Amina Kimouche & Nadia Idri, Ph.D.
Faculty of Arts and Languages, LESMS Research Lab
University of Bejaia, Algeria

A NEED-BASED EVALUATION OF AN ORAL PRESENTATION COURSE AT BEJAIA UNIVERSITY: PERSPECTIVES AND CONSIDERATIONS

Abstract

This paper reports on a needs-based study conducted to explore EFL master students' academic needs and to examine the adequacy and effectiveness of the oral presentation course in catering to those needs. To this end, a survey questionnaire and a semi-structured interview were conducted with students. The findings suggest that the current course had a number of drawbacks in meeting the learners' expectations and needs. The course could be further improved by incorporating relevant materials, increasing the time allotted to the course, and putting more emphasis on the students' needs regarding the master thesis oral presentation.

Keywords: EFL students, needs analysis, needs-based evaluation, oral course evaluation,

1. Introduction

EFL graduate students are expected to engage in several academic tasks to ensure successful completion of their courses. One major challenging task that graduate students face is writing a research paper and presenting an oral summary of this research during their thesis defense. To cope with these demands, the Department of English at Bejaia University offers a wide range of modules and courses such as scientific communication skills, oral presentation skills and research paper writing techniques. The purpose of these courses is not to render students a better command of English, but to enable them to carry out certain tasks pertinent to their academic success in their prospective fields of study. Most of these courses can be compiled under the umbrella of English for Academic Purposes (EAP).

English for Academic Purposes is a major field in Applied Linguistics which, in a broad sense, encompasses all areas of academic communicative practice such as undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate teaching, classroom interactions, academic publishing and curriculum issues, as well as various research and student genres (Hyland, 2006, p. 1). Dudley-Evans and St-John (1998) define EAP briefly as "any English teaching that relates to a study purpose» (p.34). Hence, the main focus of EAP is to equip students with the necessary academic skills to complete their University course tasks (Jordan, 1997; Hamp-Lyons, 2001; Brick, 2012). These study skills are common to all students at the tertiary level and considered to be as discipline independent (Brick, 2012, p. 170). Hamp-Lyons (2001) claims that the purpose of EAP courses is to teach the formal and academic genres of the language as opposed to general English courses which tend to focus on conventional and social genres. EAP can be further categorized as English for General Academic Purposes (EGAP) and English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP). EAGP draws on academic discourse common to all disciplines; whereas, ESAP focuses on discipline-specific academic discourse (Brick, 2012).

Evaluation is considered as an essential process to insure the effectiveness and efficiency of any language course. Programme evaluation refers to "collecting information about different aspects of a language program in order to understand how the program works and how successfully it works, enabling different kinds of decisions to be made" (Richards, 2001, p. 286). A course evaluation can be carried out for several purposes and can be oriented to serve different agents. Weir and Roberts (1994) identify two main purposes of language programme evaluation: programme accountability and programme development. The former kind of evaluation is oriented to measure the effects of a programme at significant end points and is often conducted for the interests of an outsider audience or decision-makers. The latter, however, is concerned with improving the quality of a certain programme as it is implemented and usually involves teachers, learners and the staff who are already engaged in the programme (Weir & Roberts, 1994, p. 5). Based on its purpose, language programme evaluation can be either termed as summative, which usually occurs at the end of a course or formative, which is conducted during the course (Rea-Dickins & Germaine, 1992). Summative evaluation is considered to be formal and aims at assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of a programme; whereas, formative evaluation is informal and usually aims to refine and enhance the current practices of the programme (Graves, 1996). Chen (2005) points to the necessity of gathering hard evidence to prove programme effectiveness and efficiency. He adds that neglecting feedback from participants has great potential in steering the course towards more effective processes. In congruence with this, Richards (2001) purports that examining the effectiveness of a course involves different measures such as mastery of objectives, performance on tests, and measures of acceptability which is considered as a valuable account for students' and teachers' satisfaction about the course (p. 294).

