagogical Implications, Conclusion and  
Recommendations**

## Chapter V

### Findings, Discussion, Pedagogical Implications, Conclusion and Recommendations

#### 5.1. Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentation at Al Aqsa university. Particularly, this study investigated Al Aqsa university students' perception of giving academic oral presentations during class with respect to clarity of speech and voice quality, correctness of language and interaction with audience in light of the questionnaire and also in light of the six basic criteria of the interview card. Questionnaire and interview cards were designed in this study to identify and analyze the difficulties. One hundred fifty-four students from Al Aqsa university, whose native language is Arabic and who were majoring in English were randomly selected to fill the questionnaire and also forty-five English majors who participated in the interview card. Nine of referees employed at Gaza universities and the Ministry of Education agreed that the questionnaire and interview card were valid.

In this study, this chapter aims at discussing the findings in relation to giving interpretations and analyzing these findings. The researcher then comes out with overall suggestions and recommendations depending on the study findings, interpretations and analysis.

#### 5.2. Findings

##### 5.2.1. Based on the results of this study, the following findings were noticed in light of the questionnaire:

1. More than 60% of the students were in agreement that "Speakers don't act cheerfully and smile when speaking" was the major difficulty encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentations at Al Aqsa university.

2. More than 58% of the students were in agreement that "Speakers don't stick to the objectives of the speech", "presentation lacks a good connection of ideas", "Speakers don't use appropriate transitional words and clear signals", "Speakers don't keep eye-contact with audience" and "Presenter is unable to use tools such LCD and powerpoint effectively " were the major difficulties encountering English majors in delivering academic oral presentation at Al Aqsa university.

3. Over 55% of the students agreed that "a presentation is given in a disorganized way", "speakers don't outline the presentation objectives to audience", "presenter delivers the presentation with unclear and low voice", "presenter hesitates while speaking and presenting", "interruption from audience during presentation" and "student focuses on the grammar accuracy more than fluency" were serious problems.

4. Over 50% of the students identified " Student doesn't have the right to choose the topics in certain courses", "Speakers speak with lack of confidence", "Student is unfamiliar with the criteria of effective oral presentation", "Lack of using body language and gestures while speaking", "Weakness of rapport between the students", "Student doesn't practice giving the presentation solo or with peers" and "A presentation includes many examples and details" as specific difficulties they encountered in delivering the academic oral presentation.

5. Over 45% of the students were in consensus that "A presentation is delivered with incorrect pronunciation", "Lack of appropriate vocabulary and expressions used in a presentation", "Students rarely speak English in social interactions and contexts", "Speaking proficiency of the Students' is weak", "Students are unfamiliar with free oral and speaking activities", "Weakness of student knowledge in comparative linguistics", "Student rarely interacts orally with their instructors in many courses", "Lack of courses that develop the speaking and conversational skills" and "Weakness of academic interaction between students outside the class" were important difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentation at Al Aqsa university.



6. Over 70% of the instructors agreed that " A presentation is given in a disorganized way ", " Student is unfamiliar with the criteria of effective oral presentation ", " A presentation is delivered with incorrect pronunciation ", " Lack of appropriate vocabulary and expressions used in a presentation ", " Student focuses on the grammar accuracy more than fluency ", " Lack of using body language and gestures while speaking " and " Presenter is unable to use tools such LCD and powerpoint effectively " were the major difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentation at Al Aqsa university .

7. More than 60% of the lecturers were in consensus that " Speakers don't stick to the objectives of the speech ", " A presentation includes many examples and details ", " Speakers don't outline the presentation objectives to audience ", " Students make grammar mistakes during the presentation ", " Students rarely speak English in social interactions and contexts ", " Weakness of rapport between the students ", " Lack of courses that develop the speaking and conversational skills ", " Speakers don't keep eye-contact with audience ", " Student rarely interacts orally with their instructors in many courses " were serious difficulties encountering English majors in delivering academic oral presentation at Al Aqsa university .

8. There are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) between male and female students due to gender in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations in light of the questionnaire.

9. There are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) between junior and senior students due to classification in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations according to the questionnaire.

10. There are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in all domains and the total domain of the questionnaire in the difficulties encountering English majors from students' perspectives and instructors' perspectives according to academic classification.

**5.2.2. Based on the results of this study, the following findings were noticed according to the interview card:**

1. More than 80% of the students were in agreement that "the purpose statement of the presentation isn't explicit" was the major difficulty encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentations at Al Aqsa university in light of the main criteria of academic oral presentation in the interview card.

2. Over 75% of the students were in consensus that "there isn't a good choice of the topic", "the objectives aren't clear", "there isn't a good connection of ideas", "there aren't well structured and clear conclusions" and "he doesn't use suitable gestures to keep audience's attention" were serious difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentations.

3. More than 70% of the students agreed that "Is there a clear pronunciation?", "Is there an appropriate use of vocabulary?", "there aren't good structures and registers", "Clarity of expressions", "he doesn't use various techniques of body language", "He doesn't use eye-contact technique to keep the audience attention" and "there isn't an appropriate use of signal words?" were important problems that encounter English department students in giving academic oral presentations.

4. Over 60% of the students were in agreement that "the presenter doesn't use technological aids", "the presenter doesn't use the aids effectively", "he doesn't stick to the time of the presentation?" and "he doesn't distribute the time to a presentation parts effectively"

5. More than 80% of the instructors identified "There are no well structured and clear conclusions", "The presenter doesn't use technological aids", "There isn't an appropriate use of signal words", "Clarity of expressions" and "There isn't good structures and registers" Al Aqsa English students encountered in giving the academic oral presentations.

6. Over 60% of the Al Aqsa professors were in agreement that "The aids aren't various", " Presenter doesn't use suitable gestures to keep audience's attention " and " There isn't a good connection of ideas" were noticeable difficulties encountering Al Aqsa English Majors in giving academic oral presentations.

7. There are statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) between male and female students in favor of the females due to gender in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations according to the interview card.

8. There are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) between junior and senior students due to classification in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations in light of the interview card.

9. There are statistically significant differences in the difficulties encountering English majors for English students at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) due to academic classification from students' perspectives and instructors' perspectives, in first, second, fifth and sixth criteria and the total criteria of the interview card.

### **5.3. Discussion of the results of the first question**

What are the difficulties encountering English majors at Al Aqsa university in giving the academic oral presentations from students' point of view according to the interview card and questionnaire?

To answer this question the researcher used the frequencies, the sum of responses, standard deviation, means, the percentage weight and rank of each item of the questionnaire. Tables (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4) show the results.

The only major difficulty and the most important one was difficulty No. (26) " Speakers don't act cheerfully and smile when speaking" which occupied the highest rank of difficulty with a percentage weight of (61.17%). Item no. (27) " Speakers don't keep eye-contact with audience" occupied the second rank with percent weight

(%58.96). The researcher attributes this to the fact that the psychological and social factors greatly affected the students' performance during giving the academic oral presentations such as anxiety and excessive fear. It is also because the students speak English as a foreign language. In addition, social factors played an important role in the difficulties in which the presenters encountered difficulties in eye-contact with audience so it is advisable to the instructors to prepare the students psychologically before giving the presentation and build bridges of confidence and friendly relationships between the students themselves and between them and their students.

