

Improving the Lecturers of Musi Charitas Catholic University Speaking Skills through Oral Presentation

Sheilla Noveta Asmaruddin
UNIKA Musi Charitas, Palembang
snoveta@yahoo.com

First Received: 13th February 2018 Final Proof Received: 24th April 2018

doi: 10.31002/metathesis.v1i2.623

Abstract

This research is aimed at investigating whether oral presentation technique was able to be used as a way to develop the lecturers of Musi Charitas Catholic University speaking skills, Palembang. This study is a quasi experimental design, specifically, it is a one group pretest posttest one. There were 22 lecturers taken as samples based on availability. These lecturers were from three faculties - Faculty of Business and Accounting; Faculty of Science and Technology; Faculty of Health Science. Training were administered for five days for each lecturers from different faculties. A speaking rubric was used to evaluate the lecturers' speaking skills development by two experts in TESOL. Paired t-test and multiple regression were used as statistical analysis to find the significance and the depth of influence of each category of speaking techniques. Those categories were organisation, content and presentation. The significant finding of the research is that oral presentation technique was able to improve the lecturers' speaking skill in terms of talk of performance.

Keywords: Speaking Skills, Oral Presentation, Lecturer

Introduction

The purpose of this research is to investigate the effectiveness of oral presentation strategy in improving the lecturers of Musi Charitas Catholic University (MCCU) speaking skills. Below are two strong arguments supporting the need for lecturers of MCCU to have their English proficiency developed, especially speaking skills.

Firstly, the university has been developing a pathway to conduct research collaboration with a reputable university from abroad since its first launch in

2015. It is one of the main efforts for the university to maintain or to increase its university accreditation. Based on the seven standards of university quality assurance standards developed by the Higher Directorate Generale, the seventh standard - Research, Community Service and Collaboration - takes up one of the highest point in determining the accreditation of a university.

By conducting international collaboration with other universities, the university is able to accelerate its quality assurance of the university since the university obtains strong support in dealing with research skills and academic skills which is the backbone of lecturers' profession. Furthermore, MCCU is able to learn from other universities in developing their university.

The second argument, to hold qualified university accreditation, it is urgent that Musi Charitas Catholic University prepare its graduates to be able to compete in this global era and to fulfill the demands of ASEAN Economic Community, in terms of language proficiency in relation with their discipline. Hence, it is vital that the lecturers of MCCU, firstly, develop their English proficiency in order to prepare these graduates, specifically, in improving their speaking skills to a level in which they have the appropriate capacity to be able to communicate in English.

Additionally, a questionnaire aimed to find out about lecturers' preference in speaking in English was distributed to the lecturers of Musi Charitas Catholic University. Based on the result of the questionnaire, it indicated that lecturers of MCCU seeked support in improving their speaking skills. However, speaking is a challenging process moreover in speaking English. This is because the people involve in the speaking process must listen carefully and at the same time prepare an immediate response (Fauzan, 2016, p.50). That is having the accurate sentence structure, with the right choice of vocabulary and fluency and accurate pronunciation.

There are three functions of speaking, namely, talk as interaction, talk as transaction and talk as performance (Richards, 2008, p.21). Lecturers use more of talk as performance within their profession. One of activities to support talk as performance in which is often used by lecturers is conducting oral presentation. Not only lecturers sometimes use oral presentation in delivering the lectures but also in delivering seminars and conferences. Oral presentation is an effective

strategy to develop one's motivation and confidence in speaking and to develop one's speaking skill. The activity of oral presentation using English language could facilitate the participants' language aspects and language skills. Those are grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary. The language skills are reading, writing, speaking and listening. Additionally, it involves researching for the topic to construct an argument or an opinion which means that the participants use their critical and analytical skill (Kovak and Sirkovic, 2012, p.8).

However, several studies indicated that participants have fear of presenting in public and they become anxious, moreover presenting using English. Anxiety can hamper one's language capacity in which should be dealt before developing language proficiency (Al-Nouh, Abdul-Kareem & Taqi, 2007, p.136). Whilst other studies indicated that presenting activity consist of stages that scaffold the ability of speaking (Sukitkanaporn & Phoocharoensil, (2014, p.91). The researcher strongly believes that oral presentation activity is suitable for the lecturers of Musi Charitas Catholic University and could develop speaking skills, moreover if the topic of presentation is in accordance to the lecturers' discipline. For example, lecturers of Economics present about Economy. Through oral presentation the lecturers' motivation, confidence, and other attributes that belong to speaking skills can be developed positively (Masmaliyeva, 2014, p.1).