Moreover, Hutchinson and Waters (1987) stress the importance of course evaluation in both ELT and EAP contexts. EAP courses are designed to respond to particular educational needs; therefore, evaluation is a necessary tool to demonstrate to what extent those needs are fulfilled (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, p. 152). Long (2005) considers language programme evaluation as a part of the larger context of programme Needs Analysis (NA). According to Brown (1995), NA refers to "those activities involved in gathering information that will serve as the basis for developing a curriculum that will meet the learning needs of a particular group of students". It follows that course evaluation and needs analysis, though can stand alone, may intersect at certain points. In fact, some of the outlined aims of NA are directly associated with course evaluation. For example, NA can be used to examine if the course is "preparing the learners properly for their use of English at the end of the course" (Nation & Macalister, 2010, p. 123) and "to help determine if an existing course adequately addresses the needs of potential students" (Richards, 2001, p. 52).

In the present study, course evaluation was utilized as a part of a needs analysis process that attempts to examine areas of mismatch between the course and the students' needs. In doing so, the students' wants and expectations are identified and discussed in relation to the course. The researcher approached the current course from students' perspectives. Students, as key participants in evaluation, provide valuable information "on the way the program was taught and the relevance of what they have learned to their needs" (Richards, 2001, p. 196).The evaluation was carried out after the course, by the end of the second semester to make sure that the students have delivered their thesis oral presentations. An after-course evaluation is deemed highly important because "the learners will be in position to judge how well the course prepared them for the target situation they are in now" (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, p. 155). After going through their academic experience, former learners can lend vital insights into the process of improving the instruction and learning of academic oral presentations skills.

The main goal of the current course, as stated in the official curriculum, is to improve students' oral presentation skills (c.f. Appendix 01). With the goal being general, some freedom was left for the instructor to determine the intermediate objectives of the course, the content and the methods by which to carry out the course. Such process exerts great responsibility on teachers since it requires a thorough and ongoing needs analysis. Some teachers may skip this step which often results in a prescribed course based on the teacher's idiosyncrasies rather than students' real needs. Hence, the present study intends to cast lights on students' needs and concerns and reveal areas that require further improvements in the course. Nunan (1988) considers NA as the first step in designing and improving language programmes. Therefore, the findings of this research will set a foundation for the upcoming process of designing a focused course that will cater to EFL master students' needs at Bejaia University.

The following questions guide this research:
• How do students judge the adequacy of the course in terms of content, structure, timing, materials, feedback and instruction?
• How effective was the course in responding to the students' needs?

2. Methods

The main purpose of this study is to evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of the oral presentation course through the perspectives of the learners. To provide rich information and reinforce evaluation conclusions, the present study employs a mixed- methods design drawing on both quantitative and qualitative accounts. In language programme evaluation, the use of both quantitative and qualitative data is preferable since they often complement each other (Richards, 2001).

2.1. Participants and Setting

The course under evaluation is offered by the Department of English at Bejaia University as a compulsory subject in the Master 2 programme of the Linguistics option. The course has a time span of two hours and half per week and covers only fall semester. The participants of the study include 16 EFL master 2 students majoring in Linguistics. The study was conducted after the course, by the end of the academic year 2017-2018.

2.2. Research Instruments

The programme evaluation was conducted after the course in the form of summative evaluation. Data was obtained through quantitative and qualitative measures. A survey questionnaire was devised and administrated to students by the end of the academic year after the students have completed the master thesis defense. In summative evaluation, questionnaires are widely used as research instruments because they permit the collection of large data set about a course and they are very efficient where "there are very clear focuses for the evaluation and there is a need to summarize the data to get a general picture" of a course (Nation & Macalister, 2010, p. 130). The survey questionnaire aimed at gathering students' opinions about the effectiveness and the adequacy of the course in terms of the content, organization, materials, feedback, timing and instruction. Data obtained from questionnaires were compiled and analyzed using SPSS. Data has been presented in tables and described in terms of percentages.

In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 students after the questionnaires were obtained. Interviews can be used to supplement the survey questionnaire by providing in-depth information on specific questions (Richards, 2001, p. 300). Semi structured interviews were utilized to explore students felt needs and to provide deep insights

on the effectiveness of the course in meeting those needs. The qualitative data obtained from the interview were coded and analyzed through content analysis.

3. Results and Discussion

To get a deep sense of students' evaluations of the current course, both quantitative and qualitative data were used. The findings from both types were analyzed separately. To answer the research questions, both quantitative and qualitative data were both analyzed and discussed under two main sections: the adequacy of the course and the effectiveness of the course. The students' suggestions were included in the qualitative data analysis.