This study shows similar results with those of **Chen (2009)** which revealed that the students were moderately anxious, suggesting that the anxiety level was not too severe for the students to cope with. The researcher showed that there were two clusters of stressors were found to contribute to students' anxiety – social and psychological. Social factors included peers' response and audience familiarity; whereas psychological factors included self-perceived oral proficiency, self-perceived accuracy of pronunciation, and self-perceived personality. These difficulties that are No.3 " Speakers don't outline the presentation objectives to audience", No.4 " Speakers don't stick to the objectives of the speech" and No.10 " Student is unfamiliar with the criteria of effective oral presentation" refer that English majors are unfamiliar with criteria of academic presentation and lack of knowledge to prepare the presentation and state the objectives and stick to them.

This current study is also similar to **Otoshi and Heffernen study (2008)** which found similar results compared to this current study. In this study, the researchers recommended that instructors ought to prepare their students psychologically before asking them to give the academic presentation. The teachers ought to clarify to the students the criteria of the academic oral presentation. The majority of the difficulties found in this study related to the difficulties under the first and third domains in the questionnaire of the current study. The similar difficulties found in this study such the presentation should be given in a clear voice; the presentation ought to be delivered in an organized way and so on. According to this study, the results of this study are similar to the findings of the current study. The majority of difficulties found in terms of organization, objectives, clarity of voice and interaction with the audience.

The previous findings of the current study in conformity with **Cheng & Warren (2005)** study in which they focused on the use of an integrated method of feedback: one in which learners write an outline for their presentations first, evaluate each other's work, and then make their presentations based on the corrections given by their peers. Learners then do their presentations in-class while the teacher and the other students evaluate that presentation using rubrics they have had. The researchers suggested that if teachers take time to demonstrate how and when to use eye contact, how to organize a presentation, connect with an audience, use body language and manage time, and how to construct an effective PowerPoint presentation. Thus, the researchers ensured that they expend the correct amount of time and energy into giving the learners the tools they need to become effective presenters in the target language. The learners can build upon their existing knowledge to use in future presentations.

The results found in this study (**Orsmond, Merry & Reiling, 2000**) are similar to the findings in the current study particularly with this finding. Student is unfamiliar with the criteria of effective oral presentation. This study showed that the first step is for teachers and learners to establish marking criteria. Involving learners in this process will be of great benefit to them in preparing for their own presentations. The researchers explained that learners must clearly understand the criteria set out for evaluating presentations. The study recommended that teachers need to monitor that learners used the criteria correctly and applying the tenets of the rubric in an accurate manner.

Similar findings were also evident in an ethnographic study conducted by **Morita (2000)** in a Canadian university. This study found that academic oral presentation was challenging for both native and non-native speakers for different reasons. For native speakers, they experienced psychological difficulty. This refers to low confidence as a presenter. For non-native speakers, they reported experiencing three types of difficulty – linguistic, sociocultural, and psychological. Although the non-native speakers were perceived to have displayed advanced English proficiency, the speakers themselves regarded their own English skills as the main source of difficulty. Sociocultural difficulty refers to the quick-paced, less controlled classroom interaction, compared to the one in the non-native speakers' home country. Lastly, the psychological difficulty was their own inferiority complex, and this was related with the

linguistic and sociocultural difficulties. Thus, it is not surprising that these EFL students find oral activities difficult because they are required to use a foreign language to think and to express themselves. Not only was speaking difficult, such difficulty may well accompany anxiety. It was found that nonnative speakers reported experiencing linguistic, sociocultural and psychological difficulties with academic oral presentations. Therefore, it is reasonable to suspect that English foreign language speakers who engage in academic oral presentations may experience anxiety that stems from the linguistics, the language and the complex task of communicating in public.

The findings of the current study are similar to those of an exploratory study was conducted on students' behavior and belief about academic oral presentations (**Wu, 2008**). Five Taiwanese TESOL graduate students were studied. The study found that academic oral presentations involved complex and constant decision-makings for the students from the beginning – the preparation stage, to the final stage – the presenting stage. Based on a student's account, the presenting stage was likely the most anxiety-provoking stage because much of the decision-making was required immediately. Moreover, it was found that a discrepancy existed between the instructor and the students about what constitutes an academic oral presentation and its goal. This may also contribute to students' anxiety about oral presentations because students were likely uncertain about the quality of their preparation and performance. The researcher explained that Oral presentation is a common task in graduate seminars in which presenters lead seminar discussion. An oral presentation may seem to be a straightforward activity, involving understanding the assigned material, summarizing it and presenting it to the instructor and classmates. However, research has shown that oral presentation requires constant negotiation and decision making for it to be successful.

**Young (1990)**, this study found similar results to those of the current study. In this study, the researcher showed that Professor's non-threatening error correction approach and friendly personality might have served to reduce the students' anxiety. This supports the findings obtained in the current study. The researcher surveyed students' views towards instructor's characteristics and behaviour that reduce their foreign language classroom anxiety. The top three characteristics were good sense of humor, friendliness, and relaxation might have served to reduce the students' anxiety.

also the study showed that there were many difficulties in giving the academic oral presentation. The study explained that students ought to prepare their presentations in light of specific criteria.

According to **Cheng et al. (1999)**, this study showed similar results to the current study. The researchers studied a group of Taiwanese university students and found a significant negative correlation between self-perceived speaking competence and foreign language classroom anxiety. The researchers found the relationship between second language classroom anxiety and second language writing anxiety and their relationships with speaking and writing achievements.

In light of the questionnaire, it was obvious from table (4.4) that the First domain "Clarity of speech and voice quality" occupied the first rank with percent weight (54.73%), the third field "Interaction with audience" occupied the second rank with a percentage weight of (51.53%), and the second field "Correctness of Language" occupied the third rank with a percentage weight of (46.47%). That indicates that "Clarity of speech and voice quality" constitute the most serious difficulty encountering students in the process of giving the academic oral presentation simply because English students are unfamiliar to organize the presentation according to the basic criteria the criteria of academic oral presentation, how to state and stick to the objectives, organization of the presentation and importance of signal words in connection of the ideas.

Consequently, the instructors should take in consideration explaining the criteria of academic presentation, how to prepare it, state the objectives and stick to them and how to use signal words and transitional words to connect the ideas of the presentation.

Thus, the instructors ought to improve all the points related to "Clarity of speech and voice quality" as far as possible before embarking on giving academic oral presentation.

The researcher also observes that the total score of the difficulties of the questionnaire had a percentage weight of (50.95%), which indicates these difficulties have a serious effect on the level of students in giving the academic oral presentation.

