

**Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University of Algiers 2 Abou El Kacem Saadallah
Faculty of Foreign Languages
Department of English**



*Portfolios as a means for raising students' awareness of their oral
skills' improvement: The Case of 3rd year students in the department of
English at the University of Algiers 2*

**A dissertation submitted to the Department of English, University of Algiers, in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Magister in English Linguistics and
Didactics.**

SUBMITTED BY:
Mr. Mohamed Walid Abbassi

SUPERVISED BY:
Dr. Yasmine Boukhedimi

2018

Board of Examiners

Chair: **Prof. Faiza Bensemmane.** University of Algiers 2.

Examiner: **Prof. Kamel Khaldi.** University of Algiers 2.

Supervisor: **Dr. Yasmine Boukhedimi.** University of Algiers 2.

Declaration

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

I am duly informed that any person practicing plagiarism will be subject to disciplinary sanctions issued by authorities under the rules and regulations in force.

Date:

Signed:

Dedication

To my family and friends.

Acknowledgments

I would first like to thank my thesis advisor Dr. Boukhedimi, Y. for her continuous support, contribution, feedback, and patience throughout this challenging study. She was always available whenever I ran into a trouble spot or had a question about my research or writing. She consistently allowed this paper to be my own work, but steered me in the right direction whenever she thought I needed it.

I would also like to thank the staff of the English Department. A special thanks to my post-graduation teachers, the administrators, and especially the students who participated in my research.

I would also like to acknowledge Mr. Aboukacem Slimane, Docotoral Research Assistant in Sam Houston State University, for his support, and I am gratefully indebted to him for his very valuable comments on this thesis.

Finally, I must express my very profound gratitude to my parents and to my friends for providing me with unfailing support and continuous encouragement throughout my years of study and through the process of researching and writing this dissertation. This accomplishment would not have been possible without them. Thank you.

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to investigate the oral portfolio as a means for raising Algerian EFL degree students' awareness of their oral interaction and oral production. The study involved 12 EFL degree students from the English Department at the University of Algiers 2. Students were involved in two tasks (oral interaction and individual oral production). As Algerian EFL students needed more speaking practice in English, and also needed an unthreatening environment outside the classroom, participants in this study were required to provide three audio recordings of their oral performance in the oral interaction task and three audio recording performances in the individual oral production task. Participants' reflections on their oral performance over the period of eight weeks may answer the research question on how the oral portfolio would raise students' awareness of their oral skill. Audio recordings transcripts from the participants, questionnaires and interview were used to collect data. The data analysis using a mixed methods research composed of both qualitative and quantitative method showed that the portfolio had a positive influence in raising students' awareness of their oral skill. The findings revealed that the use of portfolio decreased the frequency of errors produced by participant throughout tasks phases, developed students' self reflection and self correction of their linguistic competence in terms of grammatical, phonological and lexical, and promoted additional opportunities to practice the language outside the classroom.

Table of Contents

Declaration.....	iii
Dedication.....	iv
Acknowledgment.....	v
Abstract.....	vi
Table of content.....	ix
List of tables.....	xi
List of abbreviations.....	xii
<i>General Introduction</i>	1
1. Statement of the problem	2
2. Research question	5
3. Significance of the study.....	5
4. The conceptual framework of the study.....	6
5. Structure of the study.....	7
<i>Chapter One: Background and Literature Review</i>	8
Introduction.....	8
1.1 What is an educational portfolio?.....	9
1.1.1 Advantages of portfolios.....	12
1.1.2 Issues about portfolios.....	16
1.2 The learning theory behind portfolios.....	17
1.3.1 The speaking skill and its importance.....	18
1.3.2 The nature of the speaking skill and its assessment.....	19
1.3.3 the types of speaking activities.....	26

1.3. The role of learner’s output.....	28
1.4.1 Empirical studies on portfolios that addressed the oral skill.....	29
1.4.2 The use of technology in the EFL context.....	33
Conclusion.....	37
Chapter Two: Research Design.....	38
Introduction.....	38
2.1 Participants.....	38
2.2 Procedure.....	39
2.2.1 First task (oral interaction.....	41
2.2.2 Second task (individual oral production).....	42
2.3 Instruments.....	43
2.3.1 Portfolios.....	44
2.3.2 Questionnaires 1 and 2.....	47
2.3.3 Interviews.....	48
2.4 Method of analysis.....	49
Conclusion.....	50
Chapter Three: Data Analysis and Presentation.....	52
Introduction.....	52
3.1 Portfolio findings (audio recordings) data.....	52
3.2 Questionnaire data analysis.....	53
3.3 Interviews data analysis.....	53
3.4 Presentation of the findings and results.....	54
3.4.1 Portfolio findings.....	54

3.4.2 Questionnaire 1.....	62
3.4.3 Questionnaire 2.....	66
3.4.4 Interviews' findings.....	69
Conclusion.....	77
Chapter four: Discussion and Implications.....	79
Introduction.....	79
4.1 Answer the research question.....	79
4.2 Pedagogical implications.....	90
4.3 Limitations of the study.....	93
4.4 Further research suggestions.....	94
Conclusion.....	95
General conclusion.....	97
Bibliography.....	101
Appendix. 1: Questionnaire. 1.....	109
Appendix. 2 : Questionnaire. 2.....	110
Appendix. 3 : Interview's questions.....	111
Appendix. 4 : Sample of interview's transcript.....	112
Appendix. 5 : Interview consent form.....	115
Appendix. 6: 1 st 2 nd and 3 rd recording transcripts (1 st task) example.....	116
Appendix 7 : 1 st 2 nd and 3 rd recording transcripts (2 nd task) example.....	120
Appendix. 8: Error analysis transcripts example.....	122
Appendix. 9: task one assessment rubric	125
Appendix. 10: : Task two assessment rubric.....	126
Appendix. 11: Sample of the coding process of students' interviews' responses.....	127

Appendix. 12: example of the teacher’s feedback..... 133
Abstract in Arabic 134

List of tables

No	Contents	Page
1	Task one process	42
2	Task two process	43
3	1 st task portfolio collection of data	44
4	2 nd task portfolio collection of data	45
5	1 st task transcript word count	46
6	2 nd task transcript word count	47
7	1 st task error analysis results	56
8	2 nd task error analysis results	60
9	Students' difficulty using the English language	63
10	Finding mistakes in speaking	63
11	Peer- assessment contribution	64
12	Students' self –correction vs. teacher's feedback	64
13	Improvement of students' speaking skill	65
14	Students' digital skill	66
15	Students' experience using digital recording tools	67
16	Students' tasks preferences	67
17	Students' impression about their speaking	68
18	Students' technical improvement	69
19	Students' preferences between interaction and individual oral production	73
20	Students' agreement/disagreement on the oral skill improvement	75

List of Abbreviation

CD-ROMs: Compact Disc, Read-Only-Memory

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ESL: English as Second Language

ELT: English Language Teaching

E-mail: Electronic Mail

L1: First Language

L2: Second Language

P: Participant

USB: Universal Serial Bus

ZPD: Zone of Proximal Development

NES: Native English Speakers

NNE: Non Native English

General Introduction

Over the past years, educators have been searching for a valid and effective way to capture and evaluate the rich array of what students know and can do, an alternative method that paints a broader picture of student knowledge and reveals the process by which the student learns. There has been a change over the past two decades from teacher-centered to student-centered approach; this change suggests that it could be more useful to involve students in the assessment of their learning and skill development by giving them an opportunity to undertake some responsibilities for their own learning, (Brown, 1998). For many years, self-assessment design was ignored in traditional approaches to curriculum, instruction, and assessment. It was believed that students are inexperienced to undertake their own assessment and therefore being developing their language skills. However, considering the benefit of involving students in the assessment process, many institutions are beginning to use portfolios as a method of documenting students' learning growth over time, and as a tool of authentic assessment in agreement with their curricula and instruction content and objectives.

As technology has itself matured, digital instruments have been gradually incorporated into English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instructional context, universities in different regions of the world have already started using electronic portfolios, video and audio portfolios in their curricula, this can be considered as a true evaluator when it comes to improve language learners' oral skills, (Wang and Chang, 2010). Additionally, a pedagogical shift has been observed, that values 'student- centred' active learning. The

concept of the ‘sage on the stage’ is challenged by the pedagogical model of the ‘guide on the side’, based on a constructivist approach to learning where potential learning can occur under guidance and collaboration of instructors and peers. The students become more active, as they reflect on their past performance and construct a new one through the help of the teacher in collaborative learning environments, (Byrnes, 2007). Therefore, portfolios can be an effective teaching tool that can promote student-centered education and make students’ learning process traceable and accessible. Although, the literature on the use of portfolios in teaching and learning is rich, the attention was mostly on general learning achievement (Chang, Wu, and Ku, 2005), and writing performance (Erice, 2008).

Few attempts have targeted the relationship between portfolios and the speaking skill. Moreover, many instructors are still reluctant in using new technologies. According to Godwin-Jones (2011), this problem is not necessarily related to digital shortcomings, but refers to a genuine lack of “conceptualization of how language learning could be enhanced in new, innovative ways.” (p. 7). Consequently, this study aims at finding out the extent to which the use of the portfolio enhances EFL degree students’ speaking skill development.

1. Statement of the problem:

With the growing rate of globalization, developing advanced oral proficiency has become an important challenge for EFL degree students. Learners should exhibit a certain mastery of the speaking skills and demonstrate a high degree of linguistic competence. According to Florez (1999), speaking can be a predictable skill having its own structure and conventions that speakers may acquire through practice. In the same vein, Byrnes (2007)

observed that the quality and breadth of learning opportunities help students acquire advanced proficiency. “A well-designed instructional setting may be what is needed to attain advanced level language skills.” (p. 3).

However, one of the major problems that face the Algerian EFL learners is the lack of genuine opportunities to practice and develop their speaking abilities outside the confine of the academic sphere. The classroom seems to be the only important setting that gets students nearer to the target language. Students’ formal learning usually takes place in the classroom where the instructor reinforces their oral practices with assigned materials such as formal speeches and presentations, group conversation and pronunciation activities. However, the lack of class time during the year and inappropriate classroom practices could be an obstacle for the EFL students to improve their speaking ability. Adding to this, the fact that learners generally express more anxiety over speaking than other language skills (Horwitz, 1986). Most of the time, a feeling of worry anticipating embarrassment and failure prevents such students from trying to perform speaking activities in front of the class. Additionally, the Algerian EFL degree students had experienced seven years of formal English teaching prior to University studies; however, when they join university, most of them struggle in communicating using the target language. The problem is that students, who received several years of formal English teaching, generally remain deficient in the ability to actually use the language and to understand its use whether in spoken or written mode (Widdowson, 1972).

In the Algerian English classes, the assessment of the speaking skill is being neglected to some extent; even in one of the most significant achievement tests such as the Baccalaureate national test of English where oral proficiency assessment of students is missing. Yet a few of these students may enter the university and study for an English degree without having a clear evaluation of their oral abilities. My short experience as a teacher revealed that most of the students often wonder whether their speaking quality might be up to required standards. Students that are aware of their linguistic progress during the course are likely to increase their motivation in developing their L2. According to Ellis (1994), good results act as a reward and reinforce or increase motivation. In this sense, motivation is a consequence – and not a cause – of the learning outcomes.

In response to the issues discussed above and with regard to the continuous development of technological tools available to EFL students, the use of portfolios is believed useful as it might contribute to developing students speaking skill. Especially since portfolios offer additional opportunities for oral practices (Huang & Hung, 2010).

Portfolios provide individual feedback to students about their learning, experiences, achievements, strengths, and weaknesses (Goldsmith, 2007). Consequently, students may improve their language skills including their speaking skill through self-reflection and feedback (Cepik and Yastibas, 2013). Affective problems such as anxiety and motivation could be overcome through the use of portfolios (Huang & Hung, 2010, Cepik and Yastibas, 2013, Ozdeimr-Catagay, 2012). Therefore, the present study aimed to address the following research question:

2. The Research Question:

- What is the influence of speaking portfolios in raising third year Algerian EFL students' awareness of their oral skills (interaction and oral production)?

Algerian EFL students need more speaking practice in English, but they also need an unthreatening environment, in order to view oral activities as something within their grasp. The oral portfolio can provide such an environment, where learning and assessment are a natural, experimental and harmless process.

1. Significance of the study:

The literature on the use of portfolios reveals that a few attempts were made to find out about the influence that this device had on students' learning in general. Therefore, to understand the way EFL students may use the portfolio as a device to raise their awareness of their speaking skill, it was felt useful to opt for portfolio procedure that offers EFL students a combination of various learning opportunities and situations to use the target language outside the classroom. The assumption is that student may feel the need to use the target language; this may have an impact on the amount and the quality of language the participants are able to produce at the end of each practice unit. To help students explore their speaking strengths and weaknesses, and by doing so, we will create an atmosphere of self-regulated learning, where students are responsible for their own achievements. Guiding and supporting students through the process through constant individualized feedback will create a sense of engagement on the part of the students, to prepare themselves for undertaking more responsibilities for not only their own but also their peers' learning

process. The study may contribute interesting insights for the Algerian EFL context about the use of technology based portfolios.

4. Conceptual framework of the study:

Van Lier (1996) advanced three essential principles to maximize language learning: Awareness (learner must first notice the need to learn), autonomy (learner must be able to decide what he learns, when, and how), and authenticity (each learning act must be intrinsically motivated). (p. 11-13). Van Lier (1996) refers to Vygotsky's (1978) conceptual construct of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), where learning occurs under guidance or collaboration of instructors or peers. This implies that learners are seen as active participants in the learning process, and also in the assessment process, where they need to reflect on their own progress using the target language, so they become autonomous. Therefore, creating an environment that promotes effective language skills acquisition may be achieved through the oral portfolio use that is believed encourage students to reflect upon their performance, particularly their speaking performance. According to Cole and Ryan (2000), through reflection students could improve to construct their own knowledge, "map their route" and check their progress, they value where they have been and how much they have achieved. Additionally, the portfolio use promotes collaborative work among students and teachers through feedback and peer feedback (Abrami and Barrett, 2005). The portfolio may also be highly motivating to learners. According to Johnson and Rose (1997), students become intrinsically motivated when the tasks assigned to them are meaningful; they are permitted to set goals, plan their own learning and reach their goals, enjoying gradually the

process. Anderson (1998) found that if learners are more engaged, they make more efforts and spend more time on their work, as a result obtain more benefits.

With the growing use of technology in education, a few attempts have been made to explore the impact of such digital tools on students' speaking skill. Castañeda and Rodríguez-González (2011) carried out a similar study on technology based portfolios. The findings indicated that the use of oral portfolios may promote learners' performance in speaking, and boost self-awareness and motivation for their own performance. Thus, the implementation of the portfolio may bring positive results in improving students' speaking skill. Therefore, using the portfolio to provide a reflective, collaborative, and motivating environment may be an effective way to enhance students' speaking skill.

5. Structure of the study:

This dissertation contains four chapters. The first chapter will review the relevant literature of the portfolio, the speaking skill, and the use of technology in EFL contexts. In the second chapter, the methodology applied by the researcher is presented, including the setting, the participants, the instruments, the data collection procedures, and the data analysis methods. The data collected will be analyzed and the findings will be presented in chapter three. Finally, in the fourth and the last chapter, discussion and interpretation of the findings, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research will be presented.

Chapter One: Background and Literature Review

Introduction

The review of the literature will cover several sections. First, it will start by providing an account on the concept of educational portfolios and speaking portfolios that address the four skills including the oral skill, the one we are trying to investigate in this study, centering our focus on the influence of portfolios as a means in raising EFL students' awareness for their speaking skill. Secondly, the nature of the speaking skills will be also discussed, in addition to the role of input and motivation in L2, and finally, an account on the use of technology in EFL classrooms.

Over the past years, there has been an interest in using alternative assessment techniques, evaluating both process and products of learning, providing useful information, motivating learners by involving them in the assessment process.

The procedures used within this paradigm include checklists, journals, interviews, videotape, audiotape, self-evaluation, teacher's observation, portfolios, conferences, diaries, self-assessment and peer-assessment. These procedures have been referred to as "alternative in assessment" as opposed to traditional assessment techniques such as multiple choice, cloze test, dictation, etc. These alternative techniques are used to cover some issues of the one shot traditional assessment that focused on the product while alternative assessment focuses on the product and process. Therefore, it felt necessary to review the concept of portfolio and the paper-based portfolios in general in the field of education in order to understand the

development context of the portfolio. This latter will be discussed in depth, its benefits and issues related to its use and implementation.

1.1 What is an educational portfolio?

Educational portfolios are implemented in science, mathematics and geography, and have become also widely used in ELT. An educational portfolio is usually defined as a collection of work that an individual has built to demonstrate his or her learning processes and progress, (Chambers & Wickersham, 2007). The concept of portfolio development was adopted from the field of fine arts where portfolios are used to display illustrative samples of an artist's work. As stated by Jongsma (1989) “the purpose of the artist's portfolio is to demonstrate the depth and breadth of the work as well as the artist's interests and abilities.”

Many educators perceive the intent of educational portfolios to be similar to that of portfolios used in fine arts, to demonstrate the depth and breadth of students' capabilities through biographies of students' work, (Wolf, 1989, cited in Moya & O'Malley, 1994).

According to Genesse and Upshur (1996), “a portfolio is a purposeful collection of students' work that demonstrates their efforts, progress and achievements in given areas.”

According to Simon and Forgette-Giroux (2000), “a portfolio is a cumulative and an ongoing collection of entries that are selected following a given framework, and reflected upon them by the student, to assess his development of a specific competency.” Along with the various definitions that can be attributed to portfolio, a number of different portfolio types have been also described. Tierney, Carter, and Desai (1991) categorized two different types of portfolios; “process and products”. In process portfolio, students collect their works

over a period of time; get feedback then revise their works when necessary to improve their performance, while in product portfolio, they simply collect their work or performance outcomes.

O'Malley and Pierce (1996) also classified portfolios in three groups; the first is called showcase portfolio, in which students display their best works to the teacher. The second type is collection portfolio, in which students include all their work, so they provide evidence of both process and products. The third is called assessment portfolio, unlike the previous types, it focuses on the systematic collection of students' work for the assessment portfolios, and students need to put all their products to show their progress in relation to the fulfillment of the objectives set beforehand. In detecting improvement and progress, it is advised to focus on the process.

English language portfolios might include materials such as:

- Essays and compositions in draft and final forms.
- Report, projects online.
- Audio and video recordings of presentations and demonstrations.
- Journals, diaries and other personal reflections;
- Tests, tests score and written homework exercises.
- Self and peer-assessment, comments, evaluations and checklists.

According to Brown and Hudson (1998):

We define portfolio assessments here as purposeful collections of
any aspects of students' work that tell the story of their

achievements, skills, efforts, abilities, and contributions to a particular class, (p. 664).