3.1 Findings from Students' Questionnaire

3.1.1. The adequacy of the course

This section of the questionnaire attempts to illicit students' opinions about the adequacy of the course in terms of course timing, content, structure, materials, feedback, and instruction. In doing so, the areas of strength and weakness in the course were identified and highlighted.

Table1

Students' opinions about the course

Items	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
	%	%	%	%	%
1-The time frame given to the course was sufficient	43.8	43.8	12.5	0.0	0.0
2-Error correction and feedback were appropriate.	6.2	50.0	6.2	37.5	0.0
3-There was enough variety in the lessons.	12.5	50.0	6.2	31.2	0.0
5-The class atmosphere was positive.	0.0	12.5	6.2	56.2	25
7-Materials were appropriate.	31.2	56.2	6.2	6.2	0.0
8-All instructions were clear.	0.0	0.0	25	56.2	18
9-The skills taught in the course were -appropriate to my needs.	0.0	50.0	6.2	43.8	0.0
10-The course provided rich knowledge and information.	0.0	56.2	6.2	37.5	0.0
11-The content of the course was appropriate to my needs.	0.0	43.8	12.5	43.8	0.0

The results presented in table 1 indicate that some aspects of the course were deemed adequate while others seem to be less adequate in students' views. The majority of students disagree (43.8%) or strongly disagree (43.8%) that the time allocated to the course was appropriate. Over half of the participants (56.2%) reported that the course did not provide rich information and knowledge. A significant number of students strongly disagree (56.2%) or disagree (31.2%) that the materials used in the course were appropriate. Half of the respondents indicated that the feedback they have received during the course was not sufficient. Only few students (37.5%) reported that the feedback was adequate. In response to Item 3, many students strongly disagree (12.5%) or disagree (50%) that the lessons included enough variety.

Apparently, the majority of students find the course timing, materials and feedback to be inadequate. In addition, there seem to be an agreement concerning the lack of variety in lessons and a shortage of rich information and knowledge. This can be considered as a pitfall in the course, which should be addressed accordingly.

Further, the results indicate that almost all respondents agree (56.2%) or strongly agree (25%) on the positivity of the classroom atmosphere. Very few students (12.5%) seem to disagree with this statement. A large number of students agree (56.2%) or strongly agree (18.8%) that the instructions they have received in the course were clear. It seems that the classroom atmosphere and the instruction have received a better agreement among students. This can be due to teacher's personality or way of instruction.

Additionally, the findings reveal some areas of division where rates are not very conclusive. As illustrated in table 1, (43.8%) of the participants rated the course as appropriate to their needs. In contrast, other (43.8%) of students reported that the course was not appropriate to their needs; against (12.5 %) who remained neutral. Some (43.8%) of the students agree that the skills thought in the course were appropriate; whereas, 50% of respondents disagree with this item. Opinion was divided concerning whether the course content and skills were appropriate to student's needs. This can largely be due to the fact that needs have a subjective nature. Many students have different views and opinions about their needs. Therefore, the course may have met some of students' needs and may have ignored the needs of others. In some cases, students can be unaware about their needs. This however points out to the importance of identifying students' needs before implementing an EAP course.

3.1.2 The effectiveness of the course

This part is devoted to report on the effectiveness of the course in developing students' oral presentation skills and therefore preparing them for the task of delivering master thesis oral presentation.

Table 2

The students' perspectives towards the effectiveness of the course in improving their presentation skills

Items	Not at all helpful %	Slightly helpful %	Helpful %	Very helpful %
1.The ability to cope with stress	0.0	18.8	68.8	12.5
2. Engaging the audience	0.0	25.0	68.8	6.2
3. Appropriate pace	0.0	18.8	75	6.2
4. Adequate timing	6.2	18.8	68.8	6.2
5. Effective non-verbal communication skills	6.2	18.8	50.0	25
6. Fluency	6.2	12.5	56.2	25
7. Correct pronunciation	6.2	37.5	43.8	12.5
8. Appropriate range of vocabulary	6.2	50	37.5	6.2
9. Accuracy of grammar	6.2	62.5	18.8	12.5
10. Appropriate handling of visual aids	62.5	18.8	12.5	6.2
11. The organization of supporting materials in a logical way	37.5	43.8	12.5	6.2
12.The organization of content in a coherent way	25.	50	18.8	6.2
13. Adequate selection of relevant content	12.5	62.5	12.5	12.5