According to the interview card, it was obvious from table (4.6) that the First domain " Originality of content" occupied the first rank with percent weight (78.72%), the third and fifth fields " Clarity of speech" and "Body language" occupied the second rank with a percentage weight of (74.23%), and the second field " Correctness of Language" occupied the third rank with a percentage weight of (72.16%), the sixth field "Time management" occupied the third rank with a percentage weight of (67.38%), the fourth field " Visual aids" occupied the sixth rank with a percentage weight of (61.23%)

That indicates that " Originality of content", "Clarity of speech" and "Body language" constituted the most serious difficulty encountering students in the process of giving the academic oral presentation simply because English majors aren't able to design an organized presentation and state the purpose and objectives of the presentation. Moreover, they were unable to use body language correctly because they have no ideas about it and also English students don't have the ability or experience to use the signal words to connect the ideas together.

One also observes that the total score of the difficulties of the interview card had a percentage weight of (71.59%), and that indicates these difficulties have a serious effect on the level of students in giving the academic oral presentations.

The researcher noticed that the majority of difficulties found according to the questionnaire are similar to those in the interview card because there were three domains which were in the questionnaire included in the interview card as the basic criteria of academic oral presentation. Thus, the difficulties obtained from the questionnaire were similar to those in the interview card.



## 5.4. Discussion of the results of the second question

**5.4.1.** Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering Al Aqsa English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between male and female students according to the questionnaire?

The results in Table (4.7) show that there are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between male and female students in light of the questionnaire.

The researcher thinks that the difficulties in general are of the same importance for male and female students. That result is simply because both male and female students live in the same social, political, educational and economic circumstances. In addition, they have the same teachers and instructors, and study the same courses. Besides, they also have received the same education before entering the university and the genre is new and challenging to both.

**5.4.2.** Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering Al Aqsa English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between male and female students in light of the interview?

The results in table (4.8) reveal that there are statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral between male and female students for females according to the interview.

The researcher believes that the main reason behind the statistically significant differences between males and females students for females was that the number of female students in the academic sections was more than males. Thus, it is possible that the female students don't have chance to give their academic presentation comfortably, so the difficulties encountering female students were more than those encountering males especially, in terms of clarity of speech which was affected from the excessive number of female students in the academic class.

## 5.5 Discussion of the results of the third question

**5.5.1.** Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering Al Aqsa English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between junior and senior students according to the questionnaire?

The findings in table (4.9) show that there are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering Al Aqsa English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between junior and senior students in light of the questionnaire.

The researcher thinks that both junior and senior students encounter the same difficulties in giving the academic presentation. That result is simply because both junior and senior students live in the same social, political, educational and economic circumstances. In addition, they usually registered the same courses together with the same instructors.

The previous findings of the current study that there are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering Al Aqsa English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between junior and senior students. The findings related to the second question don't match the results **Chen (2009)** who revealed that there were statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) between first and second levels of the MA students in TEFL programme. The study justified that result that the second level students had more experience than the first level students.

**5.5.2.** Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering Al Aqsa English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between junior and senior students in light of the interview?

The findings in table (4.10) show that there are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering Al Aqsa English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between junior and senior students according to the interview card.

## 5.6. Discussion of the results of the fourth question

5.6.1. What are the difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentations during class at Al-Aqsa university from instructors' perspectives according the questionnaire?

To discuss the results of this question according to the questionnaire, the researcher used the frequencies, sum of responses, standard deviation, means the percentage weight and rank of each item of the questionnaire. Tables (4.11, 4.12, 4.13, 4.14) show the results:

The researcher found that more than 70% of the instructors agreed that " A presentation is given in a disorganized way ", "The student is unfamiliar with the criteria of effective oral presentation ", " A presentation is delivered with incorrect pronunciation ", " Lack of appropriate vocabulary and expressions used in a presentation ", " The student focuses on the grammar accuracy more than fluency ", " Lack of using body language and gestures while speaking " and "The presenter is unable to use tools such LCD and powerpoint effectively " were the major difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentations at Al Aqsa university. Thus, the researcher strongly believes that the instructors think that the English majors at Al Aqsa university should understand the effective criteria of academic oral presentation and they ought to realize how to organize their academic presentation correctly and accurately.

In addition, it is important for the students to focus on the phonetics and phonology courses to improve their pronunciation during the academic presentation and they have to expand their vocabulary and expressions in all fields to develop their abilities to speak English particularly when they are asked to give presentation and also to use it in every day academic life.

Furthermore, Al Aqsa professors think that their students should use body language when they give the presentation and also use the technological devices effectively and easily to enrich their presentation and save the time and efforts.

The study found the English students concentrate on the accuracy more than fluency, so they hesitate through the presentation and make grammar mistakes. That's why Al Aqsa

instructors ought to advise their students to speak regardless of the grammar mistakes they may make during it.

The results of the study also showed that Al Aqsa professors think that it is very necessary to develop the students' capabilities in the speaking skill since it is the important skill used in giving the academic presentation. Students should enhance their social and academic relations between them and their professors to encourage themselves to speak in and out of the class and consequently improve their communication and speaking skills.

From table (4.14) the researcher notices that the first field " Clarity of speech and voice quality " occupied the first rank with percent weight (60.4%), and the second field " Correctness of Language " occupied the second rank with a percent weight of (52.7%) ,whereas the third field " Interaction with audience " occupied the third rank with percent weight (52.6%) .That shows that the first domain: " Clarity of speech and voice quality " constitutes the most serious difficulty encountering students in the process of giving academic oral presentations from the instructors' perspectives. Consequently, the instructors ought to provide English students with the basic criteria of academic oral presentation in order to organize the presentation easily. The researcher noticed that the first domain in the questionnaire "Clarity of speech and voice quality" represents the major difficulty in giving the academic presentation from students' perspectives and instructors' perspectives and approximately with equal ratios. That indicates "Clarity of speech and voice quality" ought to be taken in consideration from both students and lecturers and exert efforts to overcome all the difficulties related to this domain.

We also see that the total score of the difficulties of the questionnaire from instructors' perspectives had a percentage weight of (55.10%), that indicates these difficulties have serious influence on the level of students, so we should shed light on the difficulties to get rid of all.

**5.6.2.** To discuss the results of this question in light of the interview card, the researcher used the frequencies, sum of responses, standard deviation, means the percentage weight and rank of each item of the interview card. Tables (4.15, 4.16) show the results:

The findings of this question showed that more than 75% of the instructors identified the following difficulties " There are no well structured and clear conclusions ", " The presenter doesn't use technological aids ", " There isn't an appropriate use of signal words " " Clarity of expressions " " There aren't good structures and registers " "The aids aren't various" were serious. Thus, it is a good idea for instructors to encourage the students to expand their knowledge of vocabulary and organize their presentation to enable them to give a good academic presentation.

one notices from table (4.16) that the third criterion "Clarity of speech" occupied the first rank with percent weight (80%), the fourth criterion "Visual aids" occupied the second rank with a percent weight (68.89), the second criterion "Correctness of language" occupied the third rank with a percent weight of (61.67%) ,while the fifth criterion " Body Language" occupied the fourth rank with percent weight (54.44%) ,whereas the first criterion occupied the fifth rank with percent weight (47.78%). The sixth criterion occupied the sixth and the last rank with percent weight (40%).