In recent years, portfolios have been utilized as an assessment instrument and as part of activities to improve students' foreign language skills. Portfolios provide an opportunity for English as a Foreign / Second language (EFL/ESL) learners to monitor their own progress and take responsibility for meeting learning goals. By documenting growth over time through a systematic collection of their work, portfolios enable learners to see possibilities for reflection, redirection, and confirmation of their own learning efforts (O'Malley & Pierce, 1996).

Moreover, Farr & Tone (1998) argued that if students are to improve, they must see the need for that improvement. The students must self-assess and consider how to improve by identifying both strengths to be practiced and perfected and weaker areas that need improving through focused practice on them.

Therefore, a portfolio as a collection of students' work tends to provide the teacher with a bird-eye view of student's progress over a period of time, and to see whether the goals and objectives of learning have been met.

Portfolios are considered to be new methods for conservative teachers and educators, and in order to offer a visible picture of what is a portfolio and what benefits it may bring to EFL classroom, a few advantages of portfolios are considered next.

1.1.1 Advantages of portfolios:

A list of advantages of portfolios will be traced in this review of literature, but to make our claims more objective, some studies and research's results on the benefit of using portfolios are presented as well.

Unlike the traditional assessment methods that give one side dimension of EFL learners' ability, alternative methods such as portfolios would depict a multi-faced array of what the students is capable of, including the positive impact that portfolios would have on students' ability and learning process.

The studies about the use of portfolio assessment in foreign language teaching largely show that they do improve writing skills. But, foreign language skills are not limited to writing skill alone. Reading, speaking and listening skills are also important.

An experimental study was conducted by Charvadel, Jahandarl and Khodabandehloul (2012), the study involved 50 female intermediate EFL students in a private institute in Iran, and the purpose was to investigate the impact of portfolio assessment on Iranian EFL students' reading comprehension ability. The researcher reports that at the end of the study, there was statistically a significant difference between the performances of the two groups in terms of their reading comprehensions ability. The comparisons made showed that the reading comprehension of those students in the treatment group where portfolio assessment had been implemented differed significantly from those of students in the control group where traditional assessment had been used. It was concluded that there is a significant difference between the impact of portfolio assessment and traditional assessment on EFL

learners' reading comprehension ability and portfolio assessment has a positive effect on EFL learners' reading comprehension ability. The findings of this study seem in agreement with the existing studies in the literature which revealed that portfolio assessment methods could enhance students' achievements. The study also enabled teachers and students to share some responsibility, teachers become more facilitators and collaborators than just knowledge transmitters, students become self-directed and autonomous learners, they become active learners by taking more responsibility in learning and more involvement in assessment. The study also showed that some alternative assessments methods such as self-assessment are very useful to promote language learning. And portfolios also might be applicable to all language skills and sub-skills such listening, speaking, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar and so on.

As suggested earlier, a portfolio consists of a folder in which students keep several completed tasks addressing certain objectives and competencies selected by teachers; it may help students develop their written skills, as Celce Murcia and Olshtain (2000) as cited in Martinez-Lirola & Rubio (2009) indicate:

The portfolio, which is usually an ongoing collection of different writing assignments kept by the student in a folder or workbook, has become an important concept in developing writing skills and in giving teachers a fairer and more perceptive way to evaluate. (p. 159).

Using portfolios will enhance students' motivation and confidence in taking part of the learning process. Martinez-Lirola and Rubio (2009) conducted two studies in two different Spanish universities, involving students that used portfolios for the first time for assessment.

The purpose of the study was to examine and explore students' opinions about the use of portfolios. Their motivation has also been surveyed. Students in both studies believed that portfolio evaluation leads to "long-term learning". Some students explained that portfolio use provides them with the opportunity to apply theoretical issues to practical matters, and that gives a sense of realness to what they are studying. Using portfolio gives students an active role of the learning process; they are motivated to learn and their learning process is progressive.

Moradan & Hedayati (2011) conducted a study that involved 92 intermediate Iranian EFL students in the Engineering faculty of Kurdistan University taking general English classes. The purpose of the study was to investigate the impact of portfolios and conferencing on Iranian EFL students' writing skills. The study was involved three groups, two experimental groups and one control group.

The results of the study revealed a significant difference between the performance of the two experimental groups and that of the control group. Experimental group participants received feedback whereas in the control group participants received only scores. This was not enough to help them to know about their weaknesses and strengths. During portfolios and conferencing, students are involved; they assess themselves, reflect, monitor and communicate their own progress. Students take the responsibility of their own learning as a result they become more independent, this engagement in this process of improvement and decision making motivate students to learn and try to improve their capabilities.

Self-assessment and self-monitoring are also other valuable pieces in portfolio procedure; O'Malley and Valdez Pierce (1996) as cited in Yoshida (2001) highlighted the importance of self-assessment as follows: "Without self-assessment and reflection on the part of the student, a portfolio is not a portfolio." (p. 35).

Other studies showed that self-assessment and self-monitoring if well implemented might have a positive impact on students' learning process. (Wang and Chang, 2010) investigated the impact of self-monitoring and portfolios on college students' English speaking performance, the researcher hoped by this study to provide valuable account on the use of self-monitoring and portfolios. Using these concepts, teacher is able to help students to find their own strengths and weaknesses in speaking performance. The findings showed that flexibility and versatility of the concept of portfolios makes it a useful tool for engaging students of all abilities as they examine the process and products of their learning. On the other hand, videotaping was found to be an effective way to record students' English speaking performance. After the students reviewed their English speaking performance, they understood their strengths and weaknesses in their performance. Next time they can perform better through the use of portfolios. All the performances that include students' videotapes and several records: observation reports, checklists, and reflection papers, Wang and Chang (2010).

According to Brooks (1999), the portfolio system allowed students to track their own progress, and at the same time contributed to a less threatening atmosphere in a class that is already fraught with performance anxiety and resentment of a required class. Focusing

students' attention on the strengths and weaknesses of their performance instead of attaching a letter grade that fosters hasty judgment and flawed self-description should encourage students to do better work next time.

Portfolio use might have a tremendous impact on students progress if well designed and carefully implemented; however, some problems have been depicted while using this method.

1.1.2 Issues and concerns about portfolios:

According to Brown (2004), one of the most common difficulties concerning portfolios is practicality related to time, effort, portability, cost, scoring and management.

Martinez-Lirola & Rubio (2009) in their study pointed out that most students considered the process of completing each task in the portfolio very time-consuming, which implies that it is not always possible to have the portfolio updated. However, as Johnson and Rose (1997) suggested that teachers could overcome this problem by making schedules for each student in order to avoid overwhelming efforts when grading students' work. Time concern diminishes as teachers begin to establish a classroom environment that encourages students to be independent and responsible in assessing their own progress.

Another issue that has been discussed is self-assessment. Self-assessment is a key concept in portfolio procedure; however, to succeed students need some assistance from their teachers. As O'Malley and Valdez Pierce (1996) cited in Yoshida (2001) put it, "self-assessment is a process through which students must be led." (p. 39).

According to Moya & O'Malley (1994):

Because the Portfolio Assessment Model is fundamentally a qualitative approach to student assessment, establishing its validity and reliability may prove substantially more difficult than is the case for quantitative approaches. The need for multiple judges, careful planning, proper training of raters, and triangulation of objective and subjective sources of information cannot be ignored for successful validation of the procedure to occur. Clearly, the degree of involvement necessary for validating the portfolio procedure is costly and time-consuming, (p. 13).

Compared to traditional standard tests, which are thought to be consistent, objective, quantifiable, portfolios bring about the problems of subjectivity, validity and reliability caused by reflections, evaluations or peer feedback. Mabry (1999) reported the challenges of validity and reliability in the assessment process. Ekbatani and Pierson (2000) also stressed that the complexity of grading within portfolios creates subjectivity in the assessment. So, practitioners might face reliability as well as validity problems while implementing portfolios.

1.2 The learning theory behind Portfolios:

A portfolio generates learning because it provides an opportunity and virtual space for students to critically assess their academic work, and to reflect on that work. From a broader view, portfolios fall within a theory known as Social Constructivism. This theory proposes that learning most effectively takes place when students construct a system of knowledge for themselves rather than having information presented to them. Vygotsky (1978) cited in Ozdemir-Catagay (2012) advanced that learning and thinking are socially constructed

through parents, peers, teachers and other members of the community. According to Barrett (2005), a portfolio's whole purpose is to foster learning and document growth over time is based upon a constructivist model of learning. Jackson (2003) believed that we should be encouraging students to construct new knowledge rather than showing them how much transmitted knowledge they have retained. This pedagogical approach promotes student-centered approach. In other words, learning occurs in a social context where learners view their knowledge within their surroundings. And with the wide use of technology, learners are exposed to new information and build a new knowledge in order to understand the world. This use of technology as an evaluator has been particularly true when it comes to improving language learners' speaking skills, Wang & Chang (2010).

1.3.1 The Speaking skill and its importance:

According to Florez (1999) as cited in Sakale (2012), speaking is an interactive process of constructing both form and meaning; depending on the context and the purpose of speaking. Chaney and Burk (1998) offered another definition of the speaking skill as a process of building and sharing meaning through verbal and non verbal symbols in a variety of contexts. Having this in mind, we conclude that speaking is a tool of communication. We communicate with one another by sharing our ideas and expressing our thoughts through speech. Hence, developing the speaking skill is crucial for any language learner. Without speech our communication is reduced to a mere script. The speaking skill is considered to be the most difficult skill in language classes. According to O'Malley and Pierce (1996), the nature of the speaking skills is the reason why some learners have difficulty in speaking the

language. According to Carter and McCarthy (1995) as cited in Sakale (2012), more attention has been given to the written skill for its well-established position among other skills. This is mostly because most of the history of language teaching was concerned mainly with the written skill. As a result the role of the speaking skill has been ignored in EFL language development. Therefore, the status of the speaking skill should be reconsidered. The continuous flux that characterized its nature demands permanent updates and research.

In-order to become a good and a successful communicator one needs to be proficient in each of the four language skills. However, the ability to speak accurately the language provides the speaker with several distinct advantages. Speaking skills are important for career success, but certainly not limited to one's professional aspirations. Speaking skills can also enhance one's personal life. According to Lazaraton (2001), the ability to speak a language is exactly the same as knowing the language as it is the basics of human communication.

Teaching and learning the speaking skill in an EFL context is a serious challenge in Algeria. Limited exposure to the language is a handicap as most of the EFL students use Arabic, Berber, or French to communicate outside the classroom. The lack of genuine and authentic space to enhance their speaking ability should be a driver to the EFL teachers to create and introduce new environments and situations to develop the speaking skill.

1.3.2 The nature of the speaking skill and its assessment:

Speaking is a very complex and challenging skill in nature (Sakale, 2012). According to Luoma (2004), to speak in a foreign language, learners must master the sound system of the

language, and have access to appropriate vocabulary and be able to put words together intelligibly with less hesitation. In addition, they must understand what is being said to them, and be able to respond accordingly in real time to maintain a certain flow in communication.

The difficulty in speaking a foreign language can be explained through the very special type of anxiety that emerges from such activity. Anxiety generally takes place when the speakers are afraid of being judged or humiliated. Although people realize that this nervousness is irrational, they still experience the anxiety, which can result in depression, distress, and frustration. This is also known as Communicative Apprehension (CA), which is defined by Richmond & McCroskey (1989) as cited in Wang & Chang (2010) as “an individual’s level of fear of anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons.” Speakers feel nervous and tense while they are speaking in public. The problems include lack of confidence, fear of making mistakes, and low language control. It appears that CA can be reduced by upgrading skills, changing cognitions, and getting people to relax, (Wang & Chang, 2010).

Brown (2001) also presented some challenges of speaking such as colloquial language, rate of delivery, stress, rhythm, and intonation. Another challenge with speaking is that in an (EFL) context, natural environments where EFL students communicate with native people are rare or even nonexistent. Therefore, teachers have the responsibility to create authentic environments and ways to expose their learners to the target language on a regular basis rather than just with exams or exam practice (O’Malley & Pierce, 1996). To avoid these

problems in classroom instructions, Brown (2001) offers some suggestions for teachers as in the following:

- 1- Focus on meaning
2. Provide intrinsically motivating techniques
3. Encourage the use of authentic language
4. Provide appropriate feedback
5. Capitalize on the natural link between speaking and listening
6. Give students opportunities to initiate oral communication
7. Encourage the development of speaking strategies, (p. 275).

Assessing speaking is challenging, however, because there are so many factors that influence the view of how well someone can speak a language. It is a difficult skill to evaluate since speaking is combined with other skills. O'Malley and Pierce (1996) affirmed that one major factor hindering speaking assessment is the listening skill of the speaker. A possible communication breakdown can occur between the test taker and the interlocutor. In the same line Widdowson (1972) added: "The speaking skill involves both receptive and productive participation."

Another problem with assessing speaking is that validity and reliability may not be ensured with large numbers of test takers, O'Malley & Pierce, (1996).

Speakers of any language use their speech to convey an image of themselves to others. The process may include using speed and pausing, variations in pitch, volume and intonation. They also create a texture for their talk that supports the meaning behind their

utterances. The sound of people's speech is meaningful, and that is why this is important for assessing speaking. According to Luoma (2004), people tend to judge native and nonnative speaker status on the basis of pronunciation. This leads to the idea that the standard against which learner pronunciation should be judged is the speech of a native speaker. But is this standard justified? This is another issue in assessing speaking.

Kachru (1985) as cited in Berns (1995) proposed a model of the functions and roles English fulfills around the world. The Kachravian framework consists of three concentric circles. The first circle is the 'inner' circle that contains countries whose speakers are considered by learners to be the standard-providers of English. This group includes Australia, Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom and New Zealand. The second circle the 'outer' refers to those countries where English was enforced by way of imperialism, and functions as an official language, Berns (1995). This circle includes Bangladesh, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tanzania and Zambia, countries whose speakers use English as a second language and develop their own varieties referring to the existing standard varieties of the inner circle. The last circle is the 'expanding' circle that refers to speakers of English who learn English as foreign language referring to the norms and standards set by the speakers of the 'inner' circle. Speakers from the expanding circle perceive English as an international language. However, according to many, the Kachravian model is problematic, McArthur (2003), Bruthiaux (2003), and simply as unfair to English users, Modiano (1999). According to MacArthur (2003), the Kachravian model does not

present clear boundaries between the three circles. He observes that English speakers from the outer circle are more fluent in various linguistics aspects than the natives, especially in professional context, and that many speakers from the expanding circle who use English as foreign language use it with greater ease than those whom English is second or native language. Modiano (1999) also stresses that the model reinforces the status of native English speakers as central, norm settings, and at the top of class followed by inferior speakers of English as second language and speakers of English as foreign language. This hierarchy does not encompass the role of English as lingua franca, and the active role of the non native speakers in developing English as an international language. “The understanding that the international variety of the English language is defined by native speakers must become a thing of the past.” Modiano (1999).

According to Luoma (2004), it is difficult to determine which single standard refers to the native speaking standard of any language, as we may find various regional varieties and standards, especially for the widely used languages such as English. And this makes it difficult to choose a standard for assessment that learners are required to achieve or to approximate. According to Levis (2005), few learners who initiate L2 study in adolescence or adulthood will ever gain complete control over its phonological dimensions. Ortega (2009) adds that the issue is not that attainment of a native-like accent is impossible, but it is uncommon and few L2 learners ever accomplish this. Therefore, if the native-like is to be the criterion for assessment, most of language learners will fail. Knowing that, it seems unfair to encourage learners to believe that they will be able to become native-like accented

English speakers. Yet, this is what most language teachers have been practicing through over emphasis on native English speakers (NES) models. This tradition is well articulated by Cook (1999):

Teachers, researchers, and people in general have often taken for granted that L2 learners represent a special case that can be properly judged by the standards of another group. Grammar that differs from native speakers', pronunciation that betrays where L2 users come from, and vocabulary that differs from native usage are treated assigns of L2 users' failure to become native speakers, not of their accomplishments in learning to use the L2. Just as it was once claimed that women should speak like men to succeed in business,

(p. 194-195)

It may be more productive to raise learner's awareness that some intelligible and comprehensible non-native English (NNE) varieties of spoken English can be accepted as legitimate inspirational models. According to Kanellow (2009), most ESL/EFL teachers realize native-like phonological control is an unnecessary goal as long as learners continue to progress toward relevant levels of intelligibility/comprehensibility. In the same line, Luoma (2004) found that communicative effectiveness which is based on comprehensibility may be considered a better standard for learner pronunciation. Additionally, Pennington and Richards (1986) found that there are some social and psychological reasons why some learners may object of being mistaken for native speakers of a language. Some learners convey their non-native status, so their cultural and politeness mistakes would be understood by the listener.

The sounds of speech that learners may produce can refer to many functions of the speech stream, such as individual sounds, pitch, volume, speed, pausing, stress and intonation. However, it is difficult to put all these features under one single criterion for assessment. In other words, should we focus on the accuracy of pronunciation or the expressiveness of students' speech? It depends on the purpose for what scores will be used. Using pronunciation as a criterion in assessment may not be always easy as it is difficult to define the criterion. One aspect of pronunciation criterion can be identified such as accuracy, but as accuracy always related to comprehensibility, and as research states, comprehensibility is more than accuracy, it often includes speed, intonation, stress and rhythm all of which may be more important for the overall comprehensibility of the talk than the accuracy of individual sounds. According to Luoma (2004), if the emphasis in the assessment is the inability to create meaning in discourse, the developers might want to evaluate 'interactional efficiency'. This means the use of stress and intonation, as well as the way their expressions should be interpreted. In other contexts, they might want to focus on 'expressiveness' as indicated by the general texture of the talk, the speaker's use of speed and pausing, and variations in pitch, tone and volume.

Another point related to the designing tasks that address the speaking skill is the fact that speaking tasks may differ from planned to unplanned speech, and this has a great impact on the assessing procedure, Luoma (2004). Planned speech where speakers have prepared and rehearsed their presentations beforehand. Unplanned speech on the other hand, is spoken on the spur of the moment, usually as a reaction to interlocutors, where short sentences and

ideas are common. Formality also differs from one type to another; planned speech is usually more formal than unplanned speech. Formal situations require written-like language with more complex grammar, whereas informal situations encourage mostly oral-like language. In assessing speaking, it is important to consider the difference between written-like and spoken-like situations.

Feedback is another key concept in assessing the speaking skill, informal feedback about speaking skills is very common in teaching contexts, but more organized strategies for reporting feedback to learners also need to be developed. Useful feedback is concrete and descriptive. One possibility to provide appropriate feedback is to use rating checklists, organizing feedback report is another possibility, but this means that teachers need to be able to define speaking goals; the achievement of these goals by students must be stated in terms of scale (Luoma, 2004).