Table 2 depicts on the students' views concerning the effectiveness of the course in developing their presentation skills in 13 areas. A large number of participants (68.8%) stated that the course helped them to cope with stress and engage with audience; whereas, 18.8% of students maintained that the course was slightly helpful. The majority of respondents reported that the course was effective in helping them develop appropriate pace (75%) and adequate timing (68%). About half of the students assert that the course was helpful (50%) or very helpful (25%) in improving their non-verbal communication skills and fluency. Half of the participants (50%) claim that the course was not very effective in providing them with an appropriate rang of vocabulary to deliver oral presentations. 62.5 % of students claim that the course was slightly helpful with regard to accuracy of grammar. Another (62.5%) indicated that the course was not helpful at all in teaching them how to handle visual aids. Evidently, the course was not effective in the area of organizing the supporting materials in logical way. 50% of the respondents maintained that the course was slightly helpful in assisting them to select and organize the content of presentation. Some students claimed that the course was not helpful at all with regard to this skill.

The results imply that the course was effective with regard to delivery skills such as coping with stress, engaging the audience, responding to the audience, adequate timing and managing non-verbal behavior. As for language, the course seems to be effective in developing students' fluency and pronunciation and slightly helpful with regard to vocabulary and grammar. This indicates that the course offered a good opportunity for students to practice and improve their oral skills. However, the course seems to be less effective in equipping students with the necessary skills to prepare an oral presentation. Preparation skills include mainly the ability to select and organize appropriate content and the ability to design and handle visual aids or supporting materials. It seems that the focus of the course was more on delivery skills rather than preparation skills. This might have happened because the teachers take for granted that master students have adequate knowledge of how to prepare formal oral presentations. As for the visual aids, the shortcomings can be due to the lack of materials such as audio-visuals and computers. Since the course is carried out in a regular classroom, it is difficult to teach students how to handle and design visual aids effectively.

3.2. Findings from Semi-structured Interview

3.2.1. The adequacy of the course

The qualitative data obtained from semi-structured interviews revealed a great resemblance to that of the questionnaire. Students reported on some areas of weakness and strength in the course. One major theme appeared in the analysis is the inappropriate time span of the course. In this regard, a student said: "it was kind a short…so not many sessions…we didn't have enough time I guess to learn more about oral presentations especially the viva presentation" (S6). Another student adds: "it wasn't sufficient, just one session a week and as you know we had some strikes so it was not enough" (S1). The students suggest increasing the time allotted to the course. Some students even proposed to start the course in master one so they can have sufficient training.

Moreover, the students expressed their dissatisfaction with the materials used in the course saying that "we didn't use any new or good materials such as computers or data-show" (S7). Similarly, a participant stated, "there was a lack of materials like computers, so we didn't learn anything about how to design and make a presentation in PowerPoint" (S4). Apparently, the lack of materials inhibited the students from learning how to manipulate and design effective visual aids. In reply to this lack of materials, the students strongly advocate the use of technology such as computers, projectors and internet. Given the nature of the course; this seems to be a crucial demand to insure the adequacy of the course materials.

Some students described the content of the course as good and sufficient. However, other students have pointed out that the course content was inadequate in terms knowledge and relevance to their needs. A student in this context stated that "in terms of information or knowledge… we didn't focus on that but we did practice and did many activities" (S9). Another respondent mentioned that "there was a lack of input, if there is no input how can we give the output" (S3). There seem to be a lack of content which a student addressed saying "before any techniques we need a basic background knowledge about oral presentations" (S8). A participant suggested that "the content of the course should include many components like the possible software we can use, the techniques…information about what makes a good presentation, what should be done or avoided»(S5). The students; thus, emphasize rich and relevant content before practice. As for the activities, the students seem to prefer debates, free presentations and research based presentations.

Additionally, there seem to be a lack of feedback and correction during the course as a student reported "even we had some presentations but there was no feedback so we didn't learn much from our classmates' presentations" (S4). Similarly, a student expressed her view saying that "we didn't really have enough time to deal with each presentation... each one gives his presentation, there isn't much time to talk about it or reflect on it" (S6).