This clarifies that the field "Clarity of speech" in both the questionnaire and interview card constitute the most serious difficulty encountering students in the process of giving academic oral presentation from the instructors' perspectives.

That's why the instructors should give this domain considerable concern because it forms the basic difficulty encountering Al Aqsa English majors in giving academic oral presentation.

The researcher also notices that the total degree of the difficulties of the interview card from instructors' perspectives had a percentage weight of (60%), that indicates these difficulties have an explicit effect on students' level.

## **5.7. Discussion of the results of the fifth question**

**5.7.1.** Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations from instructors' perspectives and students' perspectives according to the questionnaire?

To answer this question according the questionnaire the researcher used means, , Mann Whitney U value, sig. value and sig. level. Table (4.17) shows this:

The table (4.17) shows that there are no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in all domains and the total domain of the questionnaire in the difficulties encountering English majors from instructors' perspectives according to academic classification

The researcher thinks that both instructors and students agreed that the same difficulties encountering English students whether males or females in giving the academic presentation. That result is simply because English students at Al Aqsa university live in the same social, political, educational and economical circumstances.

**5.7.2.** Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations from instructors' perspectives and students' perspectives in light of the interview card?

To answer this question in light of the interview card, the researcher used means, Mann Whitney U value, sig. value and sig. level. Table (4.18) shows this:

The previous table (4.18) shows that there are statistically significant differences in the difficulties encountering English majors for English students at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) due to academic classification from students' perspectives and instructors' perspectives in first, second, fifth and sixth criteria and the total criteria of the interview card.

The researcher thinks that the difficulties encountering English majors in light of the interview card from the instructors' perspectives are of the different importance one criterion to another. That result is simply because instructors noticed students when they give the presentation under the basic criteria of academic presentation, so lecturers found some differences in their performance.

### **5.8. Discussion of the results of the sixth question**

The researcher used content analysis card to answer this question. The researcher designed the tool and elicited the difficulties encountering English majors in the written aspect of the oral presentation through two criteria that is, originality of content and correctness of language. According to content analysis card, the most important and serious difficulties are first, "connection of ideas", which got 87.9%. This shows that "connection of ideas" is considered an important difficulty encountering English majors in the written aspect of the academic oral presentation. Secondly, "using appropriate transitional words and clear signals", that's why, "using appropriate transitional words and clear signals" is considered a difficulty in the written aspect of the oral presentation. Thirdly, "organization of the written topic", which got 69.7%. So "organization of the written text" is considered a difficulty encountering students in the written aspect of the oral presentation. Fourthly, "the student weakness in comparative linguistics.", which got 84%. So knowledge of comparative linguistic is considered a serious difficulty encountering English majors in the written aspect of the academic oral presentation. Fifthly, "lack appropriate structures and discourse markers to express ideas", that got 53.6%. That's why, it is a difficulty encountering students in the written aspect of academic oral presentation. Finally, "interlingual errors" got 78%. This confirms the result of the previous items that is the student's weakness in the comparative linguistic leads to many interlingual errors in the written texts of English students. That's why, interlingual errors are considered a difficulty encountering English students in the written aspect of the oral presentation.

## 5.9. Pedagogical Implications for Teaching

The findings of this study revealed that there are many difficulties encountering Al Aqsa English majors in giving their academic oral presentation. This study has some implications. First of all, Al Aqsa English students don't have much experience in doing academic oral presentations, and were generally more anxious, so it is important to provide psychological and academic support and encouragement when they join Teaching English Methodology department. Thus, the researcher raises some pedagogical implications:-

First, due to psychological factors such "Speakers don't act cheerfully and smile when speaking", "The student is unfamiliar with the criteria of effective oral presentation", " The purpose statement of the presentation isn't explicit", "The objectives aren't clear", "The presenter gives the presentation with unclear and low voice", "Speakers speak with lack of confidence" and "The presenter hesitates while speaking and presenting" were identified to be important difficulties for the English majors, so it is possible to reduce stresses and difficulties aroused by this factor, the course instructor may provide information such as the grading criteria and the purpose of the oral presentation activity. With this information available to students, they will be able to engage in a more realistic appraisal process. That is, students will be able to give the academic presentation effectively and audience also will be able to evaluate the situation at hand, which is the requirements of the oral presentation, the actions or preparations needed, and the feasibility and effectiveness of such actions.

Secondly, teachers should help students reduce their fear of making grammatical and pronunciation mistakes. In this study, students perceived pronunciation and grammar accuracy as important difficulties encountering English students. It is also true that grammar and pronunciation are often taken as grading criteria, but teachers may inform students of the importance of the presentation content.

Thirdly, it was found that "Weakness of rapport between the students" and "Student doesn't practice giving the presentation solo or with peers" played significant roles as important difficulties in giving the presentation. Therefore, it is very necessary



to build a strong rapport and friendly relationships between the students themselves and between them and their instructors. This will likely to be effective in relaxing students and developing their ability in giving the academic presentation.

Fourthly, teachers may inform students of the importance of showing appropriate behavior while they listen to oral presentations. This study found that "Interruption from audience during presentation" represents one of the difficulties encountering the students in giving the presentation. Thus, when the audience interrupt the presenters during the presentation, they are likely to be nervous and confused. Therefore, teachers may emphasize the importance of showing respectful academic behaviour when students listen to oral presentations and also encourage the students to raise questions and comment after finishing the presentation.

Fifthly, instructors ought to encourage the students to prepare and organize their academic presentation in light of the criteria of the academic oral presentation that are known and accepted from the instructors and their students.

Sixthly, students should outline the main objectives of the presentation and they should stick to them in order to save the time and effort. It is advisable to the students to decrease the details and examples related to the ideas of the presentation.

Finally, lecturers should motivate the students to use transitional and signal words in order to be able to relate the different ideas of the presentation with each other in a logical way and avoid making the audience feel that there is a gap between an idea and the other.

## 5.10. Conclusion

Based on the findings derived from the results of this study, the following conclusions were reached:

1. Major and serious difficulties encounter Al Aqsa English majors in giving the academic oral presentation in class from both instructors' perspectives and students' perspectives according to clarity of speech, originality of the content, organization of the presentation, effective criteria, confidence of the presenter, objectives of the presentation, signal and transitional words, voice quality, connection of the ideas and drawing a good conclusion.
2. Major and serious difficulties encounter Al Aqsa English majors in giving the academic oral presentation in class according to correctness of the language such: inaccurate pronunciation, lack of vocabulary, structures, discourse markers, grammar accuracy, fluency, oral proficiency, communicative competence and oral speaking activities
3. Major and serious difficulties encounter Al Aqsa English majors in giving the academic oral presentation in class in light of interaction with audience, body language, eye-contact technique, visual aids, time management, lack of technological devices, lack of courses that develop speaking skill, psychological factors, lack of rapport and practice between students and their professors, social factors and interruption from the students.
4. Technological devices such: LCD, OHP and computer were very helpful aids for Al Aqsa English students in giving the academic oral presentations. These devices also facilitate their tasks and save their time and effort.
5. There were no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering Al Aqsa English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between junior and senior students according to the interview.