In this study, the researcher investigated the problem of the research which is the lecturers' of MCCU speaking skills that still needed to be developed. Whilst the objective of this research is to find the out whether developing the lecturers' speaking skill could be improved by teaching them oral presentation techniques which include organisation, content and presentation techniques. Organisation category consists of three elements. Next, the content category consist of six elements. Finally, the presentation category consists of eight elements.

Additionally, the researcher aimed to investigate the influence of each category of oral presentation techniques towards the lecturers of MCCU speaking skill. Specifically, finding out which elements needed to be improved. Hence, further actions could be taken for future research. It is expected that the result of this study strongly supports the lecturers of Musi Charitas Catholic University, in helping their students' develop their English proficiency speaking skill based on

their discipline background and in improving their speaking skills when delivering conferences, seminars and lectures in English. Hence, this research strongly supports the university's quality assurance and accreditation.

The following term is to define clearly the terms in this research. Firstly, improving is an action to make a better condition of the lecturers of Musi Charitas Catholic University speaking skills in English when delivering their presentation whether in class or in academic conferences, and in supporting the university in collaboration with English speaking university for upgrading the university's accreditation. Secondly, lecturers are the lecturers of Musi Charitas Catholic University, Palembang from three faculties namely, Faculty of Business and Accounting, Faculty of Science and Technology, and Faculty of Health Science. Thirdly, speaking skills is the skill that the lecturers of MCCU develop within academic setting whether to be delivered in class or in academic conferences. Finally, oral presentation is the technique given to the lecturers within five days of training to develop their speaking skill which covers organisation, content and presentation category.

Review of literature

Speaking skills

There are many research that attempted in finding appropriate strategies in improving speaking skills. Richards (2008, p.19), pointed out that speaking skills especially in English is vital for EFL learners. Many believe that it is through speaking skill that a person's language proficiency is evaluated immediately. Hence, when speaking skills is poor lead to negative impact. Those are speaking anxiety and lack of motivation to speak in English. Richards (2008, p.21) explained that there are three functions of speaking. Those are talk as interaction, talk as transaction and talk as a performance. The writer argues that talk as a performance is the foundation for developing the lecturers of Musi Charitas Catholic University speaking skills. One of those activities that support talk as a performance is conducting oral presentation which is similar to giving a lecture in which is the main job of a lecturer. Hence, oral presentation activity may improve the lecturers' speaking skills.

Oral presentation activity

Oral presentation is defined as an activity that is prepared in advanced conducted in public (Levin and Topping (2006, p.2). When students conduct oral presentation, they attempt to comprehend the subject they are discussing about using their own words (Joughin, 2007, p.323). Hence, this type of activity is accurate to improve lecturers' of Musi Charitas Catholic University speaking skill since it will facilitate them in sentence structure and vocabulary choice. Moreover, they will present their own discipline in which elevate the lecturers' strong interest to speak. There has been several research which involve oral presentation activity.

Gambari, Yusuf & Balogun (n.d, p.1) conducted a research focusing on developing cognitive skill using oral presentation activity. The result of the research indicates that presentation activity can bring positive input to language learner. Al-Nouh, Abdul-Kareem & Taqi, (2007, p.136) investigated the difficulties that students encounter when dealing with oral presentation activity. Their research involved 500 female EFL college students in Kuwait. It was found out that they have medium level of difficulties when dealing with oral presentation. Another research conducted by Kovak and Sirkovic (2012, p.8) investigated the influence of peer evaluation on oral presentation in first-year students of engineering. It was found out that students had positive attitude towards peer evaluation in oral presentation activity.

Another research that concerns about oral presentation was conducted by Pathak and Le Vasan (2015, p.179). Their research focused on a design-based collaborative approach. The collaboration was between the engineering faculty and language teachers. The research showed that such approach was appropriate for students in developing their speaking skills. From the above explanation, little research has been done in terms of using oral presentation as means of improving lecturers' speaking skills. Moreover, using this strategy on lecturers from different field of discipline. In this research, lecturers' speaking skills is improved through oral presentation synchronizing with the lecturers' discipline background.

Method

This research applied quasi-experimental, a one group of pretest posttest nonequivalent group without control group. Since the researcher's objective is to investigate whether oral presentation could develop the lecturers' of Musi Charitas Catholic Univeristy speaking skills in English, the researcher selected the design. The researcher gave pretest to and posttest to the group.

The training was conducted for five days for lecturers of each study program, approximately three hours in one day. All together, the implementation occurred for twenty days at the lecturers' room of each study program in campus A-Bangau and campus B-Burlian, Palembang.