To sum up, the holistic nature of the speaking skill makes it very difficult to be assessed in a clear way; however, this does not mean it is impossible to achieve better understanding of the assessing procedures. Standards, criterion, and various features of the language must be taken into consideration in the assessment process. Furthermore, further research on the speaking skill is needed to provide deeper insight.

1.3.3 The Types of Speaking Activities

According to Brown (2001), there are five types of speaking activities:

“Imitative, intensive, responsive, interactive, and extensive (monologue)”. To make us clearer to understand each of type the writer will explain one by one:

a. Imitative

One of continuum of types of speaking performance is the ability to simply parrot back (imitative) a word or phrase or possibly a sentence. Drilling a legitimate part of the communicative language classroom offer students an opportunity to listen and to orally repeat certain strings of language that may pose some linguistic difficulty, either the phonological or grammatical. Drills are to language teaching what the pitching machine is to baseball, They offer limited practice through repetition, they allow one to focus on one element of a language in a controlled activity.

b. Intensive

Intensive speaking goes one step beyond imitative to include any speaking performance that is designed to practice some phonological and grammatical aspect of language. Intensive speaking can be self initiated or it can even form part of some pair work activity, where learners are going over certain form of language. For example of intensive assessment tasks include directed response tasks, reading aloud, sentence and dialogue completion, limited picture-cued tasks including simple sequences, and translation up to simple sentence level.

c. Responsive

A good deal of student speech in the classroom is responsive; short replies to teacher or student's initiated questions or comments. These replies are usually sufficient and do not extend into dialogues, such speech can be meaningful and authentic. Responsive assessment tasks include interaction and test comprehension but at the somewhat limited level of very short conversation, standard greetings and small talk, simple requests and comments.

d. Interactive

The difference between responsive and interactive speaking is in the length and complexity of the interaction. Interaction can take the two forms of transactional language or interpersonal exchange. Transactional language has the purpose of exchanging specific information. Conversation for example may have more of a negotiate nature to them than does responsive speech. While interpersonal exchange has more for the purpose of maintaining social relationship than for the transmission of facts and information.

e. extensive (monologue)

Finally, students at intermediate to advanced levels are called on to give extended monologues in the form of oral reports, summaries, short speeches, or perhaps story-telling, during which the opportunity for oral interaction from listeners is either highly limited (perhaps to nonverbal responses) or ruled out altogether. Language style is frequently more deliberative (planning is involved) and formula extensive tasks, but cannot rule out certain informal monologues such as casually delivered speech.

1.3.4 The role of learner's output:

The role of output in the development of second language proficiency has been largely underestimated. Swain & Lapkin (1995) discussed some of the benefits of the learner's output. The purpose of their study was to determine if learner's own output does serve as an attention-getting device and if it does, does it sometimes serve to stimulate learners to engage in linguistic analysis?

Schmidt and Frota (1986) hypothesized that the activity of producing the target language may prompt second language learners to consciously recognize some of their linguistic problems. It may bring to their attention something they need to discover about L2. But what do they do when they notice a problem? Do they focus on morphology or syntax? In the paper, these questions were investigated through think-aloud protocols produced by L2 students (18 students from a French immersion program) while writing. The results of the study showed that adolescent second language learners indeed become aware of gaps of their linguistic knowledge when producing L2. They do so even when external feedback is unavailable. Findings also revealed that even though students had received abundant comprehensible input in French and were somewhat fluent in the language, they had still not acquired grammatical competence. Swain & Lapkin (1995) proposed that one possible way to account for the lack of grammatical accuracy was that learners were not being 'pushed' to produce language output. Swain & Lapkin (1995) further suggested that the output was the missing factor, because when learners are producing comprehensible output they have an absolute interest in being as accurate as possible. Producing comprehensible output requires learners to take a more active role than that required in listening, and through their produced output learners can test hypotheses about the target language. But as Swain and Lapkin (1995) pointed out, further research is needed to trace these cognitive processes on learning.

1.4.1 Empirical studies on portfolios that addressed the oral skill:

The literature on portfolios that dealt with different language skills is rich. However, few attempts only addressed the speaking skill. In this section of the review of literature,

some of the studies that have been conducted in the field of EFL teaching and learning will be presented to summarize what has been achieved, and what is left to be investigated.

Yoshida (2001) conducted a study to investigate the implementation of oral portfolios in Japanese high schools using tape-recording technique. Findings showed that oral portfolio can be a tool for raising self-regulation among language learners. It requires students to reflect actively, self-evaluate process as well as product, and collaborate with other students and the teacher, which will enhance self-regulated learning. However, Yoshida agreed on the fact that the procedure was time-consuming, but confirmed that was a more rewarding activity.

Özdemir-Çağatay (2012) conducted a study to determine whether speaking portfolio (SP) could be a useful alternative way of assessment in an EFL context, the study involved 77 Turkish students, five instructors and two administrators from an English preparatory program of a state university, the study intended to explore students and instructors attitudes towards the implementation of the speaking portfolio technique. The findings revealed a positive attitude from the stakeholders to the implementation of SP. Students felt that they improved their speaking skill through the use of the SP. However, it was agreed on the fact that SP increased students' level of anxiety and did not promote autonomy and motivation.

Brooks (1999) carried out a study on speaking portfolio with 86 students from 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th grades to compare the control and the experimental groups in various levels. The experimental group was assessed through students' speeches which were videotaped and also the feedbacks of those students on their own speeches whereas the control group

was assessed traditionally by the teacher after the speech was presented. The results revealed that the experimental group using video-portfolios performed better than the control group. Besides, the subjects of the research had positive perception towards portfolio assessment compared to traditional assessment.

Castaneda and Rodrigues-Ganzález' (2011) study examined students' positive attitudes to oral portfolio employing video recording. The finding indicated that 80% of the participants voiced the effectiveness of portfolio in terms of self-reflection. Moreover, participants pointed out that they ameliorated in their speaking performance using portfolio.

Huang and Hung (2010) study was conducted to explore EFL students' perceptions towards the use of electronic portfolios as a tool to document and assess their speaking performance. In so doing, this study intended to bridge the gap in the emerging literature on e-portfolio instruction and assessment, and bring to light an alternative tool for EFL teachers to obtain more informed evaluation of students' oral skills. The study took place at a Taiwanese university; involving 51 Taiwanese EFL students, the results revealed that most students indicated that e-portfolios helped them identify the weaker areas in their speaking that undermined their performance. Specifically, they believed that e-portfolios could best bring to light the problems associated with their pronunciation and vocabulary use. For instance, one student participating to the study pointed out that 'through listening to my own artifacts (production), I could find the parts of my speaking that need improvement, like pronunciation and vocabulary'. Most of the students verbalized a preference for e-portfolios because they offered additional chances for them to sharpen their English speaking skills

outside the classroom. And this is one of the key principles and benefits of the e-portfolio, the additional time that EFL students spend in practicing the target language outside the academic sphere.

Cepik & Erdost Yastibas (2013) conducted a study to investigate the effect(s) of technology based portfolio on the speaking skills of Turkish EFL learners. The purpose was to find out whether portfolio had a similar positive effect on improving speaking skills as it does on writing skills. The study involved 17 students in an English Language preparation department of one of the universities in Turkey. The students were given two assignments depending on the units covered in their listening and speaking courses. They were required to video record or audio record their assignments and upload them to www.lore.com, which was used as a portfolio platform to collect their data, interviews and self assessment papers. Results of the study showed that e-portfolio was equally effective in Turkish EFL learners' speaking skills as it was with their writing skills. The results also showed that all of the students thought that portfolio could improve their technology skills especially video recording and video upload. It may be because technology is the key point in preparing a portfolio, and the students were required to record a video or audio and upload it to YouTube in order to submit. These obligations could lead to the improvement in technology skills.

Research on portfolios is taking another dimensions nowadays, however, few attempts were made concerning the impact of the portfolio method on the speaking skill. Only

considerable experiences on the topic will tell us more about the benefits and limitations of portfolios in EFL classroom.

1.4.2 The use of technology in the EFL context:

In the early nineteenth century, when the blackboard was introduced, it was considered as a brilliant new way to help students visualize information. Nowadays, we can say the same thing about the use of technology in education. “The Net Generation” was a term that was introduced by Tapscott (1999), and it demonstrates how the new digital generations have grown up digital and living in the twenty-first century. However, the education system in many places is outdated. This example is very relevant to the current situation in some countries such as Algeria where technology is not fully introduced to students, especially language students. Studies over past years have revealed that using technology in EFL classrooms might enhance learners’ abilities to use the target language. In fact, computers, laptops and cell phones are taking a valuable part in the academic life of EFL students in Algeria or elsewhere. However, the access to technology may not be available for all the students; this is why some educators, teachers and administrators are very reluctant regarding the use of technology in their classroom.

Some studies have been conducted introducing technology in the field of education, particularly in the EFL classroom. These are some of the works that brought significant results regarding the use of digital instruments in enhancing the speaking skill.

Kasapoglu-Akyol (2010) conducted a qualitative study at the Eastern Michigan University involving international EFL students to explore the experience of these students

in using technological instruments to improve their communication skills in English. The results suggested that participants used technological devices for many purposes especially for their learning, it was seen that this could be helpful for them to improve their communication skills.

Voice recording tools have been introduced and used in a variety of ways in language instruction in an attempt to provide learners with opportunities to produce oral output “as they allow language students to practice and enhance their speaking skills outside the classroom while receiving feedback on their performance” (Pop, Tomuletiu, & David, 2011) . Many attempts so far have been registered concerning the use of audio-recording techniques in the EFL classrooms. From cassette-tapes to the digitalization of voice recording tool and the growing access to the internet, this shift greatly improved the feasibility of incorporating these tools and expanding the possibilities of voice recording tool use in language instruction.

Brown (2012) as cited in Aoki (2014), conducted a study in an ESL class setting, used voice recordings and self-assessment, he not only gave his students feedback, but also individualized the class materials according to the students’ self-reflection on their performances. In his study, the students listened to native speakers’ recordings from a variety of English speaking countries and then recorded themselves reading the same scripts they had listened to. An awareness-raising activity was incorporated in which students talked about similarities and differences of different English accents, students listened to their own recording and analyzed what they would have to work on in their next recording. Collected

data from questionnaires indicated that students were aware of their difficulty pronouncing specific segments of English sounds. As the project progressed, students' attention shifted from segmental (e.g., vowels and consonants) to supra-segmental (e.g., intonation, linking, and sentential stress). The recording project was viewed as a success in enhancing the students' intelligibility.

Yen-Kuang (1999)'s study used an audio taped dialogue journals technique to enhance Taiwanese EFL students speaking skills, the results were positive, however, some limitations have been discovered throughout the study, one major concern was that student rehearse what they produce and manage to correct their own mistakes by using any means that help them such as dictionary which may not be helpful in real communicative situation. Nevertheless, the study as pointed out by the author; is much more an additional practice time for EFL students to use the target language outside the classroom and it did. The absence on the interlocutor is also considered to be an issue to the study.

Nesapiradana & Murtiana (2013) conducted a classroom action research to investigate the impact of voice recording on EFL students fluency, two classes of intermediate students were involved in the study, students were asked to record their voice while reading monologues, the result of the recordings was checked by the teacher to locate the parts which students need to improve, students were asked to perform the same task based on teacher's feedback. The results revealed that most of the students were able to improve their reading fluency, as evidenced by their correct use of chunking, phrasing, intonation, and word stress.

Lys (2013) in her investigation integrated iPads in an advanced German conversation class. The purpose was to examine how students learn through using new technologies and how it affects the development of their oral proficiency. The results suggested that this technology allowed students to practice speaking and listening at advanced levels, students spent a huge amount of time recording their performances using the iPads. In addition, the time required for the recordings increased from the first to the last assignment and therefore the students' language clearly improved. According to Lys (2013), using mobile devices is an effective instructional approach by providing learning opportunities that the traditional classroom alone cannot furnish.

Lynch (2007) compared the improvement of speaking performance between two classes. In one class, the teacher initiated feedback to the students' recordings, and in the other class, students initiated self-reflection of their recordings. Findings revealed that the recordings made later in the courses indicated that the class in which students initiated self-transcribing and self-reflection outperformed in accuracy. However, time issue was the common concerns in most of the studies that dealt with audio-recording, but the benefit from it is much more conclusive.

The studies discussed above have attempted to investigate how learners can become aware of their own language performance. Rehearsing their oral output and revising their recordings after self-reflection would promote more sophisticated and complex use of vocabulary and language form.

According to the literature, it is still unclear whether self-reflection of recordings directly contributes to the improvement of students' pronunciation; however, it is known to help students become more self-aware of their oral output and pronunciation. Keeping audio-recording entries in a chronological order may allow students to easily archive and compare their very first recording to the most recent. If they find any improvement in their speech, they will become more motivated and build up confidence.

Conclusion:

It seems that the content of the review of literature might reflect the directions and the needs of the present study to investigate the influence of portfolios use on Algerian degree EFL students' oral ability. In this chapter, the concept of language portfolio was discussed, pointing its benefits and shortcomings. The nature of the speaking skill was also reviewed with reference to some empirical studies. Finally, research on the use of technology in EFL context was additionally considered in the review. Reflection on the review may deepen our understanding the previous studies that have been conducted in the field. Introducing the portfolio as a way for raising students' awareness of their speaking skill. Improving and assessing the speaking skill might present a challenge to the Algerian EFL classroom. The next chapter on methodology will provide an account of the step by step procedure which has been used to achieve the study purpose.

Chapter Two: Research Design

Introduction:

The primary aim of the study is to shed light on the possible outcomes of the use of speaking portfolios as a means to raise students' awareness of their speaking skills (interaction and oral production). The study was carried out at the English department, at the Faculty of Foreign Languages of the University of Algiers 2.

The study attempts to answer the following question: What is the influence of speaking portfolios in raising third year Algerian EFL students' awareness of their oral skills (oral interaction and oral production)? To investigate this question, the researcher used a qualitative research method. Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2006) define qualitative research approach as a study in which the researcher collects descriptive narratives and non-numerical data to gain insight into the phenomenon of interest. In other words, the researcher collected appropriate data to document an understanding of the impact of portfolios may have on EFL students' speaking skill.

This chapter describes the participants, the procedure, and the instruments used to collect data.

2.1 Participants:

The study took place at the University of Algiers-2. The researcher selected a group of third year linguistics students from the English department. The participants were 12 students from an Oral Communication class that the researcher was in charge of. The

participants were 10 females and 2 males whose age ranges from 20 to 26. The oral communication class comprises more than 30 students. The researcher purposefully selected 12, as they showed willingness in taking part in the study. The small number of participants was chosen in order to reach effectiveness of the individualized feedback. Hsu, Wang and Comac (2008) mentioned that the instructor who used an audio-blog for more than ten students would decrease effectiveness of the individual feedback, as these activities are time consuming and present a burden for teachers. Gender in this study was not considered a variable of research. Prior to the study, the researcher obtained the consent of participation and made it clear to the participants that participation is voluntary and they can withdraw at any moment. The Participants were given pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality. The pseudonyms were as follows: Selma, Salima, Yousra, Sihem, Djahida, Nomedja, Lilia, Cyrine, Hassina, Ryma, Yacine and Adel.

2.2 Procedure:

The study lasted for 8 weeks. At the beginning of the study, the researcher made sure to debrief the participants that they were involved in an academic study to investigate the use of speaking portfolios in their class. The students were in knowledge that their performances, recordings, and responses to the questionnaires will be kept safe and only be used for the purpose of research. Equally important, the data collected will be destroyed once the study is completed.

The researcher decided to conduct the study on a weekly basis to establish consistency in collecting data. Two tasks were designed. In the early stages of the study, the teacher

researcher introduced the theme of portfolios to the participants and how the portfolio might improve their speaking skill of English as a Foreign Language. The researcher explained the steps that he was going to follow throughout the study. In addition, the participants were given instructions on how to use the Web to share their work with the teacher researcher. The eight weeks length was established on purpose to tackle two different concepts of the speaking skills, unplanned (4 weeks) and planned speech (4 weeks). These two concepts were suggested by Luoma (2004), who posited that in order to tackle a large proportion of the speaking skill, the teacher should focus on both unplanned (first task) and planned speech (second task). In planned speech including presentations, speeches, lectures...etc, the quality of the spoken language in terms of grammatical features complexity and the level of formality are highly required. In the unplanned speech, the speakers use a less formal and non complex language, and have to provide spontaneous responses unlike the planned type of speech where the speaker may have rehearsed his work before hand. Also, voice recording activities introduced in the study have the reputation of not having interlocutors; for that reason, the researcher adopted both conversation activities where participants interacting with each other as well as recording themselves individually in order to cover a large portion of their speaking skill. Additionally, the researcher introduced these two concepts in the study to give additional opportunities to participants to practice different language situations (interaction and oral production)

2.2.1 First task, (4 weeks): Unplanned speech:

In the first task, the participants were asked to produce a voice recording conversation with the partner of their choice (some participants chose external students of the same level), the topic of the conversation was not designated, and the participants were free to engage in any type of conversation. The researcher created an accessible and available e-mail account (oralcommunicationgroup7@gmail.com) as the main instrument for the students to send their recordings and answers to the questionnaires. This was believed to diminish time constraint and effort in collecting participants' work. According to Brunner, Yates and Adams (2008) Email is widely accepted as a technological means of communication in educational and workforce environments. The e-mail account was also a tool used to send feedback to students after assessing their speaking performances. The researcher's assessment was done against criterion adopted from Auda (2013), (see appendix 9). Then, the participants were asked to listen to their first recording, looking for possible errors in terms of vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation. The participants were not given any assessment procedures to follow, the researcher wanted to find out to what extent students were aware of their errors as suggested by Yoshida (2001). Then, the participants were asked to correct their errors and to perform a second recording based on their self-assessment. Then, the researcher assessed the two recordings and sent feedback via e-mail to the participants who were asked to correct their errors and make a third recording based on the teacher's feedback. The length of each recording was about 3 minutes each. Each participant created a portfolio file in which they saved the recordings and feedback, so they

can have a full access to their work to reflect on their three performances. Their reflection will be investigated from their responses to the instruments used in the study (questionnaires and interviews) to see whether they witnessed any improvement of their speaking skill. The participants were asked to record the conversations using any type of digital instruments available to them.

A summary of the process is presented in the following table.

	Week1	Week2	Week3	Week4
Task one	Students record a first sample, reflect and assess	Students record a second sample based on their own correction	Teacher assesses the two samples and provides individualized feedback	Students record a third and last sample based on the teacher's feedback

Table1. Task one process.