6. There were statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between male and female students for the females according to the interview card.

7. There were no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering Al Aqsa English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between junior and senior students in light of the questionnaire.

8. There were no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountering English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between male and female students according to the questionnaire.

9. There were no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in all domains and the total domain of the questionnaire in the difficulties encountering English majors from instructors' perspectives according to academic classification.

10. There were statistically significant differences in the difficulties encountering English majors for English students at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) due to academic classification from instructors' perspectives in first, second, fifth and sixth criteria and the total criteria of the interview card.

11. Gender and classification had no influence on their perceptions towards giving the academic oral presentation.

12. Psychological and academic difficulties that were in the first domain "Clarity of speech" represented the major difficulties from students' perspectives and instructors' perspectives the most important difficulties encountering Al Aqsa English Majors in delivering the academic oral presentations.

13. The researcher is thoroughly convinced from his study that the role of instructor is not an easy job. It is his role to break down the psychological barriers between students and the ability to give the academic oral presentations.

14. Free oral and speaking activities like role-play, simulation, oral participation and free dialogues were the most effective strategies in developing the academic oral presentations of English students.

15. Body language such as gestures and eye-contact which is one of the constituents of the academic oral presentation was one of the major difficulties encountered by English majors in giving the academic presentations.

16. The clarity of speech was the only main criterion which was statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the difficulties encountered by English Majors in giving academic oral presentations between males and females students for the females in light of the interview card.

17. Psychological and social difficulties were more important than the linguistic difficulties according to the interview card and the questionnaire.

### 5.11. Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of this study and in the light of the difficulties encountering English students in giving the academic oral presentation, the researcher suggests some recommendations to overcome these difficulties and to improve the learning teaching process generally in oral proficiency and speaking skill in particular.

1. It is recommended to provide Al Aqsa university classes and academic rooms with the necessary technological devices such as LCD, OHP and a computer in order to help the English students in giving the academic oral presentation and save their time and efforts and facilitate their academic tasks as well.

2. Instructors ought to encourage their students to prepare and organize their academic oral presentation in light of the criteria of the academic presentation that are known for both the teacher and the students.

3. It is advisable to English students to outline the purpose of the presentation before they begin and state the basic objectives clearly and stick to them.

4- It would be highly effective for English students to use discourse markers, transitional and signal words in their academic presentation to relate the whole ideas of the presentation together.

5. It is recommended to build a strong rapport and friendly relationships between the students themselves and between them and their instructors. This will likely to be effective in relaxing students and developing their ability in giving the academic presentation

6. Lecturers ought to remove the psychological difficulties in order to reduce presenters' anxiety. Therefore, a friendly, patient personality and non-threatening error correction approach from the professor will likely to be effective in relaxing students and improving their academic performance.

7. Instructors should motivate English students to speak and talk in order to enable them to be fluent speakers of English and also lecturers ought to enhance the participation in the class and give every student the chance to speak and express his ideas.
8. Lecturers ought to emphasize the importance of showing appropriate and respectful behavior while the presenters are speaking. Thus, audience should not interrupt the presenters during the presentation.
9. It is strongly recommended to teach and add many courses that are closely related to the development of speaking and conversational skills in order to enhance the abilities of English students in the speaking skill and giving the academic oral presentation.
10. Professors should encourage English students to speak English between them outside the academic sections and practice the academic presentation with their colleagues inside and outside the university.
11. It is advisable to English students to use body language and eye-contact technique in the academic oral presentation since it is one of the constituents of the academic oral presentation.
12. English majors ought to expand their knowledge in recognition of new vocabulary and expressions to be able to give the oral presentation confidently.
13. Instructors should encourage English students to relate the whole ideas of the presentation together and draw a good conclusion to the presentation.
14. It is recommended to English students to stick to the professional criteria of academic oral presentation and implement their presentation in light of these criteria.
15. Not only will developing the academic oral presentation of English students benefit them in their academic life in the university, but also they will make use of it in their educational life in schools when they become teachers of English.

16. English students ought to stick to the time specified for them to deliver their academic presentation in order to reinforce their ability in management of the time.

17. Instructors should motivate English students to use various free oral activities like role-play, dialogues, simulations and academic presentation in the free time in English lab to develop their speaking skills.

18. It would be highly positive for English students to be engaged in academic oral activities such as paraphrasing, comparing and summarizing in order to develop fluency and make them feel brave and enhance self-esteem and confidence.

19. Instructors should give students a good chance to participate and use their previous knowledge, experience and ideas after finishing the presentation in order to increase positive feelings and enrich the discussion and participation in the class.

20. Giving the academic oral presentation is considered as a means of oral assessment of the students from instructors' and students' perspectives. Thus, these presentations will give them feedback about their performance later.

21. Giving the academic presentation gives English students the opportunity to exchange the ideas and cultural information between the students and consequently, students will recognize more and various topics through the different presentations

22. It is recommended to reinforce students' confidences, particularly, with opinions which might be inaccurate.

## 5.12. Recommendations for Further Studies

Future research may concentrate on organization of the academic presentation, criteria of academic presentation, social and psychological factors of the presentation, the role of body language in the presentation and it also focus on the academic oral presentation in the schools, which might influence the academic oral presentation. More research should be dedicated to examine the role of foreign culture in the process of the anxiety-coping in EFL students who study in countries other than their native ones.

The result of this study is hopefully planned to be the base for English department at Al Aqsa university to start orientation courses that are closely related to the oral proficiency of English majors which will help them to develop their abilities in giving the academic oral presentation in particular, and the speaking and conversational skills of English language in general. Thus, the instructors of English department in Al Aqsa university are kindly required to increase the number of courses that require to deliver academic presentation and also they are required to specify the criteria of the academic oral presentation they adopt in order to help the students to follow them and be evaluated in light of these criteria.

Furthermore, more researchers must be encouraged to study in depth what are the difficulties encountering EFL in giving their academic presentation and what are the social, linguistic and psychological factors affect the presentation among English students in the Gaza strip.

As a result instructors will be able to help their students become better presenters and speakers of English language. The results of the study will contribute to this field by giving information and ideas on the academic oral presentation that EFL learners use them to present their academic tasks and be assessed from the instructors' and students' perspectives.