Despite the students' dissatisfaction about some areas of the course, the participants also have identified some positive aspects of the course. A student said that "the positive thing is that we can feel that the teacher is dynamic and gives us the chance to speak instead of her presenting and talking, which allowed us to practice" (S1).

Another student reported "we felt comfortable with the teacher, she was very active and positive" (S1). It seems that the students were satisfied concerning the instruction and the atmosphere of the classroom.

3.2.2. The effectiveness of the course

The qualitative data concerning the effectiveness of the course in preparing students for their master thesis oral presentation revealed deep and new insights that support the questionnaire data. Many students reported that the course was not helpful in some areas. A student mentioned that the course "was short and didn't help much" (S4). Similarly, another student said "honestly, I didn't think I learned many things in that course, because it was always about group discussions and debates… these activities were okay but not enough" (S3).

Many students felt that the course did not well-prepare them for their thesis oral presentation. A student stated in this vein "we feel that we were frozen when we got to that moment of presentation, we didn't know how to start or what to do and the teacher didn't give us enough information concerning all these things" (S7). Another student said "actually the course we had this year wasn't that helpful because we didn't have like a lot of sessions and it wasn't about how to present your thesis presentation" (S1). Similarly a participant further explains that "the viva presentation was different and something new for us, we were not so ready for it" (S3). Another student reported when he was sharing his experience of master thesis defense "I remember weeks ago we were talking about our presentation and we were confused about which elements to include and how do we structure the presentation, we were not prepared for this...we didn't study this in the course" (S8).

The students attributed different reasons for the ineffectiveness of the course including the lack of time and materials, inappropriate content and activities, and insufficient information about the master thesis presentation. The students' statements suggest that the focus of the course was not the thesis oral presentation particularly; rather, the course seemed

to be oriented to tackle speaking skills and oral presentations skills in general. This aligns with a student' comment that the course «was similar to first year, second year or third year sessions of oral expression where we had discussions, debates, dialogues, and presentations, so it was not so helpful for thesis oral presentation" (S1). When the students were asked about the objectives of the course a student replied "I think the course should be more about the master thesis oral presentation…it's more important" (S10). Another respondent adds "the purpose of the course is to help us improve our presentation skills…so we can pass the viva and defend our topic" (S8). Similarly, a student stated the purpose of the course is "to help us give a good master thesis oral presentation". While these students relate the course objectives to master thesis oral presentation, others seem to focus on improving their speaking skills. For example, a participant mentioned that the purpose of the course should be "to improve our English and our speaking skills" (S4). Although the majority of students reported that the course should aim at preparing them for master thesis OP, there was a minority of student who seem to disagree with this claim. Probably, those learners have low linguistic competence thus they are more concerned about improving their speaking skills. In contrast, students who are in good command of speaking skills might be interested in acquiring the necessary skills to deliver an effective thesis oral presentation as one student explicitly states "I think that the course is made to help us prepare for the viva presentation so I think it should not be like this...general" (S5).

The students felt that the course was general thus did not prepare them well for their master thesis presentation which is a new genre for them. Evidently, the course did not respond well to the students' academic needs in this area. Therefore, the purpose of the course should be adjusted to serve the students' needs and expectations.

Some students expressed positive views towards the effectiveness of the course. The course was deemed efficient in helping students develop some delivery skills such as facing the audience and overcoming shyness and anxiety as reported in students' words:

S3: "the teacher told us how to convince others and how to present our ideas"

S2: "it was very helpful module because the teacher showed for us many strategies   how to face the audience and present better"

S1: "maybe it helped in how to overcome anxiety or shyness"

Other students emphasized the effectiveness of the course in improving their speaking skills, which implies that speaking skills are important for some students. Students in this regard sate:

S6: "I think it was effective because we practiced our speaking skills, we did debates, learned how to defend our ideas, we did also presentations …so yes it was a good chance for us to improve our speaking»

S4: "this year we had the opportunity to practice speaking more during the course and we did many activities, so the course helped me to do my oral presentation"

S9: "it was very helpful for me personally, I was not used to speak but in this course I did presentations and participated in debates and discussions".