2.2.2 Second task, (4 weeks): Planned speech

During the second month of the study, the participants were asked to record themselves giving a presentation, and unlike the first task, the participants had to work individually. Here again, the researcher asked the participants to audio record a presentation about any topic the students felt comfortable with. In other words, the students were given total freedom to select a topic. The researcher worried about the fact that some participants may not be at ease with certain types of topics which may have a negative impact on the quality of their oral production. After the first recording, the participants were asked to correct their oral productions in terms of vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation, and were asked to exchange their performance with a partner. According to the literature, peer evaluation may

improve collaborative learning, Ozdemir-Cagatay (2012). Then, the participants produced a second recording without changing the initial topic, based on their self-assessment and peer assessment. Like the first task, the criteria of assessment were absent. The researcher provided a final feedback (see appendix 12) based on assessment rubric adapted from Yoshida (2001), (see appendix10). Finally, the participants were asked to record themselves for a third time applying both the teacher's and peer's feedback. The participants like the first task, were asked to reflect upon their three recording performances.

In sum, the participants were expected to provide three recordings for the first task and three for the second. The time required for each recording was supposed to last about 3 minutes.

The following table sums up the process followed during the second task.

	Week1	Week2	Week3	Week4
Task two	Students record a first sample, reflect and self assess	Students record a second sample based on their self assessment	Teacher assesses the two samples and provides individualized feedback	Students record a third sample based on the teacher's feedback

Table2. Task two process.

2.3 Instruments:

In order to investigate the influence of portfolios in raising students' awareness of their speaking skill, the researcher used the following instruments: portfolios (audio recordings of both first and second task), questionnaires (1 and 2), and interviews.

Validity and reliability are concepts that have been taken into consideration in this study through the way the data were collected, analyzed and interpreted, (Merriam, 2009). To ensure reliability and validity, the researcher in this study used multiple sources, portfolios, questionnaire 1 & 2 and the interviews. As pointed out by Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen (1993), in qualitative research, validation takes the form of triangulation. Triangulation lends credibility to the findings by incorporating multiple sources of data, methods, investigators, or theories.

2.3.1 Portfolios (Participants' audio recordings)

The main instrument used to collect the data from participants was portfolios. The researcher collected audio recordings on a weekly basis as shown in the tables 1 and 2. During the first task (interaction), the researcher collected twenty recordings at three different phases. In the first week, the researcher collected seven recordings from the participants, six in the second week and seven in the fourth week. The length of the audio recordings in the first phase was eighteen minutes fifty one seconds, in the second phase, nineteen minutes and eight seconds and in the last phase, fifteen minutes forty six seconds.

The following table describes the distribution:

1 st task	1 st week	2 nd week	4 th week	Total
Recordings n°	7	6	7	20
Length	18min51sec	19min08sec	15min46sec	52min45sec

Table3: 1st task portfolios collection

One participants did not submit a second recording, the reason behind this as explained by the participant herself will be discussed in the presentation of data.

During the second task (oral production), the researcher collected thirty recordings from thirty six supposed to be collected. Due to unpredictable digital issues, two participants failed to send their audio recordings. The thirty recordings were collected like the first task at three different phases. In the first week, the researcher collected ten recording, ten in the second and ten in the fourth week. The length of the audio recordings in the first phase was thirty one minutes eighteen seconds, in the second phase, thirty minutes fifty one seconds and in the last phase, twenty six minutes eighteen seconds.

The following table illustrates the distribution:

2 nd task	1 st week	2 nd week	4 th week	Total
recordings	10	10	10	30
Length	31min18sec	30min51sec	26min18sec	1h27min25sec

Table4: 2nd task portfolios collection

The audio recordings from the first and the second task were transcribed (see appendix 6 and 7) later on and analyzed using the error analysis method (see appendix 8). The researcher counted the frequency of words of the three set of recordings transcripts (see appendix) during the three phases. The following tables display the word count of the participants for each task:

Participants n=12	1 st recording transcript	2 nd recording transcript	3 rd recording transcript
	word count	word count	word count

1	268	–	300
2	241	237	229
3	260	257	249
4	209	202	197
5	312	274	270
6	157	150	148
7	183	178	172
8	217	208	197
9	192	201	199
10	103	118	125
11	188	194	209
12	228	233	221
Total	2558	2257	2516

Table 5: 1st task transcripts word count

Participants n=10	1 st recording transcript word count	2 nd recording transcript word count	3 rd recording transcript word count
1	320	308	319
2	473	467	429
3	456	441	451
4	290	241	298

5	312	324	287
6	553	569	555
7	342	347	336
8	297	271	314
9	391	418	407
10	407	394	322
Total	3841	3780	3718

Table 6: 2nd task transcripts word count

2.3.2 Questionnaires: (1 and 2) (see appendix 1 and 2)

Questionnaires were also used by the researcher in order to collect data from the students. Two questionnaires were assigned. The first questionnaire was given to the participants at the end of the first task (interaction); the second one was assigned at the end of the second task (oral production). Both questionnaires contained six questions each, the questions included were open-ended. According to Oppenheim (2001), open-ended questions offer freedom of answers. By using the first questionnaire, the researcher aimed at collecting information on what the students thought about their speaking skill and what areas of the speaking skill they were struggling with during the task. Additionally, the researcher intended to investigate the role of self-assessment and how students' self-assessment differed from the teacher's. The questionnaire was meant to explore whether reflecting on

their portfolios was useful in improving their speech in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar.

In the second questionnaire, the researcher aimed at finding whether the portfolio had any impact on their speaking performance. The researcher also wanted to explore the preferences of the participants in taking part in different speaking practices (first task & second task). According to Shohamy (1982) and Scott (1986), learners have preferences for certain types of task and some tasks are perceived to be easier, more interesting or more acceptable as measures of ability than others. It has been also pointed out that if learners have negative attitudes to the task then they are less likely to perform to their best of their abilities, (Messick, 1989). A common question was included in both questionnaires on the experience of the participants using digital devices. The researcher wanted to depict any technical difficulty that students may encounter using portfolios. Appropriate technical skills are needed in order to effectively use portfolios. Students need to be aware of technical challenges before using speaking portfolios.

2.3.3 Interviews: (see appendix 3)

Interviews were conducted at the end of the study, they were used in order to seek more understanding of the speaking portfolios. Interviews may reveal hidden information that was not clearly stated in students' responses to the close-ended questions (Ozdemir-Cagatay, 2012). The interviews were conducted at the end of the study (see appendix 3). The researcher used probing techniques whenever necessary. He also wanted to find out whether the participants had improved their technical skills using digital tools. The interviews were

recorded with the consent of the participants (see appendix 5), transcribed (see appendix 4) and analyzed (see appendix 8).

2.4 Method of analysis:

In this study, the researcher used a mixed methods research composed of both qualitative and quantitative method, as defined by Creswell, Plano and Clark (2007) A mixed research method is a method that focuses on collecting, analyzing and mixing both qualitative and quantitative data within the same framework. Mixed method strategies are intended to maximize the benefits available when applying different approaches, (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998). As pointed out by Wallace (1998):

Quantitative is broadly used to describe what can be counted or measured and can therefore be considered objective. Qualitative is used to describe data which are not amenable to being counted or measured in an objective way, and are therefore 'subjective', (p. 38).

In this study, portfolios data were analyzed using the error analysis method in order to see whether participants improved their speaking skill (interaction and oral production) over the period of the study. According to Muhamad, Ahamad Shah, Engku Ibrahim, Sirajuddin, Abdulmalik and Abdul Ghani (2013), knowledge on errors produced by learners can help to provide picture on linguistic development of the learners. It can also lead in creating and designing more effective language learning materials. Therefore, the analysis of errors made by learners has become an important aspect of language learning process. The error analysis in this study focused on three components of speech, vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation. According to Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982),

error can be classified into many types. The first Language components include phonology (pronunciation), syntax and morphology (grammar), semantics and lexicon (meaning and vocabulary). The researcher created a system of categorizing the errors in order to better understand where students made most of their errors. Errors were collected, identified and described. Verbal responses and qualitative data generated from the open ended questions were analyzed using a content analysis method. The interviews data were analyzed using a qualitative content analysis method. This process includes open coding, segmenting and creating categories inductively from the qualitative data. The purpose of creating categories is to provide a means of describing the phenomenon, to increase understanding and to generate knowledge (Cavanagh 1997) as cited in Elo & Kyngas (2008). With the content analysis, it is possible to distil words into fewer content related categories. It is assumed that when classified into the same categories, words, phrases and expressions share the same meaning Cavanagh (1997). To ensure reliability synonyms were also taken into consideration whenever they occurred in the data. Synonyms may be used for stylistic reasons throughout the data and thus may lead the researcher to underestimate its importance in relation to a concept, Weber (1990). Data were gathered, organized, interrelation between similar items was extracted and highlighted in text and tables. Then the data were organized and assembled to facilitate conclusion drawing.

Conclusion:

The aim of this chapter was to describe the research design used by the researcher in the investigation. Participants and procedure were discussed, including the tools used to collect

data: speaking portfolios, the questionnaire 1& 2 and the interviews. The researcher combined both qualitative and quantitative method to analyze the data. The error analysis method was adopted by the researcher in order to understand the development of students' speech in terms of vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation. A content analysis method was used to analyze the interviews transcripts and the data generated from the open ended questions of the questionnaires 1 & 2. The findings in relation to the research questions are presented and supported by appropriate examples in the next chapter.

Chapter Three: Data Analysis and Data presentation

Introduction:

The aim of this study was to shed light on the influence that portfolios may have on EFL degree students in raising their awareness of their speaking skill. The study was carried out at the English department of the University of Algiers². The data collection instruments discussed in the previous chapter, were believed to provide sufficient data to answer the research question of the study:

RQ: What is the influence of speaking portfolios in raising third year Algerian EFL students' awareness of their oral skills (interaction and oral production)?

In this study, the researcher used mixed methods research (quantitative and qualitative method) to analyze the data.

3.1 Portfolios (audio recordings) data:

The data gathered from portfolios were transcribed (see appendix) and analyzed through the error analysis method. The data were analyzed following categories based on the linguistic category classification which identifies errors in the aspect of linguistic categories such as phonological, grammatical and lexical (James, 1998), and based on the theory of type of speech errors suggested by Clark and Clark (1977). According to Clark and Clark (1977) there are many kinds of errors: 1) Silent pause, 2) Filled pause, 3) Repeats, 4) Unrestricted, 5) Retraced, 6) Correction, 7. The researcher analyzed, classified, counted, and then compared error types made by participants through the three phases (1st recording,

2nd and 3rd recording) of each task. Comparing the results of the three phases for each task may provide a better understanding of the use of speaking portfolios in raising students' awareness of their oral skill.

3.2 Questionnaires data analysis:

The questionnaires were administered to the 12 participants involved in the study separately. The first questionnaire was administered at the end of the first task as discussed in the methodology chapter, whereas the second questionnaire was administered at the end of the second task. 12 out of 12 participants returned their responses to the first questionnaire, while 10 out of 12 returned their responses to the second questionnaires.

The questionnaire 1 contained six questions as well as the questionnaire 2. The data generated from the open ended nature of the questions of the questionnaires 1 & 2 were analyzed qualitatively using content analysis method of word frequency count.

3.3 Interviews data analysis:

The interviews were conducted at the end of the study to gain additional understanding of the participants' position regarding portfolios as a means in raising their awareness towards their speaking skill.

The items of the interview were developed by adapting some questions found in Cepik & Yastibas (2013). The researcher interviewed six participants. The interview contained eight questions; follow up questions were added, depending on the participants' responses during the interview. The interviews were recorded and transcribed into texts (see appendix. 4). The transcripts were read through several times in order to make sense of the data. The

researcher used an inductive content analysis method which includes open coding the data to describe all aspects of the content. Codes were double checked to ensure that they have not been misinterpreted. Categories were created. Through interpretation, the researcher decided which items to include within a given category. To ensure credibility of the findings, the researcher made sure that the categories cover all the data. (see appendix. 9 for the coding process).

Results and findings were gathered and displayed in tables for interpretation and discussion.

3.4 Presentation of the results and findings:

In this section, findings of portfolios, questionnaires and interviews are presented.

3.4.1 Portfolios findings:

The transcribed oral interaction data and the oral production data from both task 1 and 2 were analyzed through error analysis based on the linguistic category classification and the theory of type of speech error. Categories of errors that emerged were as follows:

Grammatical errors: Refers to errors related to the rules of the language as defined by Henry and Roseberry (2007) a grammatical error is one in which there is violation of a productive rule of language. The grammatical errors in this study included:

Verb form: related to the misuse of verb tense, omission of the morphological marking such as the present simple third person singular (s), past simple (ed) form, the present (or, ing) participle and gerund form and the infinitive (to).

Plural form: refers to the inappropriate omission or addition of the plural marker (s).

Article: related to the inappropriate omission or addition of articles.

Preposition: refers to the inappropriate omission or addition of prepositions.

Phonological errors: Errors related to inappropriate pronunciation of words.

Vocabulary errors: related to the inappropriate words used by the speaker (wrong word choice).

Speech errors: in this study, the researcher found four types of speech errors.

Repeats: refers to when the speaker repeats the same word thinking about what to say next.

Silent pauses: this takes place when the speaker takes more than a second between words in order to find the next one.

Filled pauses: it occurs when the speaker is thinking about the next word by producing sounds such as: emm, aaa,,etc.

Correction: it refers to the speaker correcting his/her speech whenever they feel they made a mistake.

The following table displays the error analysis findings of the first task's transcripts.

Error category	Types of Errors	1 st transcripts error frequency	2 nd transcripts error frequency	3 rd transcripts error frequency
Grammatical	Verb form	15	11	08
	Plural form	09	09	07
	Preposition	10	08	05
	Article	11	07	05
	Total		45	35
Phonological	Pronunciation	28	25	18

	Total	28	25	18
Vocabulary	Word choice	18	16	11
	Total	18	16	11
Speech errors	Repeats	44	32	25
	Silent pauses	18	13	10
	Filled pauses	24	22	25
	Correction	22	18	14
	Total	108	85	74
Total		193	161	128
Word count		2558	2257	2516
Error: word count ratio		1:13	1:14	1:19

Table 7: 1st task error analysis results

The findings in the table 7 indicate that 193 errors were found in the first recordings transcripts. In the first category of grammatical errors, the researcher identified a total of 45 errors distributed over the four types of errors found. The researcher found 15 utterances containing verb form errors. Examples of verb form errors produced by participants are as follows: “The government doesn’t give the opportunity to the new generation and don’t follow successful strategy” in this example the participant omitted the third person singular marker (s) in (don’t). Another example of the verb form errors, “I want to start work as soon as possible” Here the student omitted the present participle (ing) form in the word work. The researcher also found 09 utterances containing plural form errors. These are some

examples: “I am 23 year old” the students omitted the plural marker (s) in the word year. Another example, “in coffees or in fast-food” the students omitted the plural marker (s) in the word fast-food. The findings also show that participants produced 10 preposition errors. “You only have to visit to war zone” in this example, the participant inappropriately added the preposition (to) before the word war. Another example found, “in case with any problem” the student made an error by saying the preposition (with) instead of the preposition (of) after the utterance in case. The researcher also found 11 errors concerning the use of articles, here are some examples: “even if we search for job” the participant omitted the article (a) before the word job. Another example, “I’m looking for new secretary” the error here consisted in omitting the article (a) before the word new. In the phonological category of errors related to the pronunciation type of errors, the researcher found 28 errors. These are some mispronounced words: genocide, hatred, representative, government, atmosphere, disadvantages, years old, whole.

Concerning the vocabulary category of errors related the word choice; the researcher found 18 utterances that contained wrong word choice. These are some examples: “Making traffic jam” in this example the participant wrongly chose the word making instead of other correct words such as (causing). Another example “I have good patient” the participant made an error in uttering the word (patient) instead of the word (patience). In the speech error category, the researcher found 108 speech errors. 44 utterances contained repetitions such as “your company company”, “graduate graduate”, “have been have been” unemployment unemployment”, participants repeated the same words while thinking about what to say

next. The researcher also found 18 silent pause utterances. For example, “but (,,,) why you think we have this problem” the participants pauses silently for more than a second in order to think about the next word. 24 filled pauses were also found. For example, “ but (emm) I mean”, “ don’t do very (aaa) don’t do much”. 22 correction errors were also found when the participants corrected the utterances they believe they were incorrect such as, “we’re gonna have we’re gonna look for a job”, “used to make some used to make sure”. Table 7 also shows that 158 errors were produced by participants in the second recording transcripts. Participants produced less errors compared to the first recording transcripts. The frequency of grammatical errors decreased to 35 errors compared to the first frequency. 11 errors in verb form such as “our school focus on much experience”. 09 plural form errors, “a lot of people with less qualification” 08 preposition errors were also found, “from the government” inappropriate addition of the preposition from. 07 article errors were found such as “A issue”. Related to phonological errors, the researcher found 25 mispronounced words. The frequency of errors slightly decreased compared to the first recording transcripts. A light decrease was also noticed in terms of vocabulary errors. The researcher found 16 errors in word choice such as “educative person”. In terms of speech errors, the findings show that 85 errors were produced by participants. The frequency decreased compared to the first recording transcripts. 32 utterances contained repetitions, “the new generation to to to apply their new ideas”. 13 silent pauses, “but (,,,) where is the problem”. 22 filled pauses, “emm honestly, I’ve been thinking” And 18 corrections such as “do you react, sorry, how do you react with your students?” in the third and last recording transcripts, the findings show a

decrease in the frequency of grammatical errors compared to the first and second recording transcripts. 08 verb form errors were found, “why especially have you choosed our school? 07 plural form errors, “their learning skill” 05 preposition errors, “work hard to higher our level so by that we can raise our chances” And 05 article errors, “so they spend most of _ time”. The researcher found 18 errors related to pronunciation and in terms of vocabulary and word choice, 11 errors were detected. The frequency of both phonological and vocabulary category of errors decreased compared to the first and second recording transcripts. Concerning the speech error category, 74 errors were found. 25 repeats, “there are there are” 10 silent pauses and 25 filled pauses. Participant corrected their speech 14 times, “there are students who made did everything”. Findings show that the error count and word count ratio is approximately the same in first and second transcripts (1 error in 13 words) and (1 error in 14 words) whereas in the third transcripts, the ratio was lower (1 error in 19 words)

The following table presents the error analysis findings of the second task:

Error Category	Types of error	1 st transcripts error frequency	2 nd transcripts error frequency	3 rd transcripts error frequency
Grammatical	Verb form	36	29	17
	Plural form	27	20	15
	preposition	11	13	08
	Article	18	15	14
	Total	92	77	54

phonological	pronunciation	65	58	49
	Total	65	58	49
vocabulary	Word choice	14	11	10
	Total	14	11	10
Speech errors	repeats	22	25	19
	Silent pause	15	13	17
	Filled pause	16	21	14
	correction	11	09	14
	Total	64	68	64
Total		236	214	177
Word count		3841	3780	3718
Error: word count ratio		1:16	1:17	1:21

Table 8: 2nd task error analysis results

Table 8 shows that 136 errors were found from the first recording transcripts of the second task (oral production). Related to the grammatical errors, the researcher found a total of 92 errors from which 36 verb form errors were found such as, “now she become_” 27 plural form errors, for example, “these volunteer” 11 preposition errors, “my goal was to go to college_which I am” and 18 article errors such as, “Women appear to be a safer drivers”. Concerning the errors in pronunciation, the researcher found 65 errors made by participant in pronouncing some words such as, “privilege, unable, mission, corporation, achieved, ensured...etc” 14 word choice errors were also found, “goals that you make” concerning the

speech errors, the researcher noticed 22 repeats errors, “you will you will”, 15 silent pauses errors, “because_ for them” 16 filled pauses, “in sss psychological” And 11 corrections such as, “to we to be”. In the second recording transcripts, the findings show that there is a slight decrease of the amount of errors in three categories of errors compared to the first transcripts. The researcher found 77 grammatical errors compared to the 92 errors of the first transcripts. 29 verb form errors, “the organization help_ people” 20 plural form errors, “many definition_” 13 preposition errors, “in San Francisco_1986” and 15 article errors, “take_course”. Concerning phonological errors, 58 errors were found, for example, “exploitative, authorized, obtaining, achieved, status, available” 11 errors were also detected in word choice such as, “to help needed people” related to speech errors, a slight increase in errors was observed compared to the first transcripts. The researcher found 25 repeats errors such as, “not reached not reached” 13 silent pauses, “such as _earthquakes” 21 filled pauses, “by fff forgiving people” and 09 corrections, “these or they can cause”. In the last recording transcripts, the analysis of errors produced by participants indicates a decrease in errors compared to the first and second transcripts’ results. The researcher found 54 grammatical errors from which 17 verb form errors, “study which reveal_” 15 plural form errors, “higher traffic violations and accident_” 08 preposition errors and 14 article errors. 49 errors in pronunciation, “priority, threat, literature, antidepressants, based, simply” 10 vocabulary errors were also found related to word choice such as, “any anormal thing happens to you” in speech errors category, 19 repeats errors were found, “tight spaces spaces” 17 silent pauses, “like_ophidiophobia” 14 filled pauses such as, “no real kkk convincing reason” and

14 corrections, “let’s lake let’s take a look” findings in the table 8 show that the error count and word count ratio is nearly the same in the first and second recording transcripts (1error in 16 words) (1 error in 17 words) whereas in the third recording transcripts the ratio is lower (1 error in 21 words).