## References

- Al Agha, E. (1996) The Educational Research: Elements, Methods and Tools. The Islamic University of Gaza. pg. 110-121.
- Al Da'ada'a, A. and Mghali, S (1992) Learning of Child Slow Learning: Jordan, Al Amman, Fikir publish home. Pg. 20.
- Al Qassim, J. (2000) The Basics of Learning Difficulties: Jordan, Amman, Al Safaa publish home. pg. 21.
- Al-Mashharawi, B. (2006). Evaluating Teachers' Performance in Teaching Speaking Communicatively in Preparatory Stage in Jabalia Area. Unpublished MA thesis. The Islamic University. 4.
- Al Sarttawi, Z. (1995) (Learning Difficulties Children Qualities form Teachers' Perspectives). Contemporary education magazine. No.73.
- Al Sayyed, A. (2002) History of Learning Difficulties:Concept, Diagnosis and Remedy: Al Fikir Arab home, Egypt, Cairo.
- Al Zarad, F. (1991) (Learning Difficulties for Sample of Elementary School in United Arab Emirates), educational survey study.129.
- Al Zayat, F. (2002) University Students Learning Difficulties. Analytical survey study. Egypt, Cairo.
- Al Zayat, F. (2000) University Students Learning Difficulties. Analytical survey study. Egypt, Cairo. 27-287.

- Arter, J. and Jenkins, J (1979)(Difficulties Diagnosis and Prescriptive). Review of educational research, vol. 49
- Barr, D. et al (2005). "Told Like it is! An Evaluation of an Integrated Oral Development Pilot". *Language Learning & Technology*. 9/3: 55-78
- Bender, w. (1995) Characteristics of Adolescent with Learning Disabilities in Secondary Classes: Identification and Teaching Strategies, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Boud, D., Cohen, R., & Sampson, J. (1999). Peer Learning and Assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*,24(4), 413-26.
- Bradbury, A. (2006). Successful Presentation Skills. Third edition. Philadelphia PA 19147, United Kingdom and USA. pg.2.
- Brown, J. and Rodgers, T. (2002) Doing Second Language Research. Oxford: Oxford University Press.117.
- Bygate, M. (1995). Language Speaking Teaching.. Oxford: Oxford University Press.3
- Camille, B. (1992) psychological and educational perspectives on learning disabilities: New York: academic press.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). (Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing). *Applied Linguistics*, 32: 1-47.
- Chen, L. (2009). A Study of EFL Graduate Students' Oral Presentation Anxiety. Unpublished master thesis, National Chung Cheng University, College of Education, Graduate Institute of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature.

- Cheng, W. & Warren. (2005). Peer Assessment of Language Proficiency. *Language Testing*, 22(1), 93-119 University Press.
- Cheng, Y. S., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language Anxiety: Differentiating Writing and Speaking Components. *Language Learning*, 49(3), 417-446.
- Chinn, C., A Anderson, R. C., & Waggoner, M. A. (2001). Patterns of Discourse in Two Kinds of Literature Discussion. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36, 378-411.
- Chiu a, T. et al (2007). Automatic Speech Recognition for EFL college learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. 20/3: 209-233
- Chivers, B. and Shoolbred, M. (2007). A Student's Guide to Presentations. First published by SAGE Publications Ltd.1,16-137.
- Clement, J. (1993) Using Bridges Analogies and Anchoring Institutions to Deal with Students Preconceptions in Physics. *Journal of research in science teaching*, vol 30.
- Delsher, D. Ellis, S. and Lenz, B (1996) Teaching Adolescents with Learning Disabilities: Strategies and Methods. Denever: Ohio publishing.
- Derwing, T.M (2003). (What do ESL Students Say about their Accents?) *Canadian Modern Language Review*; Jun 2003, Vol. 59 Issue 4, P547, 20p, 5 charts.
- Earl, S.E. (1986). Staff and Peer Assessment: Measuring An individual's Contribution Group Performance. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 11, 60-69.
- Emden, J. and Becker, L. (2004). Presentation Skills for Students: Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire. Palgrave Macmillan. pg.1-4.

- Galloway, W. (2007). (Designing Multimedia to Improve the Speaking Skills of Second Language Learners). [Online] *The Knowledge Tree*. (2007). Available: [http://kt.flexiblelearning.net.au/tkt2007/?page\\_id=12](http://kt.flexiblelearning.net.au/tkt2007/?page_id=12)
- Hilleson, M. (1996). “ I Want to Talk with Them, but I Don’ t Want them to Hear” : An introspective study of second language anxiety in an English-medium school. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hong, B. (2006). (Teaching Speaking Skills at a Vietnamese University and Recommendations for Using CMC). *Asian EFL Journal*. 14/2: 1-22
- Horwitz, B. (2002). Communication Apprehension: Origins and Management. New York: Thomson Learning. pg. 562
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign Language Anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125-132.
- Hymes, D.H. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings*. New York: Penguin Books.pg.4.
- Jackson, J., & Latané, B. (1981). All Alone in Front of all Those People: Stage Fright as A function of Number and Type of Co-performers and Audience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40(1), 73-85.
- Jerjawi, Z. (2002) Academic Failure and the Role of Education in the Diagnosis and Remedy: Saudi Arabia. Mecca, Al Sheikha publish home.
- Johnson, K & Morrow, K (1987). Communication in the Classroom. London: Longman Press.pg.71.

- Khatter, T. (1999) Problems of Beginner Teacher in Governmental Schools in Gaza Governorates. MA thesis. Islamic university.pg.7.
- Keshta, A. S. (2000) Alternative Approaches for Teaching English Literature to Undergraduate Students in Gaza Strip. Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation, University of Houston.pg.1.
- Kidder, K. (2008). Uniting Oral proficiency and Content: Collaborative Reasoning Discussions as A means to Develop Advanced Speaking Skills and Promote Response to Literature. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ohio State University, College of Education.
- Kim, S. (2006). Academic Oral Communication Needs of East Asian International Graduate Students in Non-science and Non-engineering Fields. English for Specific Purposes, 25, 479-489.
- Kobayashi, M. (2005). A socio-cultural Study of Second Language Tasks: Activity, Agency, and Language Socialization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
- Kobayashi, M (2003). The Role of Peer Support in ESL Students' Accomplishment of Oral Academic Tasks. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 59, 337-368.
- Lens, B. Alley, G. and Schumaker,R (1987) Activating the Inactive Learner: Advance Organizers in the Secondary Content Classroom. learning disability quarterly 10.
- Lerner, J. (1993) Learning Disabilities: Theories, Diagnosis and Teaching Strategies: Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Lin, L. (2007) (Preparing EFL Learners for Oral Presentations). The Internet TESOL Journal,8(3). Retrieved November 1, 2007 from <http://iteslj.org/Lessons/King-PublicSpeaking.html>.