It seems that some students prioritize speaking skills over presentation skills or they are simply unaware of the true purpose of the course. These students indicated that the course was effective in developing their speaking skills in general. The view that these students seem to hold is that speaking skills are more important and crucial for making an effective presentation. In other words, they seem to believe that if they have a good command over speaking skills, they will eventually succeed in making effective presentations, which is not

entirely true since even native speakers, who are linguistically competent, face major challenges when giving oral presentations (Morita, 2002).

Apparently, the students' views about the effectiveness of course vary according to their beliefs about the objective of the course and its relationship to their needs. The students who described the course as ineffective seem to identify their needs in relation to the master thesis presentation. According to them, the course failed to prepare them for this task; hence, their needs in this area were not addressed appropriately. However, the students who reported that the course was effective seem to identify their needs in relation to their speaking skills. That is to say, the needs of those students revolve around improving their speaking skills in general and the course seems to be successful in responding to those needs.

4. Conclusion

This study attempts to evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of oral presentation course through the perspectives of the students. The findings reveal some significant aspects of the oral presentation course under evaluation. Although the course has some strength, more efforts should be paid to improve some areas such as time allotted to the course, materials, feedback and more importantly the course objectives and content.

The results show that the time allocated to the course is not sufficient to improve students' presentation skills. Since presentation skills are acquired through intensive training, more time should be devoted to the course. The results also reveal a clear need for the use of materials such as computers and projectors. Assuming this is not always feasible, teachers can consider incorporating blended learning or using 2.0 Web tools to support the classroom instruction. Blended learning is likely to be effective in improving students' presentation skills (Ibrahim & Yusoff, 2012). Bouguebs (2019) stresses the importance of adopting flipped learning in EFL classrooms to enhance learning outcomes and compensate for the lack of materials and the limited time of language programs in higher education. This is especially true for the current course; the students may benefit immensely from out-of-class resources such as guides, lectures and videos of presentations, leaving the classroom time for practice and tasks that are more challenging.

Another area of concern revealed from this study is the lack of feedback, which is highly important especially in developing student's presentation skills. It is suggested to adopt different forms of feedback such as self-evaluation, peer feedback and teacher feedback. Research (Mika, 2006; Lee, 2017) confirm the efficacy of these forms of feedback in improving students' oral presentation skills.

A tentative conclusion that can be drawn from the findings is that the objectives and content of the course were general; therefore, they did not cater for the specific needs of students with regard to their master thesis oral presentation. The course was probably helpful in improving student's speaking skills or presentation skills. However, it was less successful in preparing the students for the challenging task of delivering an effective master thesis presentation. One of the probable reasons underlying this issue is the gap found between both objectives and content of the course, and the needs of students.

It is evident that the current course needs a reconstruction of its objectives and content. In doing so, the students' voice should be audible concerning what they learn and why they learn it (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Jordan, 1997; Long, 2005).

According to the students, the main objective of the course should be to prepare them for their master thesis presentation. Consequently, the students speaking skills will be improved as well since OPs are very useful in improving students' speaking skills (Brooks & Wilson,

2014). Hence, a detailed needs analysis should be conducted to reorient the course content and objectives in the direction of meeting the students' needs.

The findings indicate that the course under evaluation was very similar to an oral expression course, which often aims at developing students' speaking skills for general purposes. However, EFL master students can be considered as advanced learners who have already mastered speaking skills. Hence, they are in need of specific language and a set of skills to successfully carry out a particular academic task which is the delivery of master thesis oral presentation.

It appears that the English for general purposes approach adopted in the current course did not yield fruitful results. Therefore, the course is likely to be more effective if it is approached from the perspective of English for academic purposes. This narrowed angle will allow the course to address the specific academic needs of EFL master students at Bejaia University.