The population and sample

The population in this research is lecturers of Musi Charitas Catholic University from three faculties. Those are Faculty of Business and Accounting; Faculty of Science and Technology; and the Faculty of Health Science. The sample for this study will be taken from the population based on purposive sampling. That is based on the availability of the lecturers. Purposive sampling is the process of selecting a sample which is based on the purpose of the researcher (Jacobs, 2008).

Table 1. The Total number of Samples in Terms of Faculties and Lecturers.

NO	FACULTIES	TOTAL
1	BUSINESS AND ACCOUNTING	14
2	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	5
3	HEALTH SCIENCE	3
TOTAL		22

The teaching procedure

The teaching procedure is as follow, the researcher used a three-phase teaching technique that consisted of pre-teaching activity, whilst-teaching activity and post-teaching activity.

Pre-activity

1. At the beginning of every teaching session the language instructor motivates the participants. The form of motivation strategy is by giving a demonstration of an appropriate presentation.
2. The language instructor asks the participants to listen, observe and note down some of the vocabulary that might be difficult to follow by the participants.

Whilst Activity

1. The language instructor discusses and asks the participants the things that they find difficult in delivering presentation in English.
2. The participants organises the the things that they would like to talk about within their presentation using the standard template for research publication.
3. The language instructor gives an example of how to construct a format presentation in a form of power point and gives a short demonstration of how to present in front of class.
4. The language instructor together with the participants conduct simulation of presentation.
5. The language instructor gives time for the participants to prepare their presentation.
6. The language instructor records each participants' presentation.
7. The presentation takes about seven minutes.

Post Activity

1. The language instructor asks the participants to give comments and express their thought on their own activity on that day.
2. The language instructor encourages the participants to conduct presentation in English within their lecturing activity.

After five days of training, the researcher gives posttest to the participants. Afterward, the pretest and posttest are compared and interpreted. The progress of the participants is analysed. Besides giving pretest and posttest, a questionnaire on preference of communication in English is given before and after the treatment to find out the condition of the participants' motivation and confidence in speaking

in English. Finally, the researcher found out the depth of which element of oral presentation that strongly supports the lecturers' oral presentation.

In this research the writer used a speaking test that asked the lecturers to give a presentation about their research proposal. A rubric test as means of evaluating their speaking skills was used. The rubric for speaking test was the speaking scoring guide. It has three categories analysed. Those are content, organisation, and presentation. The content category are divided into three elements; organisation category are divided into six elements; and presentation category are divided into seven elements; as explained below in the table. The lowest score for each category is 1 and the highest score for each category is 5. The lecturers' speaking performance were analysed by two raters of TESOL graduate from a reputable university from abroad with TOEFL score of more than 580.

Table 2. Speaking Rubric

Category	Scoring Criteria	Total Points
Organization (15 points)	The type of presentation is appropriate for the topic and audience.	5
	Information is presented in a logical sequence.	5
	Presentation appropriately cites requisite number of references.	5
	Introduction is attention-getting, lays out the problem well, and establishes a framework for the rest of the presentation.	5
Content (45 points)	Technical terms are well-defined in language appropriate for the target audience.	5
	Presentation contains accurate information.	10
	Material included is relevant to the overall message/purpose.	10
	Appropriate amount of material is prepared, and points made reflect well their relative importance.	10
Presentation (40 points)	There is an obvious conclusion summarizing the presentation.	5
	Speaker maintains good eye contact with the audience and is appropriately animated (e.g., gestures, moving around, etc.).	5
	Speaker uses a clear, audible voice.	5
	Delivery is poised, controlled, and smooth.	5
	Good language skills and pronunciation are used.	5

	Visual aids are well prepared, informative, effective, and not distracting.	5
	Length of presentation is within the assigned time limits.	5
	Information was well communicated.	10
Score	Total Points	100

In this study, the researcher conducted the experiment by carrying out a training program to the lecturers of Musi Charitas Catholic University. The training was implemented for a five-day workshop for lecturers of business, accounting, primary school teacher education, architecture, industrial engineering, information technology, information system, mid-wifery and nursing. In which, the speaking test was administered before and after the training program. Furthermore, the researcher conducted an observation to analyse the lecturers' progress in speaking English using oral presentation techniques.

All lecturers speaking activity was recorded with the lecturers' consent. Finally, a speaking comprehension test was used because it was considered the most reliable way to get some information of the lecturers' speaking achievement. For the pretest and posttest, the lecturers were asked to present about their research proposal using power point format. To verify the hypothesis proposed, t-test analyses were applied. To find out which were the strongest and the weakest category of oral presentation rubric influencing the lecturers' speaking skill, statistical regression was applied. Additionally, the researcher used multiple regression upon the independent variable that is the oral presentation and the dependent variable that is the speaking skill.