- Mackey, A. & Gass, S.M. (2005). Second Language Research. Methodology and Design. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Maximos, W. (1968) Difficulties Encountering Eighth Graders in Solving the Theoretical Engineering Exercises. MA thesis.pg.11.
- Morita, N. (2000). Discourse Socialization Through Oral Classroom Activities in a TESL Graduate Program. TESOL Quarterly, 34, 279-311.
- Mourtaga, K. (2004) Investigating Writing Problems among Palestinian EFL Learners Study English as a Foreign Language. Published Ph.D Dissertation. London: Author House.pg.16.
- Nunan, D. (2003). The Impact of English as A global Language on Educational Policies and Practices in the Asia-Pacific Region. TESOL Quarterly, 37(4), 589-613.
- Orsmond, P., Merry, S., & Reiling, K. (2000). The Use of Student Derived Marking Criteria in Peer and Self-Assessment. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 25(1), 23-38.
- Othman, S. (1990) Learning Difficulties: Cairo, Englo-Egyptian library. pg. 11-18.
- Otoshi, J. and Heffernan, N. (2008). (Factors Predicting Effective Oral Presentations in EFL Classrooms). Asian EFL journal. Volume 10. Issue 1. Article 4. Ehime University, Japan, A study of learner anxiety in beginning, intermediate, and advanced-level college students of Japanese. Foreign Language Annals, 29(2), 239-251.
- Patri, M. (2002). The Influence of Peer Feedback on Self-and Peer Assessment of Oral Skills. Language Testing, 19(2), 109-31

- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1995). Communication: Apprehension, Avoidance, and Effectiveness (4th ed.). Arizona: Gorsuch Scarisbrick Publishers.
- Rossan, F. (2001) Psychology of Unusual Children: Introduction in Special Education. Jordan, Amman, Al Fikir for publishing, fifth edition. Pg.172.
- Rust, C., Price, M., & O'Donovan, B. (2003). Improving Students' Learning by Developing their Understanding of Assessment Criteria and Processes. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(2), 147-164.
- Saito, Y., & Samimy, K. K. (1996). Foreign Language Anxiety and Language Performance: A study of learner anxiety in beginning, intermediate, and advanced-level college students of Japanese. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(2), 239-251.
- Savignon, S. & Berns, M. (Eds) (1984). *Initiative in Communicative Language Teaching*. Reading. MA thesis study. Addison-Wesley. 46-249.
- Scott, T. (2005). How to Teach Speaking. London: Longman Press.
- Siddons, S. (2008). The Complete Presentation Skills. handbook First published in Great Britain and the United States by Kogan Page. London and Philadelphia. Pg. 1-3
- Tanveer, M. (2007). Investigation of the Factors that Cause Language Anxiety for ESL /EFL Learners in Learning Speaking Skills and the Influence it Casts on the Communication in the Target Language. Published doctoral dissertation, University of Glasgow, Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching Pathway.
- Tsutsui, M. (2004) "Multimedia as a Means to Enhance Feedback". *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. 17/3-4:377-402.

Wallwork, A. (2010). English for Presentations at International Conferences. Via Carducci 9. Italy. adrian.wallwork@gmail.com.4-10.

Wang, Sue (2009). A Case Study on Chinese Graduate Students' Oral Presentations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services.

Westberry, S (1994) a Review of Learning Strategies for Adults with Learning disabilities. Journal of learning disabilities, 27-45.

Wong, B. (1985) Issues in Cognitive-Behavior Intervention in Academic Skill Areas. Journal of abnormal child psychology 2.

Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and speaking English as a Second Language. RELC, Journal, 37(3), 308-328.

Wu, M. C. (2008). Academic Oral Presentations: A Study of 5 Graduate Students in Taiwan. The 25th International conference of English teaching and learning. Taiwan: National Taiwan Normal University.

Young, D. J. (1990). An Investigation of Students' Perspectives on Anxiety and Speaking. Foreign Language Annals, 23(6), 539-553.

Zappa-Hollman, S. (2007). Academic Presentations Across Post-Secondary Contexts: The Discourse Socialization of Non-native English Speakers. The Canadian Modern Language Review. 63, 455-485.

Zaqoot, S. (2004) Difficulties in Memorizing Literary Texts for Ninth Graders from Teachers' and Students' Perspectives in Gaza City. MA thesis.

Zhou, N. (2004). How English as a Second Language Affects Chinese Students Giving Presentation during Class in U.S. Unpublished MA thesis, Ohio State University, College of Education, Graduate School of Marietta College.



# Appendices

## Appendices

A : Questionnaire on difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentations at Al Aqsa university.

B : Interview card deigned in light of the main criteria of academic oral presentation to elicit difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentation.

C : Content Analysis Card

D: Referees list

E : The request from the deanship of post graduate studies of the Islamic University to Al Aqsa University for facilitating the researcher's mission to distribute the questionnaire and conduct the interview card .

## Appendices

Appendix No. (A)

### Student Questionnaire

The questionnaire on difficulties encountering English Department students at Al Aqsa University in Giving the Academic Oral Presentations.

Dear students,

I would greatly appreciate your completing this questionnaire, which doesn't take much time, and it is easy to complete. It is only for the academic research purposes and it is not to evaluate any course or instructor. Please, don't write your name.

Gender  Male  
 Female

Classification  Fresh (first year of the college)  
 Sophomore (second year of the college)  
 Junior (third year of the college)  
 Senior (fourth year of the college)

Read the following statements carefully before answering any of them. If you face any difficulty, please ask your instructor.

No.	Difficulties	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<b>First: Clarity of speech and voice quality</b>					
1.	A presentation is given in a disorganized way					
2.	A presentation includes many examples and details					
3.	Speakers don't outline the presentation objectives to audience					
4.	Speakers don't stick to the objectives of the speech					
5.	Presenter delivers the presentation with unclear and low voice					
6.	Speakers speak with lack of confidence					
7.	presenter hesitates while speaking and presenting					
8.	presentation lacks a good connection of ideas					
9.	Speakers don't use appropriate transitional words and clear signals					
10	Student is unfamiliar with the criteria of effective oral presentation					
11.	Students fear negative evaluation and comments					
	<b>Second: Correctness of Language</b>					
12.	A presentation is delivered with incorrect pronunciation					
13	Lack of appropriate vocabulary and expressions used in a presentation					
14.	Students make grammar mistakes during the presentation					

No.	Difficulties	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15.	Students rarely speak English in social interactions and contexts					
16.	The communicative competence of the students is low					
17.	Speaking proficiency of the Students' is weak					
18.	Student focuses on the grammar accuracy more than fluency					
19.	Lack of appropriate structures and discourse markers to express ideas					
20.	Student suffers from interlingual mistakes while presenting					
21.	Students are unfamiliar with free oral and speaking activities					
22.	Weakness of student knowledge in comparative linguistics					
	<b>Third: Interaction with audience</b>					
23.	Student rarely interacts orally with their instructors in many courses					
24.	Presenter is unable to use tools such LCD and powerpoint effectively					
25.	Lack of courses that develop the speaking and conversational skills					
26.	Speakers don't act cheerfully and smile when speaking					
27.	Speakers don't keep eye-contact with audience					
28.	Lack of using body language and gestures while speaking					
29.	Weakness of rapport between the students					
30.	Interruption from audience during presentation					
31.	Lack of motivation towards giving the					

No.	Difficulties	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	academic oral presentation					
32.	Students don't use English language in their real-life situations					
33.	Student doesn't practice giving the presentation solo or with peers					
34.	Student doesn't have the right to choose the topics in certain courses					
35.	Weakness of academic interaction between students outside the class					

**Thank you for your time and participation.**

The researcher,

**Ayman Hassan Abu El Eein**

## Appendices

Appendix No. (B)

### Student interview card

Interview card is on difficulties encountering English Department students at Al Aqsa University in Giving the Academic Oral Presentations.