3.4.2 Questionnaire 1:

The first questionnaire was administered to the 12 participants of the study. The participants had to answer six questions after taking part in the first phase of the study. This phase, as mentioned in the methodology chapter, consisted in participants recording their performances (interaction with a partner), reflecting on possible mistakes, and recording a second performance based on their self or peer-assessment. A feedback from the teacher was provided, and a third and last recording was performed based on the teacher’s comments. The researcher’s expectations of the questionnaire subsequent to the reflection on their development from the first recording to the last would bring more understanding concerning students’ capacities in using the English language, their attitudes towards teacher’s feedback, self and peer-correction, and whether portfolio use had any influence on their speaking skill improvement. The questionnaires and the interviews contained a section on the technicalities of portfolios and displaying students’ digital literacy. Table one below displays the results from the questionnaire, question. 1.

Q1: What are the difficulties you usually encounter when speaking English?

Difficulties in using English	Number (n=12)
Vocabulary	08

Grammar	04
Pronunciation	02
Speed delivery	01
No difficulty	01

Table 9: Students' difficulty using the English language.

Question 1 was intended to provide us with information concerning the problems that EFL degree students usually face when speaking English. Identifying these problems would be crucial in designing the appropriate speaking activities.

Table 9 shows that the majority of students (eight out of twelve) responded that vocabulary mistakes were their main difficulty when speaking English. Four participants mentioned that grammar is their weakness. Two participants considered grammar as their problem. One participant mentioned that speed delivery was the main concern, she explained: "the difficulty I have when speaking English is that I speak too fast so I can just finish off and take the attention out of me". Whereas one participant claimed that she has no difficulty in speaking English.

Q2: Did you find any speaking mistakes after listening to the first recording?

Responses	Number (n=12)
yes	10
No	02

Table 10: finding mistakes in speaking.

Question 2 aimed at finding out to what extent students are self critical about their oral performance. Their ability to depict mistakes is felt important in order to self-correct their work, as self-assessment is an important element in the use of portfolios.

Table 10 shows that most of the participants (ten out of twelve) did actually find mistakes in their speaking after listening to the audio recordings, whereas two participants did not find any mistakes as one of them (Yousra) replied: “No, I don’t think there were any mistakes in speaking, there was just the factor of time that needed to be shortened.”

Q3: Did your partner in the conversation help you in correcting your speaking mistakes?

Responses	Number (n=12)
Yes	09
No	03

Table 11: peer-assessment contribution

Question 3 was asked to explore any collaborative aspect of the portfolio.

Table 11 shows that nine participants out of twelve were helped by their partners in correcting their speaking mistakes, whereas three of them did not receive any contribution from their interlocutors.

Q4: Were there any differences between your own correction and the teacher’s feedback?

Reponses	Number (n=12)
Yes	11
No	01

Table12: students’ self-correction vs. teacher’s feedback

This question aimed at finding whether the information in the teacher’s feedback differed from the one found in students’ self-correction.

As shown in table 12, the majority of the respondents (eleven out of twelve) responded that they did find differences between their own correction and the teacher’s feedback, whereas only one participant did not find differences.

Question 5: After completing the task, do you feel that you improved your speaking?

This question aimed at examining whether the portfolio helped the students raising their awareness of their oral skill improvement.

Responses	Number (n=12)
Yes	10
No	02

Table 13: Improvement of students’ speaking skill.

The table 13 suggests that most of participant did improve their speaking skill after completing the first task, (ten out of twelve). As Cyrine stated:” I felt that I have improved my speaking because I have no more problems with intonation and pronunciation.” However, two participants felt no improvement in their speaking.

Q7: What kind of technical (digital) difficulties, if any, did you meet?

Digital difficulties	Number (n=12)
No difficulty	07
Low internet accessibility	03
Low familiarity with e-mail	02

Difficulty in sending files	02
-----------------------------	----

Table 14: students' digital skills.

An effective use portfolios requires knowledge on how to work with digital instruments. Question 6 aimed at detecting possible problems using the digital technology when using speaking portfolios. Any lack of knowledge about the basics of using digital instruments would jeopardize the effectiveness of portfolios impact on students' speaking skill.

Table 14 includes figures that suggest that more than a half of the participants did not find any technical difficulties; three participants had low access to the internet. For example, Sihem replied: "I don't have internet access at home, so I had to go to internet coffees to do my work". On the other hand, two participants did have difficulties in using e-mails. Ryma explained: "I always forget my password". Two participants had difficulties in sending files using e-mails. For example Yacine stated: "I couldn't send my files via e-mail, so I tried another option which is Skype."

3.4.3 Questionnaire 2:

Questionnaire 2 was administered after the participants were involved in the second task. The second task required the participants to audio record an oral production; reflect on possible mistakes, and to correct their mistakes in a second recording. After the second recording, the students receive the teacher's written feedback. The students will then produce a final recording taking into account the teacher's feedback.

The questionnaire was administered to the twelve participants of the study; however, due to technical issue in collecting the data, only ten participants returned their answers. Six questions were asked.

Q1: Did you use to record your speaking using digital instruments?

Familiarity with digital tools	Frequency (n=10)
Never	09
Sometimes	01
All the time	00

Table 15: student experience using digital tools

Table 15 shows that 90% (nine out of ten) of the participants have never used digital instruments to record their speaking, whereas only one participants used sometimes to record her speaking.

Q2: Which task did you enjoy most, conversation or presentation?

Preferences	Number (n=10)
Presentation	07
Conversation	02
Both	01
None	00

Table 16: Students' tasks preferences.

This question was important in order to understand what type of tasks should be suitable to the students.

Table 16 suggests that 70% of the participants (seven out of ten) have a preference for the presentation task over conversation. For example, Djahida stated: “Recording myself presenting individually was easier and more comfortable because I didn’t have to worry about turn-taking with my partner”. Two participants preferred the conversation task. As Hassina explained: “recording myself talking with someone was much easier, because presenting individually needs too much time for research.” Yousra was the only one who preferred both tasks; according to her “there is no anxiety in both tasks because it is recorded.”

Q5: At the end of the task, do you feel any Improvement in your speaking?

Reponses	Number (n=10)
Yes	10
No	00

Table 17: students’ impressions about their speaking.

This question was essential to find out whether the participants did improve their speaking.

Table 17 shows clearly that 100% of the participants replied positively. For example, Hassina stated:” Yes, obviously the final recording was the best one, because I corrected the mistakes and my language became very comprehensible”.

Q6: Have you improved your technical skills in using the portfolio?

Responses	Total (n=10)
Yes	10

No	00
----	----

Table 18: students' technical improvement.

Question 6 aimed at finding out whether the participants have improved their technical skills needed for an accurate use of the portfolio. As table 18 shows, all participants have responded with a 'Yes'. No participant has denied that he or she improved their technical skills. For example, Djahida confirmed: "Yes, I have improved my technical skills through the frequent use of storing and sharing information on the Web."

3.4.4 Interview findings:

The interviews were semi-structured and aimed at bringing some confirmatory results to those found in the two questionnaires. Six participants were engaged in the interviews (Djahida, Nomedja, Salima, Sihem, Yousra and Adel). Qualitative inductive content analysis, including open coding, was used by the researcher in order to analyze the data. Eight questions were asked during the interview, most of the questions were open ended. Some questions were extended or paraphrased, and probing was used whenever necessary. The questions of the interviews sought to answer some crucial questions about the portfolio influence in raising students awareness of their speaking skill.

Through the use of qualitative inductive content analysis to analyze the data from the interview, 14 categories have emerged from students' responses to the interview. (See appendix 9). They are described as follows:

- **Students' linguistic problems:** This category refers to the types of linguistic difficulties that the participants encounter when speaking English.

- **Students' reflection on speaking improvement:** This category deals with students beliefs on possible improvement of their speaking.
- **Practice as a way to improve speaking:** This category refers to students' agreement on the fact that practicing English is a key factor in improving their speaking skill.
- **Students' preferences for implemented tasks:** This category covers the reasons that encourage students in preferring one of the two tasks introduced in the study.
- **Students' reflection on self assessment:** This category indicates the students' impressions on the role of self assessment in improving their speaking.
- **Students' difficulty in tracking their mistakes:** This category points out the difficulties that students encounter in correcting their own mistakes.
- **Students' dependence on the teacher's feedback:** This category refers to the attachment that students show to different comments and orientations that the teacher provides in assessing their speaking performance.
- **Efficiency of the teacher's feedback:** This category invokes the positive attitudes of students towards the teacher's feedback, and how this latter had a positive impact on spotting their mistakes and improving their speaking.
- **Teacher's sense of presence:** This category refers to the positive state of being taken care of by the teacher that students felt. It introduces the idea that even when the teacher is at a distance, his presence will be always felt through the feedback.
- **Speaking skill improvement:** This category relates to the students feeling of improvement of their speaking skill after taking part in this study.

- **Areas of improvement:** This category indicates the areas of their speaking that the students felt they improved.
- **Students' reflection on the portfolio as a practice device:** This category represents the students' impressions on the portfolio in providing extra practice opportunities to use the language outside the classroom.
- **Students' reflection on anxiety:** This category gathers different opinions on whether the portfolio helped students decreasing anxiety while speaking English.
- **Students' unfamiliarity with digital tools in improving their speaking:** This category refers to the lack of digital literacy among students in using technology tools in order to improve their speaking skill.

The results obtained from the interview by using these categories are presented below.

Q1: What are the difficulties that you usually meet when speaking English?

Question 1 aimed at identifying the participants' difficulties when speaking English. All participants agreed on having linguistic problems in producing the spoken language. Five out of six participants stated that vocabulary was the most common difficulty. For instance, Sihem answered: "As I try to look for the vocabulary, I lose it...this is what usually happens during my speech."

From the audio recordings, vocabulary can be traced by the frequent state of hesitation, loss of words and sometimes some students switched to another language as shown in the transcripts. Two students out of six identified grammar as an additional problem they face during their speaking. This was observed in a number of cases where students produced

errors in grammar. Two students mentioned that pronunciation is another issue when they speak English. One student answered that she speaks in a fast rate.

Q2: Do you think that students can improve their speaking?

This question aimed at finding out whether participants can adjust their speaking. All the participants (six out of six) agreed that they can improve their speaking skill. Additionally, three participants out of six believed that through a regular practice of their speaking there would be no doubt that they would improve their speaking competency. To support this, Sihem stated:” With practice I see the difference; I’m improving my speaking.” Moreover, Nomedia said:” yes, I can improve my speaking by practicing the language outside the classroom.” Adel also stressed:” yes, I noticed that the more I practice the language the more I develop my speaking.”

Q3: What differences did you find between conversations task and presentations task? Which one do you prefer and why?

Question 3 was about the differences that the participants noticed between task one (interaction) and task two (oral production). This question was meant to find out more about the effectiveness of the chosen tasks.

Individual oral production	Number (n=06)	interaction	Number (n=06)
Pre-organized	02	‘Naturalness’ of the task	01
Individual	02	Collaborative	01
Self-focused	01	Positive psychological attitude	01

Positive psychological attitude	02		
	Total=07		Total=03

Table 19: Students' preferences between oral production task and interaction task.

Table 19 shows that most of the students were in favour of the presentation task. Two participants out of six confirmed that the presentation task was less difficult because it was pre-organized; as a result, students had positive psychological attitude towards the task as it brought more confidence.

Adel expressed: "In the presentation, I was more confident because I knew what I was about to say."

Two participants thought that the individual nature of the presentation was helpful to them. According to Sihem, this increased her ability to focus on her performance only, whereas in the conversation task, she had to pay too much attention to the mistakes made by her partner. Djahida also expressed that the presentation task increased her focus on her performance. Two participants explained their preferences for the conversation task because it was more natural. As Nomedia stated: "In conversation I could speak naturally."

Yousra added: "there is less pressure during the conversation recording task, because it's a collaborative work."

Q4: In both types of recordings (conversation and presentation) the teacher asked you to self-correct your work. Do you think that self-assessment is a useful way in improving students' speaking skill?

This question aimed at exploring the participants' ability to self-correct their mistakes and their reflections on the role of self-assessment in improving their speaking. The data suggested that though most of the participants (five out of six) thought that self-assessment was helpful to them, they admitted that they prefer teacher's feedback. This was labeled as students' dependence on the teacher's feedback and it was expressed by three students. Nomedia posited: "Self-assessment in some way helps, but I prefer the teacher's feedback." Adel pointed out: "Yes it was helpful. Sometimes you are tired and you don't pay attention to the mistakes, here comes the teacher and helps you in correcting yourself."

One participant (Djahida) answered that self-assessment was not helpful, she said: "Self-assessment was not really helpful, sometimes I can't see my own mistakes, so I need someone who masters the language better than me so that he can notice my mistakes."

Q5: Did the teacher's feedback help you? If yes, in what way?

This question was meant to investigate the participants' position regarding the individualized feedback provided by the teacher during the two tasks (conversation and presentation). All the participants agreed on the efficiency of the teacher's feedback. As pointed out by Djahida: "Very much, I could notice some mistakes that I worked on them, the teacher's feedback was very accurate and specific."

Sihem added: "Yes, it did. For example intonation, I started to pay more attention to the intonation."

However, all the participants (6 out of 6) indicated that they were inefficient in tracking their own mistakes before the teacher provided his feedback; this was also found in the previous question, but clearly demonstrated in this question.

As explained by Salima: “I didn’t notice the mistakes I have done until I’ve heard the teacher’s feedback, I didn’t know where to look.”

Yusra said: “I didn’t notice that I speak in monotone or speaking too fast until I read the feedback.”

Nomedia also stressed:” for example I did have some mistakes in the final “ed” that I didn’t notice before.”

Q6: At the end of the study, do you feel that you improved your speaking skill?

Responses	Number (n=06)
Agree on improvement	05
Disagree on improvement	01

Table 20: Students’ agreement/disagreement on the oral skill improvement

Question 6 was about whether the students felt that they improved their speaking after taking part to this study.

As table 20 shows, five participants out of six agreed on the fact that their speaking abilities improved.

Adel echoed: “I became more confident.”

Sihem added:” yes, I noticed that there are some changes in my conversational skills.”

Djahida also illustrated: “I wasn’t sure about my level of English, but now I know my level of speaking. I had the chance to assess my speaking, so I became more confident”.

Though Salima did not feel that she improved her speaking, she confirmed that she improved the ability to self-assess her speaking performance. According to her, “I don’t think I improved my speaking, I improve my speaking on daily basis; however, I improved another thing, it’s how I correct myself.”

Furthermore, areas of improvement were also detected. As indicated by Adel: “I became more confident now when doing a presentation.”

Yousra pointed out: “I start to speak more slowly now.”

Nomedia also affirmed that she improved her pronunciation.

Q7: Do you think that the portfolio provides more time to practice English outside the classroom?

Question 7 aimed at finding out whether the portfolio used in this study can be an extra practice device providing students with extra practice opportunities to use the language outside the classroom. All the participants (six out of six) believed that the portfolio provided them additional time to practice English outside the classroom. Salima reported: “It was a chance for me to practice English outside the classroom.”

In the same sense Nomedia added: “yes, it encouraged me to practice outside the classroom with my classmates.”

Adel also stressed: “Yes I think this is a very good way to practice English when you’re not in the classroom.”

Two students stated that using digital tools to improve their speaking such as the e-portfolio was new to them. This unfamiliarity with digital tools was clearly stated by Salima: “it was obligatory and I had to do it, because if it wasn’t obligatory I wouldn’t even have the idea to do it.”

Yousra asserted: “I don’t usually practice or record myself or any of it.”

Q8: Do you think that the portfolio decreased anxiety when speaking English?

Question 8 aimed at exploring students’ reactions to the use of portfolio, and whether it helped them in providing a less anxious environment. Four participants had a positive reaction. Adel stated: “I start to become more confident in my presentations.” Djahida also mentioned that the feedback provided by the teacher helped her to gain confidence. Two participants out of six believed that using the portfolio was not helpful to them to overcome anxiety when speaking English.

As Sihem stated:” May be but I still have problems with anxiety.

Conclusion:

In this chapter, students’ data collected from the audio transcripts, questionnaires (1 and 2) in addition to those in the interviews were analyzed and presented. A combination of qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis was believed to provide a broader insight into the findings. The major findings showed that the main linguistic problems facing participants when using the English language were grammatical errors. The findings also revealed that the amount of errors produced through the different phases decreased. Portfolio helped most of the students to improve their speaking skill through the additional practice

time outside the classroom. Finding also revealed that participants' technical skill. Findings also showed that the participants were satisfied with the teacher's feedback. The next chapter will be devoted to discussion and implications of the findings.