References

- Brick, J. (2012). Teaching English for academic purposes. in A. Burns, & J. C. Richards, *The Cambridge guide to pedagogy and practice in second language teaching* (pp. 170-178). New York, USA: Cambridge University press.
- Bouguebs, R. (2019). Adopting a Flipped EFL Learning Classroom in Higher Education: Kowledge and Practices. *JSLCS, 2*(1), 57-68.
- Brooks, G., & Wilson, J. (2014). Using Oral Presentations to Improve Students' English Language Skills. *Kwansei Gakiun University Humanities Review, 19*, 199-212.
- Chen, H. T. (2005). *Practical program evaluation: Assessing and improving planning, implementation and effectiveness.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St-John, M. (1998). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A multidisciplinary approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graves, K. (1996). *Teachers as Course Developers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (2001). English for academic purposes. in R. Carter, & D. Nunan, *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 121-134). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchinson, S., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes: A learning centered approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for Academic Purposes: An advanced resource book.* Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Ibrahim, A. H., & Yusoff, Z. S. (2012). Teaching Public Speaking in a Blended Learning. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 2*(6), 573- 576.
- Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for Academic Purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, Y.-J. (2017). Sharing Peer Feedback: How Does It Affect EFL Learners' Oral Presentation Skills? *Asia-pacific Journal of Multimedia Services Convergent with Art, Humanities, and Sociology, 7*(12), 307-322.
- Long, M. H. (2005). Methodological Issues in Learner Needs Analysis. in M. H. Long, *Second Language Needs Analysis* (pp. 19-76). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Long, M. H. (2005). *Second Language Needs Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mika, S. (2006). Peer- and Instructor Assessment of Oral Presentations in Japanese University EFL classrooms: A Pilot Study. *Waseda Global Forum*(3), 99-107.
- Morita, N. (2002). Discourse Socialization Through Oral Classroom Activities in a TESL Graduate Program. *TESOL Quarterly, 4*, 279-311.
- Nation, I., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language Curriculum Development.* New York: Routledge.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus design.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rea-Dickins, P., & Germaine, K. (1992). *Evaluation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. (1990). *The Language-teaching Matrix.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge Language Education.
- Weir, C., & Roberts, J. (1994). *Evaluation in ELT.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Appendixes

Appendix 01: The official Programme of the subject: "Techniques of Oral Presentation"

Intitulé du Master: Linguistique
Semestre: *3*
Intitulé de l'UE: Méthodologique
Intitulé de la matière: Techniques de présentation orale
Crédits: 3
Coefficients: 2
Objectifs de l'enseignement
- Initier les étudiants aux méthodes et techniques pédagogiques utilisée dans les présentations orales
- Initier les étudiants à l'utilisation des supports multimédia dans les présentations orales
- Initier les étudiants à l'utilisation du power point dans les présentations orales

Connaissances préalables recommandées
- Connaissances linguistiques
- Connaissances en informatique

Contenu de la matière
Introduction
Definition of oral presentations
Types of oral presentations
Factors to consider in oral presentations
Time Control
Place
Audience
Create visual aids
What makes a good communicator?
How to deliver an effective oral presentation
Power point and video presentations

Mode d'évaluation: Examen + Travail personnel TP

Appendix 02: The programme of Semester 03 (M2, first semester) of the Linguistics Option at Bejaia University

3- Semestre 3:

Unité d'Enseignement	VHS 15 sem	V.H hebdomadaire				Coeff	Crédits	Mode d'évaluation	
		C	TD	TP	Autres			Continu	Examen
UE fondamentales									
UEF1(O/P)									
Historical/corpus linguistics (CL)	45h	1h30	1h30			2	04	*	*
genre analysis (GA)	45h	1h30	1h30			2	04	*	*
Pragmatics	22h30		1h30			1	02	*	*
UEF2(O/P)									
Contrastive and Comparative Analysis (CCA)	45h		3h			2	04	*	*
Didactics of Language Skills	22h30		1h30			1	02	*	*
Learning and Teaching Strategies (LTS)	22h30		1h30			1	02	*	*
UE méthodologie									
UEM(O/P)									
Techniques to Write a Scientific Paper (TWSP)	67h30	1h30	3h			3	06	*	*
Oral Presentation Techniques (OPT)	37h30		2h30			2	03		
UE découverte									
UED(O/P)									
Language Communication Practices and ICT (LCP)	22h30		1h30			01	01		
English for Specific Puposes (ESP)/ English for Academic Purposes (EAP)	22h30		1h30			01	01		
UE transversales									
UET(O/P)									
Methodology of Specialized Translation	22h30		1h30			01	01		
Total Semestre 3	375h	**4h30**	**20h30**			**17**	**30**		