Dear students,

I would greatly appreciate your interview, which doesn't take much time, and it is easy to answer. It is only for the academic research purposes and it is not to evaluate any course or instructor. Don't write your name and instructor's name

Gender  Male  
 Female

Classification  Junior (third year of the college)  
 Senior (fourth year of the college)

This interview card is to elicit the difficulties facing English department students in giving academic oral presentation in light of the suggested criteria for judging the effective academic oral presentations.

### Interview card

No.	The main criteria	The minor criteria	excellent	good	poor
1.	<b>Originality of content</b>	1- Is there a good choice of the topic?			
		2- Are the objectives clear?			
		3- Is the purpose statement of the presentation explicit?			
2.	<b>Correctness of language</b>	1- Is there a clear pronunciation?			
		2- Is there an appropriate use of vocabulary?			
		3- Are there good structures and registers?			
		4- Clarity of expressions			
3.	<b>Clarity of speech</b>	1- Is there a good connection of ideas?			
		2- Is there an appropriate use of signal words?			
		3- Are there well structured and clear conclusions?			
4.	<b>Visual aids</b>	1- Does the presenter use technological aids?			
		2- Are the aids various?			
		3- Does the presenter use the aids effectively?			
5.	<b>Body language</b>	1- Does he use suitable gestures to keep audience's attention?			
		2- Does he use eye-contact technique to keep the audience attention?			
		3- Does he use various techniques of body language?			
6.	<b>Time management</b>	1- Does he stick to the time of the presentation?			
		2- Does he distribute the time to a presentation parts effectively?			

**Thank you for your time and participation.**

The researcher,

**Ayman Hassan Abu El Eein**



## **Appendices**

Appendix No. (C)

### **Content Analysis Card**

#### **Purpose of the analysis:**

The analysis aims at identifying to what extent these written texts of the same topic, English language learning, match two of the suggested criteria of academic oral presentation.

#### **Sample of the analysis:**

All the (40) written texts of male and female students in English department at Al Aqsa university of Gaza.

#### **Elements of Analysis:**

The researcher chose the two criteria and designed them in light of the interview card in which it included the six criteria of academic oral presentation. These two criteria are the elements of analysis

#### **Applying the analysis card**

The researcher held three workshops to train three other colleagues researchers so as to conduct the analysis through the content analysis card. The researcher provided the researchers with the criteria for evaluating the written texts and discussed with them how to conduct the analysis. The researchers were asked to start analysis for six written texts papers to check the understanding of the colleague researchers. There was relative approximation among the researchers' collected data. After assuring the researchers' involvement, they were asked to complete the analysis for all the (40) written papers. The analysis is conducted through using a tick to indicate the presence of the criterion or a cross which shows its absence.

**The two criteria suggested to find the difficulties of the written aspect of the oral presentations**

**1- Originality of content**

- a- The text reflects using appropriate vocabulary and expressions
- b- The written topic shows grammar mistakes
- c- The text discloses interlingual errors
- d- The text lacks appropriate structures and discourse markers to express ideas.
- e- The text shows the student weakness in comparative linguistics.

**2- Correctness of language**

- a- A written topic is given in a disorganized way
- b- The written text lacks a good connection of ideas
- c- The text has clear objectives of the speech
- d- The written text doesn't show appropriate transitional words and clear signals
- e- The text includes examples that help to clarify the meaning

**Thank you for your time and participation.**

The researcher,

**Ayman Hassan Abu El Einein**

## Appendices

Appendix No. (D)

### Referees list

No.	Referee's name	position
1.	Dr. Awad Keshta	Associate Prof. the Education Department at IUG
2.	Dr. Mohammad Shqeir	Assistant Prof. in the Education Department at IUG
3.	Dr. Mohammad Al Hajj Ahmad	Assistant Prof. in the English Department at IUG
4.	Dr. Mohammed Hamdan	Associate Prof. in the Education Department at Al-Aqsa University
5.	Dr. Mohammed Ateya Abed El Raheem	Assistant Prof. in English Department at Al-Aqsa University
6.	Dr. Jaber Abu Shawesh	Assistant Prof. in English Department at Al Quds Open University
7.	Dr. Ahmad Al-Nakhala	Assistant Prof. in English Department at Al Quds Open University
8.	Mr. Rafat Abu Ghali	Lecturer in the English Department at Al-Aqsa University
9.	Mr. Wahby Al Subakhy	Supervisor of English language in the governmental schools in Rafah
10.	Mr. Mahmoud Shaqfa	Lecturer in the Education Department at University College of Applied Sciences
11.	Mr. Majed Al Jazzar	Teacher of Maths in "D" Rafah prep School
12.	Aa'ed Al Raba'i	Head of research and analytical department in MOEHE

## Consultation Form of A questionnaire

Dear Dr. ....

The researcher is carrying out A questionnaire and interview card as a part of Master Degree of Curricula and English Methodology in Education entitled

### **"Difficulties Encountering English Majors in Giving Academic Oral Presentations during class at Al Aqsa University"**

You are kindly invited to examine and check the questionnaire and interview card which are designed to survey and collect data on difficulties encountering English majors in giving academic oral presentations during class at Al Aqsa university.

I would be so grateful if you could provide me with your comments related to the relevance, sentence structure, number of items and techniques used in this questionnaire and also about interview card. Any modifications, additions, or omissions, will be taken into consideration when processing these analysis cards.

**Thank you for your time and academic assistance.**

Yours,

**Ayman Hassan Abu El Enein**

Referee's name,

.....

Signature

.....



لدينا  
بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم  
م

حفظه الله،

الأخ الدكتور/ نائب الرئيس للثئون الأكاديمية

جامعة الأقصى - غزة

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته.

### الموضوع/ لن يهمه الأمر

تهديكم عمادة الدراسات العليا أعطر تحياتها، وترجو من سيادتكم التكرم بتسهيل مهمة الطالب/ أيمن حسن أحمد أبو العنين، برقم جامعي 120090057 المسجل في برنامج الماجستير بكلية التربية تخصص مناهج وطرق تدريس - لغة إنجليزية، وذلك بهدف إجراء مقابلة وتطبيق أدوات دراسته والحصول على المعلومات التي تساعد في إعداد رسالة الماجستير والتي بعنوان:

### Difficulties Facing English majors in Giving Academic Oral Presentations During Class at Al Aqsa University

والله ولي التوفيق،،،

عميد الدراسات العليا

د. زياد إبراهيم مقداد



الأخ الدكتور/ نائب الرئيس للثئون الأكاديمية  
جامعة الأقصى - غزة  
صورة إلى: الملف

الأخ الدكتور/ عميد كلية الأداب حضرتكم  
برنامج الماجستير لغة إنجليزية  
م

انتم رئيس قسم الدراسات العليا  
م