Chapter Four: Discussion and implication

Introduction:

The aim of the study was to shed light on the influence of the portfolio in raising students' awareness of their speaking skill. This chapter will present and discuss the findings with reference to the data collected whenever necessary. Implications and limitations of the study will also be examined. In addition, suggestions for further research will be considered.

The study aimed to answer the following research question:

RQ: What is the influence of speaking portfolios in raising third year Algerian EFL students' awareness of their oral skills (interaction and oral production)?

4.1 Answer the Research Question:

The triangulation of the data sources, transcripts error analysis, questionnaire 1 & 2 and interviews, seems to have provided enough data from the participants in order to answer the research question.

The findings from the error analysis transcripts the first task (interaction) reveal that the most dominant issue in participants spoken interaction is speech errors. This was reported by Saputri (2015) who found that speech error is the error that occurred often with his students. This does not match the findings from questionnaire 1 which reveal that the most dominant issue that the majority of students faced (8/12) when speaking English was the lack of vocabulary. This was reported by Gan (2012) whose participants agreed on the fact that the vocabulary problem was the reason for which his participants could not express themselves

accurately. In other words, the lack of vocabulary hindered their fluency. In the same line, Saf and Ouahhoud (2015) in an investigation conducted at the University of Tlemcen found that half of their participants suffered from the lack of vocabulary. According to them, it was because the students did not have a context to practice English outside the school walls. Findings from the error analysis transcripts also suggest that the most dominant error in the individual oral production task was the grammatical errors. This has been observed during the three audio recording transcripts. Grammatical accuracy was also reported by Hojati (2013) whose findings revealed numerous errors produced by his participants especially errors related to grammar. This was also found in participants responses to the questionnaire 1 where (4/12) considered grammar as their main problem, though they are third year students. Ano (2005)'s observations of Japanese Senior High School English classes revealed that even though students are more fluent, they are less accurate in their grammar usage. He further suggested that the reason behind this is that teachers put too much emphasis on forcing students to engage in fluency activities while not paying enough attention on grammatical accuracy. The error analysis transcripts findings reveal that the frequency of errors produced by participants in second recordings of both interaction and individual oral production slightly decreased. Participants were able to correct some of their errors and weaknesses. This is supported by the findings from questionnaire 1 that showed that (9/12) participants did actually find errors after revisiting their first audio recordings. In Lilia's words: "I found some grammar mistakes after listening to my first conversation recording." Huang & Hung (2010) together with Cepik & Yastibas (2013) found that the

process of recording and listening to one's voice helped developing the students' self-assessment; they became more self-aware of their own learning and conscious about their speaking skill. As Salima stated; "I don't think I improved my speaking...but I improve another thing, it's how I correct myself." Producing the target language may prompt second language learners to consciously recognize some of their linguistics' problems. As pointed by Schmidt and Frota (1986) as cited in Swain and Lapkin (1995), producing the oral output helps students to notice their speaking mistakes. Further analysis from participants responses also revealed that the use of portfolio helped the students to track their own weaknesses. Self-confidence was also gained through self-assessment. "I had the chance to asses myself, so I became more confident," replied Djahida. In a study conducted by Weisi and Karimi (2012), correlation was found between self-assessment and confidence; the more students assess themselves the more confident they become in the language use. However, findings from the error word count ratio of both tasks revealed that there was no considerable change nor an important decrease in errors in the second recordings compared to the first ones. Especially, in aspects of the linguistic category such as phonological, grammatical and lexical categories. According to James (1998), correcting errors on this category requires knowledge in which without knowledge, learners may fail to provide correction to errors made. The majority of participants still felt strong dependence on the teacher's evaluation. The issue was stated by Nomedra: "In some way, self-assessment helps, but I prefer teacher's feedback." The reasons behind this preference were also depicted from the findings as some participants were not able to detect all errors they made during the audio recordings.

In fact, some participants were surprised by some errors they produced. “I didn’t know that I was speaking in monotone or speaking too fast until I read the teacher’s feedback,” echoed Yousra. Nomedra added, “I had some mistakes in final ‘ed’ that I didn’t notice before.” Salima observed, “I didn’t know where to look [for mistakes]” The last statement implied that some students were not able to spot all errors they produced. Therefore, students who did not find errors would make a call for expert evaluation. This concept of relying on teacher’s feedback was also reported in Ozdemir-Cagatay (2012). Another reason why students failed in self-assessing their speaking performance was the absence of criteria set beforehand by the researcher. Though this was done purposely to explore how much students know about their weaknesses, setting criteria was of utmost importance to allow the students to assess their performances accurately. Setting criteria for self-assessment was observed to be important by Yoshida (2001). He furthermore argued that setting criteria for students was not enough to guarantee they self-assess their performances. Many of his students found difficulties to understand the criteria of self-evaluation. Yoshida (2001) proposed a model based on a study conducted by Sperling (1993) where the teacher and students worked together in developing criteria. As suggested by O’Malley and Valdez Pierce (1996), self-assessment is a process through which students must be led. Effective training of teachers and students to develop criteria would not just ensure the clarity of the criteria, but also develops students’ higher thinking skills (Brown, 2004). Cheng & Warren (2005) also indicated that learners’ having access to the relevant criteria results in increased accuracy of self-assessment. Another suggestion that was put forward by Babaii,

Taghaddomi and Pashmforoosh (2016) was that learners should be exposed to perfect models of speaking performance. These models would develop students' understanding of what is an effective speech. The absence of such models was possibly the reason why there was no considerable change in the grammatical, phonological and lexical categories of errors in the second recordings of both tasks. Regarding peer evaluation and collaborative work, findings from students' responses showed that most of the students had a positive attitude towards peer assessment as a tool to improve their speaking skill. In fact, (9/12) participants confirmed being helped by their partners in correcting their speaking mistakes during the conversational task. By assessing their peers, students were not just correcting their partners' mistakes but also they were consolidating their own language skills. This was also reported by Yoshida (2001), Ozdemir-Cagatay (2012), who found that peer assessment contributes to students noticing their own mistakes by reflecting on their partners' performance. This was also found in Fauzan (2016) who concluded that peer assessment can improve speaking skill as his students made considerable progress in fluency and gained confidence. However, contrary to what previously cited studies found, some students in this study did not like peer evaluation and considered it an obstacle for they had to pay more attention to their partner's performance instead of focusing on theirs. This was also found in Ozdemir-Cagatay (2012) who reported that some students did not benefit from peer feedback, as they focused on their own preparation and performance. She further suggested that this was due to the fact that the anxiety generated from the speaking skill prevented students to focus on others' performances. Yoshida (2001) added that pairing less proficient students in the peer

evaluation process may cause negative effect on their peer assessment process and consequently impact their language performance. Pairing less with more proficient students may have a positive impact on self-assessment and language performances. The findings from the error analysis transcripts indicated that the frequency of errors of the third recording of both tasks considerably decreased. This was noticed after participants were given feedback on their previous performance. In fact, findings of both tasks showed that the error word count ratio in the third recording was lower. This change indicates is an improvement in grammatical accuracy, pronunciation, vocabulary and speech errors of the students' spoken English towards the end of each task. This is supported by findings from questionnaire 1 showed that the majority of the participants (10/12) improved their speaking. This goes in the same line with findings from the interview where all the participants except Salima confirmed that they improved their speaking in terms of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary. Sihem stressed: "I improve some of my conversational skills... I became more natural and fluent." In addition, Cyrine said: "I improved my pronunciation and intonation." Adel also confirmed that he improved his speaking because he gained more confidence through frequent practice. Lilia also stated that teacher's comments helped her in improving her speaking. Some other students believed that they improved their speaking thanks to the additional time in practicing English. Chang, Yu & Hu (2005) also found that the use of portfolios promotes students' speaking skill. Unlike all the participants, Salima did not feel that she developed her speaking skill, but she felt that she improved her self-assessment. This shift from "I didn't know where to look." to "I improved another thing... it's how I

correct myself.” was another supporting evidence that the portfolio had a positive impact in raising student’ awareness of their speaking skill. The results from the errors analysis data showed that students progressed throughout the tasks. The teacher’s feedback and comments on students’ errors was of utmost importance in decreasing the frequency of errors. Individualized feedback provided by the teacher also played a crucial role in boosting students’ motivation and self-confidence. Findings form questionnaire 1 revealed that the amount of information and comments in the teacher’s feedback exceeded in quantity and quality those found in the students’ self-assessment. For example, Lilia stated that comments of the teacher made her aware to be attentive in using informal expressions in formal situations. According to Sihem, teacher’s feedback provided additional comments to improve pronunciation of some words. Aoki (2014) found that the teacher’s feedback has a positive impact on students’ speaking skills.

Findings also revealed that the use of portfolio offered additional speaking practice as participants were involved in two different tasks. This is found in participants’ responses to the interview (6/6) expressed that the portfolio was an opportunity for them to practice English outside the classroom, as students need to practice extensively before recording their performances. Hung &Huang (2010) observed that students rehearse and practice several times before recording their spoken voices in the portfolio. To illustrate, Salima stated: “Especially for me... it was a chance for me to practice English outside the classroom.” Sihem added: “Yes it helps and it’s very important practice because I know I really improved myself while speaking.” Huang & Hung (2010) advanced that the effectiveness of

the portfolio in developing their participants speaking abilities was on the edge, as students noticed the absence of real life inter personal communication. In this study, the researcher combined between individual oral production and peer- interaction. Yoshida (2001) used formal presentation and informal real life interaction tasks with his participants to cover a large proportion of students' speaking abilities. Findings from participants' responses of this study also showed that students had different attitudes towards the choice of the assignments. Introducing the conversation allowed students not only to assess their performance but also their partners, as the majority of the students (9/12) affirmed that some of their speaking mistakes were found by their partners. Findings from the questionnaire 2 responses also revealed that most of the participants (7/10) had a preference for the individual oral production task over the interaction one. Findings also showed why students opted for such preferences. Selma found that presenting individually was easier because she could manage her performance whereas in the interaction task, her partner may speak more than her. In the same sense, Sihem also pointed out that she had to pay too much attention to her partner's performance in the conversation; while in the individual oral production she focused on her speaking more. This implied that students were positively engaged in the learning process when the task permits to concentrate only on their performance rather than the performance of their interlocutors. This also suggested that the students preferred to be responsible and to 'own' their learning process. Barrett (2005), and also in Goldsmith (2005), Gray (2008) cited in Cepik & Yastibas (2013) found that the oral portfolio develops a sense of ownership to the students by being responsible of their learning. The findings also

showed that the portfolio offered opportunities for students to rehearse their speaking. According to Salima, presentations were less difficult because she had the chance to pre-organize her performance before recording it. “I know what I’m going to say.” Adel also shared the same opinion, “In the presentation, I was more confident, because I knew what I was about to say.” This suggested that organizing and rehearsing the speaking performance had a positive effect on students’ self-confidence and their oral performance. However, this contradicted the findings in Huang & Hung (2010) in which some of their participants argued that they recorded their performance so many times until they got the perfect model in terms of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary, however; this preparation of the oral performance did not reflect their true speaking ability. To overcome this issue, O’Malley and Pierce (1996) suggested that the teachers may include more real life activities to the portfolios to make them more authentic. Even though, rehearsed speech may supply students with additional opportunities to practice English outside the classroom. On the other hand, some students, in this study had a preference to the interaction task, as the findings from students’ responses revealed that some students found the conversation a natural process to interact with their partners. Speaking naturally helped them to improve their speaking. Some students also expressed their satisfaction in taking part in the conversation task, as the collaborative nature of the task lowered their anxiety.

In relation to the technological skills, the findings showed that most of the students did not encounter digital problems when using portfolio such as recording, uploading, receiving, and sharing their files using digital devices. This suggests that those students have a good

facility with technology. Most of the university students in Algeria have access to digital devices; as a result, they acquired an appropriate digital literacy. According to Tapscott (1999), “for this ‘Net generation’ using technology is as natural as breathing.” (p. 18).

For some students using digital instruments was not a difficulty as uttered by Cyrine: “I didn’t meet any technical difficulty because I studied data processing before.” However, some reported having some issue with technology use. For instance, Ryma argued that she always forgets her password and cannot access her e-mail. Other students could not easily create an e-mail account; and some students did not have or had limited internet access, as put forward by Sihem: “I don’t have internet at home, so I needed to go to internet coffees.” These technical issues were reported in Lord (2008) where some of his participants experienced technical glitches. Pop, Tomuletin, and David (2011) also stated that the lack of familiarity with technology could be a threat to the learning process. Therefore, to avoid such technological issues, teachers should be aware of students’ accessibility to technological devices and applications that would best match the students’ needs and capabilities. Further findings revealed that all students improved their technical skills by the end of the study. For example, Djahida commented: “through the frequent use of storing, using and sharing information on the web, my technical skills got better each time and much easier.” This implied that the use of the oral portfolio improved students’ technical skills. In the same vein, Cepik & Yastibas (2013) found that portfolios preparation resulted in improvements in students technology skills. However, findings from questionnaire 2 revealed that most of the students (9/10) were not familiar in using digital tools to record and

improve their speaking before taking part in this study. This was also found in participants interviews' responses as indicated by Yousra: "I don't usually practice or record myself or any of it." This unfamiliarity with digital tools in improving the speaking skill was also reported by Hayta and Yaprak (2013). Their findings showed that students used digital tools for different purposes to improve their listening skills via watching movies, videos and listening to songs. They also improved their reading-writing skills via searching for expressions, vocabulary and reading online magazines and newspapers. However, students did not use this technology to improve their speaking. Furthermore, Hayta and Yaprak (2013) suggested that students need training in using technology efficiently to get the maximum benefit from their learning.

In relation to anxiety, findings from the interviews also revealed that (4/6) participants agreed on the fact that the oral portfolio helped them to decrease anxiety. They gained more confidence in speaking, as supported by Yousra who said: "When I record myself I feel less anxious." Cepik and Yastibas (2013) also found that portfolios help students produce the language feeling less stressful. The absence of a 'challenging' audience could possibly be the reason for less anxiety within students. This was also found in Huang and Hung (2010), according to their participants, the absence of an audience put them at ease in voicing their opinions, as no one would object their points when speaking. It is also important to mention that some students still felt anxious in their speaking using portfolios.

Based on the findings, the oral portfolio had a positive influence on both academic and psychological attributes of the students. This goes in the same line with Cepik and Yastibas

(2013) who found that portfolios improve the ‘academic’ abilities of students such as pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary, as well as their ‘affective’ abilities such as self-confidence, motivation and anxiety. The oral portfolio allowed students to learn not only from themselves, but also from their peers and their teachers, thus the students could self-monitor and change their learning process, consequently (Wang & Chang, 2010).

Based upon the findings, the accuracy and the nature of the feedback improved the students’ feeling of success and motivation. The choice of the tasks gave students opportunities to practice English in different speaking situations. According to Far & Tone (1998) cited in Wang & Chang (2010), if students are to improve, they must see the need for that improvement. The portfolio allowed students to track their own progress and develop the areas of their learning that needed to be honed. Findings showed that the use of the oral portfolio increased students’ awareness of their weaknesses in speaking. Students’ digital skills also improved through the frequent use of digital equipments, discovering new ways to improve their speaking.

4.2 Pedagogical Implications:

Data analysis and findings of the study suggest some pedagogical implications that have to be taken into consideration. One of the main finding is that although we do not know the exact amount of progress students made in their speaking (interaction/oral production), using the portfolio has a positive influence in raising students’ awareness of their speaking skill improvement. In the Algerian EFL context where there are little to no opportunities for EFL students to practice English outside the classroom, it is advised that EFL oral teachers

consider integrating portfolios as tools to enhance students' oral proficiency as portfolios offer a stress-free spaces for language practice. Increasing learners' output through voice recorded performances would help students assess and edit their artifacts, become independent and on-going learners who could appropriate their learning process. Studies and theories suggest that output is essential for second language learning. Swain and Lapkin (1995) emphasized the importance of output, pointing out that it would promote observation as well as fluency. One of the ways they suggested to increase output from learners is by recording so that the learners could listen to, assess, and edit their own recorded material.

The growing rate of technology and internet access has greatly improved, enabling students to record, archive their spoken voice, and transmit audio files. This would surely facilitate and promote speaking practices outside the classroom. Inviting students to get involved in the assessment process would make them aware that they are in charge of their own learning process. By providing accurate, individualized and frequent feedback on students' performances, teachers may create a sense of engagement and motivation on the part of the students. However, this would not be effective with larger classes, as listening to the audio performances and providing descent feedback is a time consuming activity. According to Hsu, Wang, and Comac (2008) it is difficult to monitor and to respond to oral performances of more than 20 students.

Self-assessment is a major aspect of the portfolio investigated in this study. Findings suggest that EFL students though they have positive attitudes towards self- assessment in developing their oral performance, inadequate knowledge and lack of confidence from the

part of students in correcting their errors have caused errors to remain errors. Therefore, teachers should guide students along the self-assessment process, as some students need assistance to explore the areas of their speaking that need to be improved. Collaboration with students and establishing clear and understandable criteria of evaluation would make the process of self-assessment feasible. Discussions between teachers and students lie at the core of the portfolio. According to Chang (2001) this requires academic staff to be as committed and involved in the portfolio process as possible. Peer assessment is another implication that emerged from this study. Findings suggest that teachers need to be aware of the process of pair and share of students Yoshida (2001). Peers may simply not be qualified to assess their classmates.

Technology was used as a vehicle in this study, adopting the appropriate technology and paying attention to students 'digital' literacy would not just ensure the effectiveness of the portfolio, but also the reduction of time constraint and efforts. As put forward by Godwin-Jones (2011), teachers may provide guidance for students in terms of using web based materials effectively in order to stimulate learners to use those materials critically knowing both their benefits and limitations.

Having students rehearsing and prepare their speaking performances is one of the major implications that has to be taken seriously by EFL teachers, as students memorize or use prompts in their speaking which most of the time do not reflect students real life communication abilities. Ozdemir-Cagatay (2012) suggested the teachers and instructors should combine different learning situations where students could speak spontaneously.

However, this would not be as easy as it seems to be because most students may experience some psychological barriers such as anxiety in producing L2; this suggests that teachers may also use the rehearsing activities to lower the students' anxiety.

To sum up, in this study the portfolio served as a tool to collect the students' oral performances. The teacher helped revising the artifacts and provided individualized feedback by involving the students in the assessment process. This involvement had a positive influence on students' motivation, as they became responsible for their own learning. Feeling responsible made them piloting their performances and carefully monitoring their own progress.