Findings and discussion

The findings of this research show that oral presentation activity is able to be used to improve the lecturers of Musi Charitas Catholic University. This can be seen from the difference between the mean scores of the lecturers' total speaking score before the treatment (pretest) and the mean scores after the treatment (posttest).

Table 3 Level of Achievement

LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT	MEAN		FREQUENCY		STANDARD DEVIATION	
	PRETEST	POSTTEST	PRETEST	POSTTEST	PRETEST	POSTTEST
Excellent	-	89,37	-	4,(0,19%)	-	1,79
Good	72,00	77,75	1(0,05%)	15(0,69%)	-	3,67
Average	62,25	65,16	4,54	2,46	4,54	2,46
Poor	51,37	-	1,37	-	1,37	-
Very Poor	42,27	-	3,29	-	3,29	-
TOTAL	50,72	78,15	10,36	7,63	10,36	7,63

Based on the results, there is a significant difference in the lecturers' speaking skills after they were given treatment of oral presentation development which consists of organisation skill, content skill and presentation skill. The most significant difference are O3, C5 and P5 category. The lecturers had sufficient knowledge and understanding in citing a number of references (O3). The lecturers were also prepared with appropriate materials and were able demonstrate their rationale of presentation (C5). Furthermore, the lecturers had visual aids which were well prepared, informative, effective and not distracting. To find out which category contributes significantly in the lecturers' speaking skill, statistic multiple regression was applied and to confirm that the 16 categories play an important role in speaking skill, statistic regression was applied.

Table 4. Mean of Pretest and Posttest

No	Variables	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Difference PrePost	T- Value	Sig p<0.05
1	SPEAKING SKILLS	50,72	78,15	-27,42409	-12,21	,000
2	O1	3,0682	4,1364	-1,06818	-5,627	,000
3	O2	2,8864	4,3182	-1,43182	-5,750	,000

4	O3	,9773	3,7955	-2,81818	-7,901	,000
5	C1	3,0227	4,0455	-,97727	-5,381	,000
6	C2	1,7500	2,9545	-1,20455	-7,228	,000
7	C3	5,1591	7,9091	-2,75000	-10,470	,000
8	C4	5,0227	7,6591	-2,63636	-9,433	,000
9	C5	4,1818	7,6591	-3,47727	-11,237	,000
10	C6	2,5682	4,2500	-1,43182	-6,539	,000
11	P1	3,3636	3,8105	-,44682	-2,206	,039
12	P2	3,5682	3,9545	-,38636	-1,933	,067
13	P3	3,1818	3,9318	-,75000	-3,447	,002
14	P4	3,1364	3,7500	-,61364	-2,723	,013
15	P5	,7727	4,0682	-3,29545	-18,712	,000
16	P6	2,4091	4,2727	-1,86364	-9,168	,000
17	P7	5,6591	7,9318	-2,27273	-9,251	,000

The result of correlations statistics indicated there is a significant correlation between speaking skills and seven categories. Those are O1- appropriateness of topic, O2- use of clear and audible voice, C1- deliver of introduction; problem; framework, C4- relevance of material, P3 – delivery procedure, P4 – language skills and pronunciation and P7 - communication categories. Category P4 – language skills and pronunciation is the most correlated with speaking skills. Category C3 – information accuracy is the least correlated with speaking skills. Next is the Sig (1-tailed). It indicates that there is a significant correlation between speaking skills and organisation, content and presentation techniques since the probability is below 0,05.

Table 5. Regression

No	Model Summary	
1	Model	1
2	R	1,000 ^a
3	R Square	1,000
4	Adjusted R Square	,998
5	Std. Error of the Estimate	,36905

a. Predictors: (Constant), P7, O3, C3, P2, C5, P6, P5, C6, C2, P1, C4, C1, O1, P3, O2, P4

Based on the table above, the R square is 0,998. This means that 99,8% of dependent variable - speaking skills can be explained by independent variable which are organisation, content and presentation. Whilst the rest (100% -) is explained by other variables. Meanwhile, the standard error of estimate is 0,369 lower than the standard deviation of speaking skills which was 8,16. This means the model regression is better in functioning as the speaking skills predictor than average speaking skills itself.