Adopting the right technology with acceptable class size; providing professional and constant individualized feedback and motivating students with different pedagogies are important conditions that, if respected, would ensure a successful portfolio implementation. (Hsu, Wang and Comac, 2008).

4.3 Limitations of the study:

In view of the narrow range of the participants, the findings of the current study need not to be generalized. Further studies could be conducted targeting a wide range of participants of different cultures, pedagogical and educational contexts.

Although findings clearly showed that the portfolio raised students' awareness of the speaking skills, there is little to know on how much they improved. Progress in the speaking area in the short term is difficult to measure. It would be better to extend study for a longer

period in order to optimize the validity of the results, as learning development needs longer time for different learners. Including a pre and post evaluation oral tests would bring more validity to the results. The absence of pre and post tests surely was a handicap. Including pre and post tests would have provided reliable results.

The absence of criteria provided beforehand hindered the effectiveness of the self and peer assessment processes. It would be useful to introduce criteria at the beginning of each task to guide students in the assessment process.

Some participants in this study showed reluctance in taking part in the assignments. Half of the population only was able to sit for the interview, while two students did not submit their responses to questionnaire 2, as well as some of the speaking artifacts were not collected due to some technological difficulties.

A number of audio performances were poorly recorded, as some participants used low quality recorded device. Making sure to standardized recording tools to a better quality, would facilitate the assessment process.

The absence of the classroom environment hindered our understanding of the use of portfolio in raising students' awareness of their speaking skill.

Accessibility of the portfolio was limited to the researcher. Making the portfolio accessible for students would promote collaborative work.

4.4 Further Research Suggestions:

No research is complete. The oral portfolio needs to be explored by future researchers. Classroom implementation is an area that has yet to be investigated. The current study

focused on the portfolio as a tool and an opportunity for the Algerian EFL students to increase the practice of L2 outside the classroom. However, introducing this technique in the classroom would also have its own ups and downs worth to be examined.

The holistic nature of the speaking skill makes it difficult to analyze. However, for future researchers, it would be recommended to increase studies that explore the speaking skill from different angles through the use of portfolios. Combining traditional assessment methods that focus on the product and the portfolio methods that look after the process would provide an almost complete picture of students' oral proficiency.

According to Ogata & Yano (2003) cited in Hsu, Wang and Comac (2008), the advancement of network and communication technology enables ubiquitous learning opportunities to support language learning. Therefore, teachers should continuously update their knowledge due to the fast development of technologies. Further research will be needed to investigate for a better and effective use of digital instruments in and outside the classroom in order to enhance learners' oral output. Based on constructivist theory of learning, introducing the visualized feedback (audio & video...etc) would add a social dimension to the learning process. Research on the use and the effectiveness of different types of individualized feedback would also enrich the literature to the better use of the portfolio.

Conclusion:

The absence of affordable opportunities for Algerian EFL students to practice English outside the academic sphere is a major handicap that faces the Algerian EFL community.

The present study provided a range of findings about the influence of the portfolio in raising Algerian EFL degree students' awareness of their speaking skill. The findings showed that the portfolio offers a great amount of speaking practices outside the classroom, and establishes a positive impact allowing students to foster their speaking performance. Portfolios require students to actively engage in the learning process by being in charge of their own learning, working collaboratively with other students and teacher to enhance self-regulated learning, motivation and self confidence in speaking L2. As the findings revealed, individualized comments of the teacher on students' performance helped them to gain more confidence in producing the target language. Students had a positive attitude toward the use of the portfolio; as it helped them to identify their weaknesses, and offered them additional space to overcome their linguistics deficiencies. Additionally, accessibility to digital tools is available for the Algerian EFL degree students, as the ownership of these instruments is almost universal. However, students may not use those instruments effectively; therefore, teachers and administrators should carefully take appropriate measures before implementing the portfolio in their curriculum. Findings also showed that students' anxiety was lowered through the use of the portfolio, as students gained confidence in using the language. The combination of various speaking situations exposed the students to a range of contexts is believed to have a positive impact on students' oral production and interaction.

General Conclusion

This study explores the use of the oral portfolio with Algerian degree students at the department of English at the university of Algiers 2 in order to see to what extent this tool would raise students' awareness of their oral skills (oral interaction and oral production) speaking. One of the greatest challenges for EFL learners is to be able to express their own personal meanings accurately. The ability to speak a foreign language is at the heart of what it means to be able to use a foreign language.

Yet speaking in a foreign language is very difficult and the linguistic competence in speaking takes a long time to develop. Most practitioners agree on the fact that achieving an advanced speaking proficiency in a foreign language may take time and effort, supported by a combination of various learning opportunities to practice the target language. However, as it is often the case with most EFL settings, the only opportunity for students to practice English is restricted to their class time. The lack of practice opportunities makes it difficult for students to increase their oral output and therefore improve their speaking performance.

Encouraging and motivating students to engage in the foreign language in the classroom is challenging on multiple levels. Students' confidence and motivation may be threatened by speaking in class anxiety. Large size classes and class time limitations do not allow for effective individualized feedback.

In order to address these challenging elements with regard to oral proficiency development, the present study has dealt with the use of the portfolio as an innovative device to develop

degree EFL students' awareness of their speaking skill. The study involved twelve participants from the English department who took part in the eight weeks planned for this study. To ensure triangulation of the instruments used to collect the data, the researcher used data from both of the interaction task and the individual oral production task, two questionnaires and interviews. The findings that emerged provided meaningful understanding on the use of the portfolio as a means in raising students' of their speaking skill.

With respect to the Algerian EFL context, the findings in this study showed that the portfolio use increased the amount of time and space for additional speaking practices. Students were able to prepare their speaking performances outside the classroom individually or with their peers. The findings also revealed that students improved the way they correct their speaking performance through self-reflection on possible errors they produced. Having a sample of their speaking performance in the form of recordings, students were able to assess their oral production. Involved in their own assessment, students became responsible for determining the objectives and aims of their learning progress. Students were also able to comment on their peers' performances. Peer assessment had also a positive impact on students' overall speaking performance. Despite this apparent positive impact of self and peer assessment, findings revealed that students expressed a strong dependence on the teacher's feedback. However, the individualized feedback and constant comments allowed students to gain enough confidence and motivation in improving their speaking performance in the future. Through the feedback, students felt that the teacher cared about

their progress which motivated them to double the effort in improving their work. As the concept of Zone of Proximal Development is often described as the developmental zone where potential learning occur under the guidance of the instructor and peers through scaffolding, it is quite apparent that scaffolding and coaching learners through feedback may become central to the construction of learning.

Findings also revealed that the portfolio also helped students in decreasing their anxiety when speaking English. The absence of a critical audience offered the possibility for students to voice their opinion without the fear of being judged. However, some students still had problems with anxiety when speaking.

Findings further revealed that the technical skills of students improved, however; some difficulties were detected in using the online applications. It is quite sure that the Algerian EFL students nowadays have acquired advanced knowledge on how to use digital instruments. The issue with technology is that students' digital literacy is very limited to social media applications. With respect to the literature students are ready to use technology in improving listening, reading and writing, but they are unable to use this technology to improve their speaking skill. Therefore students should be encouraged to develop and use meta-cognitive strategies which help to improve learner autonomy thorough the use of technology. These technological advancements have led to the emergence of numerous learning systems which have almost made it mandatory on language instructors to familiarize themselves and utilize these new media in their pedagogical instructions.

Finally, though the eight weeks timeline of the study was probably not enough, it seems that the portfolio had a positive influence on students as they looked at their weaknesses and developed a strategy to correct them. The integration of the portfolio in the Algerian EFL context could be useful in promoting students' oral output outside the classroom as well as making students aware of their performance and strengthening their sense of ownership over their own learning through offering learning opportunities that classroom setting alone fail to provide.

References

- Abrami, P. C.; Barrett, H. (2005). Directions for Research and Development on Electronic Portfolios. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 31(3).
- Alawdat, M. (2013). Using e-portfolios and ESL learners. *US-China Education Review A*, Vol. 3, No. 5, 339-351
- Anderson, R. S., DeMuelle, L. (1998). Portfolio use in twenty-four teacher education programs. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 25(1):23-31.
- Ano, k. (2005). Fluency and accuracy in the Spoken English of the Japanese High School Learners
Waseda University
- Aoki, S. (2014). Potential of voice recording tools in language instruction, Retrievable at: www.tc.columbia.edu/tesolalwebjournal
- Auda, Z. J, (2013), The impact of using scoring rubric in peer assessment on promoting iraqi EFL learners' speaking skill in the university level.
MA Thesis, College of Education, University of Basrah, Iraq.
- Babaii, E., Taghaddomi, Sh., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2015). Speaking self assessment: Mismatches between learners' and teachers' criteria. *Language Testing*, 33(3), 411-437.
- Barrett, H.C. (2005). The research on portfolios in education. Retrieved on February 16, 2005 from <http://electronicportfolios.org/ALI/research.html>.
- Berns, M. (1995). English in the European Union. In: *English Today*, 43, Vol.11. No.3. pp. 3- 11.
- Brooks, M. (1999). How I used portfolios and videotape to improve students' performance and lived to tell about it. *Language Arts Journal of Michigan*.
- Brown, J. D. and T. Hudson. (1998). The alternatives in language assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 4, pp. 653-675.
- Brown,H. Douglas. (2001). Teaching by principle an interactive approach to language pedagogy. *San Francisco: Longman*
- Brown, H. D. (2004). Language assessment: principles and classroom practices. *New York: Pearson Education*
- Brown, B. (2012). Raising student awareness of pronunciation and exploring out-of-class approaches to pronunciation practice. *Research Notes*, 48, 18-23.

- Bruthiaux, P. (2003). Squaring the circles: Issues in modeling English worldwide." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 13: 159- 78.
- Byrnes, H. (Ed.). (2007). Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky. *New York, NY: Continuum.*
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1995). Grammar and the spoken language. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 141-157.
- Castaneda, M., & Rodriguez-Gonzalez, E. (2011). L2 speaking self ability perception through multiple video speech drafts. *Hispania*.
- Cavanagh S. (1997) Content analysis: concepts, methods and applications. *Nurse Researcher* 4, 5–16.
- Celce Murcia, M. & Olshtain, E. (2000). Discourse and context in language teaching – A guide for language teachers. Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press.*
- Cepik, A., & Yastibas, E. (2013). The use of e-portfolio to improve English speaking skill of Turkish EFL learners, *Anthropologist*, 16(1-2): 307-317
- Chambers, S. M., & Wickersham, L. E. (2007). The electronic portfolio journey: A year later. *Education*, 127(3), 351-360.
- Chaney, A.L., Burk, T. L. (1998). Teaching oral communication in grades K-8. Boston: Allyn & Bacon. Retrieved on 07/11/2010, from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Kayi-TeachingSpeaking.html>.
- Chang, C. (2001). A study on the evaluation and effectiveness analysis of web-based learning portfolio (wblp). *British Journal of Educational Technology*,. 32(4)
- Chang, Y., Wu, C. & Ku, H. (2005). The introduction of electronic portfolios to teach and assess English as a foreign language in Taiwan. *TechTrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning*, 49, 1, 30–35.
- Charvade1, M., Jahandar1, S., and Khodabandehlou1, M. (2012). , The impact of portfolio assessment on EFL learners' reading comprehension ability.
- Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (2005). Peer assessment of language proficiency. *Language Testing*, 22(1), 93–121.
- Clark, H., Clark, E. (1977). Psychology and Language: An Introduction to Psycholinguistics, *New York: Harcourt B. Jovanovic.*
- Cole, D. J., Ryan, C. W. (2000). Portfolios across the curriculum and beyond. (2nd ED) *California: USA.*

- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 33(2). 185-209.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). Designing and conducting mixed methods research. *Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage*.
- Danny Huang, H. T., & Alan Hung, S. T. (2010). Implementing electronic speaking portfolios: Perceptions of EFL students. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(5), 84-88.
- Dulay, H. Burt, M., Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two*. New York : *Oxford University Press*
- Ekbatani, G., & Pierson, H. (2000). Moving toward learner directed assessment. In G. Ekbatani & H. Pierson (Eds.), *Learner- directed assessment in ESL* (pp. 1-11). *Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers*.
- Erlanson, D.A., Harris, E.L., Skipper, B.L., & Allen, S.D. (1993). *Doing Naturalistic Inquiry: A Guide to Methods*. *Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications*.
- Ellis, R. (1994): *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. *Oxford: Oxford University Press*.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62, 107-115.
- Erice D,. (2008). The impact of e-portfolio on the writing skills of foreign language learners studying at Abant Izzet Baysal University Basic English Program. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Ankara: Gazi University.
- Farr, R.; Tone, B. (1998). Portfolio and performance assessment: Helping students evaluate their progress as readers and writers. *The United States of America: Harcourt Brace College Publishers*.
- Fauzan, U. (2016). Enhancing speaking ability of EFL students through debate and peer assessment. *EFL Journal*.ISSN: 2502-6062 2016, Vol. 1 No. 1
- Florez, M. C. (1999). Improving adult English language learners' speaking skills. *National Center for ESL Literacy Education*, 5, 16-20.
- Gan, Z. (2012). Understanding L2 speaking problems: Implications for ESL curriculum development in a teacher training institution in Hong Kong. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1).
- Gay, L., Mills, G. & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research competencies for analysis and applications*. 8th ed. *New Jersey, Pearson*.
- Genesee, F., & Upshur, J.A. (1996). *Classroom-based evaluation in second language education*. *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press*.

Godwin-Jones, R. (2011). Emerging technologies: mobile apps for language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 15(2), 2–11. Retrieved from <http://llt.msu.edu/issues/june2011/emerging.pdf>.

Goldsmith, D. J. (2007). Enhancing learning and assessment through e-portfolios: A collaborative effort in Connecticut. *New Directions for Student Services*, 119: 31-42.

Gray L. (2008). Effective practice with e-portfolios. *JISC*, 5-40.

Hayta, F. and Yaprak, Z. (2013). Learner autonomy and computer technology as a facilitator of autonomous language learning. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies*, 3(2),57-63. Retrieved February 13, 2016, From http://www.wjeis.org/FileUpload/ds217232/File/09_a_fatma_hayta__zeynep_yaprak.pdf

Hebert, E. A. (2001). The power of portfolios: What children can teach us about learning and assessment. *San Francisco: JosseyBass*.

Henry, A., & Roseberry, R. L. (2007). Language errors in the genre-based writing of advanced academic ESL students. *RELC Journal*, 38, 171-197.

Hojati, A. (2013) An investigation of errors in the oral performance of advanced-level Iranian EFL students. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(4), 171-179

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol, 70. N.02 (Summer, 1986), pp. 125-132

Hsu H.Y, Wang S-K, Comac L. (2008). Using audioblogs to assist English-language learning: An investigation into student perception. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 21(2): 181-198.

Jackson, N. (2001). Personal development planning: what does it mean. *Higher Education Academy*. Retrieved September 2013 from: <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/ourwork/teachingandlearning>.

James, C. (1998). Errors in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis. *London: Longman*.

Johnson, N. J., & Rose, L. M. (1997). Portfolios: Clarifying, constructing and enhancing. *Pennsylvania: Technomic Publishing Company*.

Jongsma, K.S. (1989). Portfolio assessment. *The Reading Teacher*, 43, 264-65.

Kasapoğlu-Akyol, P. (2010). Using educational technology tools to improve language and communication skills of ESL students. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 4(2), 225-241.

- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson (Eds), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-30). *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*
- Kanellow, V. (2009). The practice of pronunciation teaching in current ELT manuals and handbook: a review. *Speak Out: IATEFL Pronunciation Special Interest Group Newsletter*, 40, 1–5.
- Lazaraton, A. (2001). Teaching oral skills. In Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (pp. 103-115). Boston: Heinle & Heinle
- Levis, J. (2005). Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 369–377.
- Lord, G. (2008). Podcasting communities and second language pronunciation. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(2), 364–379. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2008.tb03297.x>
- Luoma, S. (2004). Assessing speaking, *The Cambridge Language Assessment Series*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lynch, T. (2007). Learning from the transcripts of an oral communication task. *ELT Journal*, 61(4), 311-320.
- Lys, F. (2013). The development of advanced learner oral proficiency using iPads. *Language Learning & Technology*, 17(3), 94–116. Retrieved from <http://llt.msu.edu/issues/october2013/lys.pdf>
- Mabry, L. (1999). Portfolios plus: A critical guide to alternative assessment. *California: Corwin Press: A Sage Publications Ltd.*
- Martinez-Lirola, M., Rubio, F. (2009). Students' Beliefs about Portfolio Evaluation and its Influence on Their Learning Outcomes to Develop EFL in a Spanish Context. *International Journal of English Studies*, 9 (1), 91-111.
- McArthur, T., (2003). The Oxford guide to world English. *Oxford: Oxford University Press*, 528 pp.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). Qualitative Research: A guide to design and implementation. *San Francisco, John Wiley & Sons. Inc.*
- Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In Linn, R.J., editor, *Educational measurement*. 3rd edition. *New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.*
- Modiano, M. 1999. Standard English(es) and educational practices for the world's lingua franca. *English Today* 15(4). 3-13.

Moradan, A., and Hedayati, S. N. (2011). The impact of portfolios and conferencing on Iranian EFL learners' writing skill. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning No.8*. Semman University.

Moya, S & O'Malley, J. M (1994). A Portfolio Assessment model from ESL. *The Journal of Education and Issues of Language Minority Students*.

Muhammad, Ainon Jariah, Shah, Mohamed Ismail Ahamad, Ibrahim, Engku Haliza, Sarudin, Isarji, Malik, Faridah Abdul & Ghani, Rozina Abdul. (2013). Oral presentation errors of Malaysian students in an English for academic purposes (EAP) course. *World Applied Sciences Journal 21 (Special Issue of Studies in Language Teaching and Learning): 19-27*, 2013 ISSN 1818-4952

Nesapiradana, A.R, & Murtiana, R. (2013). Improving students' fluency through voice recording, *LIA CAR Journal vol.6. Banjarmasin*

Ogata, H., & Yano, Y. (2003). How ubiquitous computing can support language learning. Proceeding of KEST (Knowledge Economy and Development of Science and Technology), *Honjo, Akita, Japan*, 1–6. Retrieved July 12. 2007, from <http://www-yano.is.tokushima-u.ac.jp/ogata/clue/ogata-kest2003.pdf>.

O'Malley, J.M. & Pierce, L.V. (1996). Authentic assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers. *Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Publishing Company*.

Ortega, L. (2009). Understanding second language acquisition. *London: Hodder Education and Hachette UK*.

Özdemir-Çagatay, S. (2012). Speaking portfolios as an alternative way of assessment in an EFL context. The Graduate School of Education of Bilkent University. Retrieved from: <http://www.thesis.bilkent.edu.tr/0006043.pdf>

Oppenheim, A. N. (2001). Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement. *Great Britain: Biddles Ltd*.