Table 6. Anova

No	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
1	Regression	1397,649	16	87,353	641,361
2	Residual	,681	5	,136	-
3	Total	1398,330	21	-	-

a. Dependent Variable: TOTALSCORE

b. Predictors: (Constant), P7, O3, C3, P2, C5, P6, P5, C6, C2, P1, C4, C1, O1, P3, O2, P4

The significance in the lecturers' speaking skill development was due to several factors: (1) the appropriate implementation and procedure of training, (2) the quality of teaching skill of the trainer, (3) the familiar environment recognised by the lecturers, and (4) the peer connection that occur during the training. These reasons are as follow. Firstly, to overcome the reluctance of the lecturers to develop their speaking skills, the trainer applied the Natural Approach by Krashen and Terrell (1983) in which the participants acquire the language not learn the language. Next, the trainer's background expertise and teaching experience may furthermore contribute to the positive development of the lecturers. Furthermore, since the training was conducted in the lecturers' room rather than the classroom, it reduces the stress and anxiety to develop their speaking skill in English. Additionally, since the trainer was the lecturers' peer, it made the teaching learning process occur successfully. The trainer and the trainees know each other well in terms of learning preference.

However, there were several specific categories that need to be developed. Those are C1- deliver of introduction; problem; framework, C2 – definition of technical terms, P1- eye contact and P2 – voice categories. Based on the lecturers' reflection, the lecturers were not aware of how to deliver the introduction appropriately in which should be the point where they grasp the audiences'

attention. Furthermore, they had difficulty in finding appropriate technical terms in English.

P1 category focused on how the speaker maintains good eye contact with the audience and is appropriately animated. This is probably the most challenging since it deals with culture and habit which will take time to change. Generally, at the university, most lecturers are comfortable sitting down during teaching and hardly conduct eye contact due to culture prohibition. Whilst based on the regression statistical analysis P1 category is important in determining a person's speaking skill. P2 category focused on the speakers' voice. Several lecturers had to develop their articulation, intonation and stress words. The limitations found in this study is related with the duration of the training. One week was not sufficient to develop the lecturers' speaking skills through oral presentation. If the training was extended, all of the lecturers may be in the good category. Furthermore, this research would have more accurate result if it had taken the experimental design in which lecturers from two different institutions using different treatment are compared.

Conclusion

Firstly, developing the lecturers' speaking skill at Musi Charitas Catholic University is appropriate using oral presentation technique. Secondly, appropriate trainer should be considered based on their experience, education background and expertise. Next is having a familiar environment to conduct training could reduce anxiety and stress. Additionally, peer-teaching could contribute positive impact in teaching and learning process. Finally, there are two categories that need to be developed. Those are in maintaining eye contact, animation and citing several references.

Further training program for the lecturers of Musi Charitas Catholic University should be conducted. This could be organised by the Language Centre of MCCU to achieve higher accreditation. For future researcher, this research could be conducted between lecturers from two institutions using different treatments to gain accurate result. For the Higher General Directorate of Indonesia, a replica of this training could be conducted regularly for lecturers

around Indonesia, collaborating with institutions from abroad to enhance the lecturers' speaking skill in English.

References

- Al-Nouh, N., Abdul-Kareem, M.M., & Taqi, H.A. (2015). EFL college students' perceptions of the difficulties in oral presentation as a form of assessment. *International Journal of Higher Education*, Vol 4 (1), 136 – 150. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ J1060546)
- Fauzan, U. (2016). Enhancing speaking ability of EFL students through debate and peer assessment. *EFL JOURNAL: Journal of EFL, Linguistics, and Literature*, Vol 1(1), 49-57. Retrieved from <http://www.efljournal.org/index.php/efljournal/article/view/8/pdf>
- Gambari, Y & Balogun (2015). Effectiveness of power point presentation on students' cognitive achievement in technical drawing. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Technology*, Vol 3(4) 1-12. Retrived from ERIC database. (EJ 1085923)
- Joughin, G. (2007). Student conceptions of oral presentations. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(3), 323-336 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075070701346873>
- Kovak, M., M., & Sirkovic, N. (2012). Peer evaluation of oral presentation of Croatia. *English Language Teaching*, 5(7), 8-16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n7p8>
- Levin, P. & Topping, G. (2006). *Perfect presentations*. Berkshire, England: Open University Press.
- Masmaliyeva, L. (2014). Using affective effectively: Oral presentations in EFL classroom. *Dil Ve Edebiyat Egitimi Dergisi*, 2(10), 145.
- Pathak, A., & Vasan, M.L. (2015). Developing oral presentation competence in professional contexts: A design-based collaborative approach. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 4(4), 179-184. <http://iasejournal.com/online/index.php/IJERE>
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sukitkanaporn, T. & Phoocharoensil, S. (2014). English presentation skills of Thai graduate students. *English Language Teaching; Vol. 7 (3)*, 91 – 102. Retrived from ERIC database. (EJ989204)