Oxford Dictionary of English. (2009). *Oxford University Press, UK*.

Pennington, M. C. & Richards, J. C. (1986). Pronunciation revisited. *TESOL Quarterly 20*, 207–225.

Pop, A., Tomuletiu, E. A., & David, D. (2011). EFL speaking communication with asynchronous voice tools for adult students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15*, 1199-1203.

Richmond, V. P.; McCroskey, J. C. (1989). Communication: Apprehension, avoidance, and effectiveness (2nd ed.). *Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch. Scarisbrick, Publishers*.

Saf, S., Ouahhoud, Z. (2015). Exploring learners' difficulties in the productive skills: The case of first year LMD students. University Of Tlemcen.

Sakale, S. (2012). Rethinking speaking skills in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) settings, *Sino-US English Teaching*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 1100-1111

Saputri, Rismanita Ayu Eka. (2015) Errors on oral production made by english department students in microteaching class at Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta English department, school of teacher training and education Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta

Scott, M.L. (1986). Student affective reactions to oral language tests. *Language Testing*, 3, 99–118.

Schmidt, R. W. & Frota, S. (1986). Developing Basic Conversational Ability in a second Language: A Case Study of an Adult learner. In R. Day (ed.). *Talking to Learn*. Rowley, Mass. *New Bury House*.

Shohamy, E. (1982). Affective considerations in language teaching. *Modern Language Journal*, 66 (1), 13 – 17.

Simon, M., & Forgette-Giroux, R. (2000). Impact of content selection framework on portfolio assessment at the classroom level. *Assessment in Education*, 7(1), 83-101.

Sperling, D. (1993). What's worth an "A"? Setting standards together. *Educational Leadership*, 50 (5), 73-75.

Swain & Lapkin (1995), Problems in output and the cognitive processes. They Generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied linguistics*, 16 (1995) p.37. Ontario

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. *Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage*²

Tapscott, D. (1999). *Grown up digital, how the net generation is changing your world*. New York

Tierney, R. C., Carter, M. A., & Desai, L. E. (1991). Portfolio assessment in reading-writing classroom. *Inc Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers*.

Van Lier, L. (1996). Interaction in the language curriculum: awareness, autonomy And authenticity. *London: Pearson*

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. *USA: Harvard University Press*.

Wallace, M. J. (1998). Action research for language teacher. *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press*.

Wang, L. J, & Chang, H. F. (2010). Applying innovation method to assess English speaking performances on communication apprehension. *Belt Journal*.

Weber, R. P. (1990). Basic content analysis. *Beverly Hills, CA: Sage*

- Weisi, H., Karimi, M.N. (2012). The effect of self - assessment among Iranian EFL learners. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 70 (2013) 731 – 737
- Widdowson H.G. (1972). Teaching of English as communication. *English Language Teaching* 27/1: 15-19
- Wolf, D. P. (1989). Portfolio assessment: Sampling student work. *Educational Leadership*, 46(7), 35-39.
- Yen-Kuang, H. (1999). Audiotaped dialogue journals: an alternative form of speaking practice *ELT Journal Volume 57/3. Oxford University Press*
- Yoshida, Y. (2001). Authentic Progress Assessment of Oral Language: *Oral Portfolios*. Retrieved November,18, 2011, from <http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED453674.pdf>

\

Appendix. 1 : Questionnaire. 1

Questionnaire to participants:

Name :

Gender :

Age :

This questionnaire is part of a research. Could you please, answer the following questions?

- 1- What are the difficulties you find when speaking English?
- 2- Did you find any mistakes in your speaking when you listened to the first recording of your conversation?
- 3- Did your partner in the conversation help you in finding some mistakes or did you find them all by your own?
- 4- Were there any differences between your own correction and the teacher's feedback?
- 5- After your 3rd recording, do you feel that you improved your speaking skill? Why do you think so?
- 6- Did you meet any technical difficulties using, storing and sending your audio files (internet, e-mails, phones or computers...etc)? .

Appendix. 2: Questionnaire. 2

Name:

Gender:

Age:

Questionnaire to participants:

Dear participants, could you please answer the following questions.

- 1- Did you use to record your speech before participating to this study? If yes, for what purpose have you done it?
- 2- Which one was easier according to you, recording yourself talking to someone or recording yourself presenting individually? Why?
- 3- Did you find any mistakes in your speaking when you listened to the first recording of your presentation?
- 4- Is there any difference between your own correction, partner correction (if you have exchanged recordings) and the correction of the teacher? If yes, what is the difference?
- 5- After your final recording, did you feel that you have improved your speaking skill? If yes, in what way?
- 6- Do you think that you have improved your technical skills (using, sharing and storing your information on the web) after participating to this study? How?

Appendix. 3: Interview's questions

Questions: (probing techniques were used when needed)

- 1- What are the difficulties that you usually meet when speaking English?
- 2- Do you think that students can improve their speaking?
- 3- What differences did you find between conversations task and presentations task? Which one do you prefer and why?
- 4- In both types of recordings (conversation and presentation) the teacher asked you to self-correct your work. Do you think that self-assessment is a useful way in improving students' speaking skill?
- 5- Did the teacher's feedback help you? If yes in what way?
- 6- At the end of the study, do you feel that you improved your speaking skill?
- 7- Do you think that the portfolio provides more time to practice English outside the classroom?
- 8- Do you think that portfolio decreases anxiety when speaking English?

Appendix. 4: Interviews' transcript Sample

Date: March 13th 2016

Time: 11:00 am

Location: English Department of the University of Algiers. 2

Participant: Salima

Gender: female

Age: 21

.....

1- What are the difficulties that you usually meet when speaking English?

P: Sometimes I lose words and I mispronounce some words. When it's not pre-organized I usually stop to think about what I'm going to say

2- Do you think that students can improve their speaking?

P: Yes, everything starts from the bottom

3- What differences did you find between conversations task and presentations task? Which one do you prefer and why?

P: I noticed that presentation recordings are little bit less difficult than the conversation ones, because during presentations I know what I'm gonna say.

4- In both types of recordings (conversation and presentation) the teacher asked you to self-correct your work. Do you think that self-assessment is a useful way in improving students' speaking skill?

P: Yes it is, it is acknowledging student's work.

5- Did the teacher's feedback help you? If yes in what way?

P: I didn't notice the mistakes I have done until I've heard the teacher's feedback. (The researcher reminded Salima that she provided only one conversation recording), Yes, because I didn't find any mistake, I didn't know where to look

6- At the end of the study, do you feel that you improved your speaking skill?

P: I don't think I improved my speaking, I improve my speaking daily; however, I improved another thing, it's how to correct myself

7- Do you think that the e-portfolio provides more time to practice English outside the classroom?

P: Yes especially for me, it was a chance for me to practice English outside the classroom because it was obligatory and I had to do it. Because if it wasn't obligatory I wouldn't even have the idea to do it.

8- Do you think that portfolio decreases anxiety when speaking English?

P: yes because normally you practice, you speak, you know that someone else is gonna hear your recording

.....

Date: March 13th 2016

Time: 11:10 am

Location: English Department of the University of Algiers. 2

Participant: Sihem

Gender: female

Age: 25

.....

1- What are the difficulties that you usually meet when speaking English?

P: Vocabulary, as I try to look for the vocabulary I lose it. This is what usually happens during my speech

2- Do you think that students can improve their speaking?

P: of course, with practice, because I'm doing this and I see the difference even if I face many problems, but I see that I'm improving my speaking through practicing it.

3- What differences did you find between conversations task and presentations task? Which one do you prefer and why?

P: I prefer presentation because I'm alone, whereas in conversations I don't pay too much attention to my speaking but also to my friends, trying to correct them, but in presentation I can correct myself more than my friends

4- In both types of recordings (conversation and presentation) the teacher asked you to self-correct your work. Do you think that self-assessment is a useful way in improving students' speaking skill?

P: yes it's useful, but at many times I don't know what to correct. It's not that I don't make mistakes but it's difficult to find them.

5- Did the teacher's feedback help you? If yes in what way?

P: Yes, it did. For example intonation, I started to pay more attention to the intonation

6- At the end of the study, do you feel that you improved your speaking skill?

P: Yes I noticed that there were some changes in conversation skills.

7- Do you think that the portfolio provides more time to practice English outside the classroom?

P: Yes it helps and it's very important for me to practice because I know I really improved myself while speaking

8- Do you think that portfolio decreases anxiety when speaking English?

P: May be but I still have problems with anxiety.

Appendix 5: Interview's consent Form

The study: **Portfolios as a means for raising students' awareness of their oral skill.**

Name of the researcher: **Abbassi Mohamed Walid**

Consent Form

Dear participants

This study involves the audio of your interview with the researcher. Neither your name nor any other identifying information will be associated with the audio or audio recording or the transcript. Only the research or his team will be able to listen (view) the recordings. The audio recording will be transcribed by the researcher and erased once the transcriptions are checked for accuracy. Transcripts of your interview may be reproduced in whole or in part for use in presentations or written products that result from this study. Neither your name nor any other identifying information (such as your voice or picture) will be used in presentations or in written products resulting from the study.

I accept the terms, and by signing this form, I am allowing the researcher to audio or video tape me as part of this research.

Name:

Participant's Signature:

Appendix 6: 1st 2nd and 3rd recording transcripts (oral interaction) examples

First recording transcript

Participants: Salima, Sihem

Sa: good morning Sihem

Si: good morning

Sa: how are you

Si: fine hamdulah

Sa: I want it talk to you about a internet

Si: yes of course, it's an interesting topic

Sa: yeah, yes, of course, so what do you think about that? it's a good thing or a bad thing

Si: of course it's a good thing, it's very helpful for studies, it help us a lot. Sometimes, we need to have books, we need to have lot of knowledge, cannot find everywhere, so internet it's very it's very interesting source of information, I think ehh especially for ehh for us as students, it's very helpful, personally, it helps me a lot.

Sa: well ok, I cannot disagree with you in that point, but emm, I mean, however, like this source of information as you mentioned is, it can be a real danger for us because of its dis disadvantages

Si: well I see, personally, I see it from a positive ehh positive way

Sa: perspective

Si: of course, perspective because its help, I think that it help me a lot, so I always look at internet in a positive way, it's pretty sure for me, so I don't care about the disadvantages. I'm fully,,

Sa: personally, I'm more inn interested in the disadvantages, you know I had problem with facebook and so on, so yeah. Like it can be, really, it can be like people who stays in front of t for a long time makes, lke, they forget about their duties and about their homeworks, for students. And, it can,,like it can allow children through their treatment by like babysitters websites that are not allowed compared to their ages like there is no supervision on this internet

Si: well

Sa: anyone at any given age can enter in any websites that is not really allowed to his age, and plus to speaking with different countries, like for for instance, facebook or twitter, like you can speak with people that are unden,, emm like

unknown, you don't know them like you don't identify them, so, they can be bad persons, like they can be persons from different countries from different cultures, it can influence especially adolescents and children

Si: well, I think internet of course as you're saying may be it has some negative side, but I think if you know how to use it, I think it will be it will not be as negative as you see it because..

Sa: of course, it's a double edge sword

Si: of course, you have to know how to use it, in what side in what you have to specify what internet is useful for

Sa: well, ok that's your point of view. I respect it somehow

Si: of course I respect you

Sa: yes

Si: but it's still for me, internet is very beneficial

Sa: okay, if we know how to use it

Si: of course, if we know how to use it, this is the point

Sa: okay, thank you Sihem

Si: you're welcome Salima

Sa: thank you

Salima:268 words

Sihem:260words

Second recording transcript

Participants: Adel, Yacine

Ya: Good morning Adel

Ad: Good morning Yacine

Ya: You are so late today, why, is there any problem?

Ad: No problem. Just like always, traffic jam. You can't do anything, just stay and keep silent, and wait till they move you move, they stop you stop, that's it.

Ya: I really wonder why all this traffic in this country, if it is at the beginning of the day, it's okay, we can find a reason for that, people go to work and students go to their studies, but ..., where is the problem?

Ad: I think that the problem is unemployment, people don't work, so they spend most of time or the whole of the time in roads making traffic jam or in coffees or in fast food just for eat or drink.

Ya: last year I've been in England and I noticed that there is a big difference between their working time and the rest of the time. In your opinion why people don't work in our country. Is there, Do you think that the problem is in the people themselves or in our government

Ad: The problem I think is in both, in the government and in people at the same time. Government don't build new place of work or don't create new post of work there are and there are not enough industries and the government don't give the opportunity to the new generation to to to apply their new ideas, and in population, the problem that is, the population don't work in any work they given to them, they always looking for for the work when they don't give more effort, and sometimes people don't accept any work given to them, they always want to work in very specific places

Ya: if we take all these points in consideration, isn't there any solutions or suggestions to solve this problem?

Ad: If they ask me about any solutions, I would say that the first thing that the government should do is based on persons. We have to invest to make an investment in persons because when you have a very educative person you can rely on him and you wait from him lot of things. And from the government, it can do also give the opportunity to the new generation and build new place and create new place of work and at the same time encourage foreign investments and with to give them different advantages like lower taxes.

Ya: let's stop here, Adel, it's a this this kind of topics is very complicated and we can't solve it alone, so let's stop.

Adel: 312 words

Yacine: 157 words

third recording transcript

Participants: Lilia, Ryma

Ry: good morning, madam

Li: good morning, please, sit down

Ry: thank you

Li: tell me, you are interested in the position of English teacher in our school, right?

Ry: yes, I'm very interested

Li: first, tell me about yourself

Ry: my name is Benbrik Ryma, I'm 23 years old. I have an English degree, and also I made some research about students' learning and how can they develop their learning skill.

Li: have you any experience because you didn't mention that in your CV

Ry: yes, I have some experience. I have worked for six months in a private school

Li: our school focus on much experience. To ensure the good functioning of tasks. So, Why do you think that you deserve to be accepted? As you see, many people are waiting for this position as well, and they also may have longer experience than you

Ry: I deserve to be accepted because I am responsible and serious. To be an English teacher is my passion since I was young and I'm also patient with students and I understand their way of thinking

Li: Suppose you are accepted, what the you can bring to your class?

Ry: If you accept my proposal I will try to improve students' skills and provide them an appropriate atmosphere and this will help them improving their level and increase their desire to learn

Li: Alright, in case of any problems how do you react with your students?

Ry: in case of any problem, I will try to take the right decisions that do not affect my students' learning, and if I have a problem with any one of them, I will not embarrass him in front of his classmates

Li: why especially have you choosed our school?

R: I chose your school because it's it is known for its high level of learning and for the good atmosphere that the administration offer for the teachers and this help them work better

Li: thank you miss for your coming, we will call you soon

Ry: thank you very much madam and I hope that you will offer me this opportunity because I really deserve it

Li: you are welcome

Ry: thank you

Lilia: 103 words

Ryma: 188 words

Appendix 7: 1st 2nd and 3rd recording transcripts (individual oral production) examples

First recording transcript

Participant: Djahida

Hi, my name is Djahida and today i'm gonna deal with a very important topic which is women drivers. car driving for women has been the most controversial matter recently, and some societies are not ready to accept the fact that women can drive, and they look at women behind the wheel of car as something strange or inappropriate because for them, only men should have this privilege. and many others say that due to women driving, the rate of accident has increased. i personally disagree with that. According to a recent statistics done by the insurance company which reveal that although know more park cars and know to handle them, they are more likely to cause vehicle accidents than women, even sometimes, they tend to be aggressive and they get angry easily and also most of them don't mind taking risks brake road code which leads to a higher traffic violation and accident. Women appear to be a safer drivers than men cause they are calmer, less aggressive and law abiding drivers, that is mostly, they tend to break the road code which leads to a fewer accident. and some societies, i mean some societies; women women driving is something considered unacceptable and they believe that allowing women to drive cars diminishes the value of men in that society and they might lose their control of women like in Saudi Arabia, women are not allowed to drive cars even though there is no law says that it is prohibited because it has nothing to do with a law, actually, it's up to traditions and cultures of that society whether it is acceptable or not which means that women is Saudi Arabia will be able to drive cars whenever the society is ready to accept it. so, after all that , to me, I believe that there is nothing wrong with women driving cars as long as she is not doing anything illegal, and there is no real convincing reason for not accepting it or a law that prevents women from driving cars

342 words

Second recording transcript

Participant: Nomedra

hi, today i'm gonna talk about the right definition of success, so do you believe you are successful or do you wanna to be successful. well, success everyone wants it, i believe we have the right to call ourselves successful, and of course to truly be successful is to work for your goals and never give up on it. and then finally achieve it. many people believe that success is being famous or wealthy but to truly be successful is achieving goals that you make, for example, graduating from high school, it is a kind of success of course because not everything in life will be handed to you. personally, my goal was to go to college which i am, so i now considered myself successful because I achieve it of course. what helped me most was to set up my goals throughout my high school career because if you don't have a goals, what are you shooting for. for instance, right now i had ten out of twenty in some of modules, and i am very happy with that, and this kind of happiness is based on how i feel about myself. i tried to do something that was difficult and even though some people may may not think of ten as a success, but for me it is, because i know how hard i worked to get it. and that makes me feel like a success. so there would be no point going through life without goals, if you don't have a goal, there is nothing in your life you can accomplish, therefore you can not be successful. according to Mustapha Hosni who says and I quote: " it is never too late to start over if you weren't happy with yesterday, try something different today, do not stay stuck, do better, so if you dream it you can do it" well, this is a great quote because it is stressing that you make your own goals and live your life the way you want, do not let anyone tell you that you cannot do something but if you they do prove them wrong, be successful. well, no doubt that that success is different from person to person because successful people do not different things they do simple things differently. for instance let's take a look about Oprah, Oprah, she

started from scratch and she faced many difficulties and obstacles in her life like poverty and disparation of her parents and the kidnap and many other thing things. but she achieved her goals and she become successful and famous woman. so, there are many different interaptions of what success is . some related success to money, other related success to happiness but but it all depends on the type of person. there is no right or wrong ideas of success, success can only be achieved if one is willing to believe he is successful. the truth is, success can only be what or want to believe it, it is. anyone can achieve success, it just take a desire and, so, problem is we focused too much on power and money and don't having things and i think that is keeping a lot of people from being happy. in my opinion, may be if we start to think of success differently, there would be more time when success and happiness would be in the same thing. thank you.
569 words

Third recording transcripts

Participant: Sihem

hello, my name is Sihem today i am going to speak about forgiveness
i would like to ask you a question
are you able to forgive people who hurt you, whatever the mistakes they did? what would you say if i tell you that forgiveness is a crucial and necessary factor that contributes to success, however, its absence can lead to failure. thus it is important to know the reasons of the inability to forgive, its bad effects on our our life and more important the benefits we get by forgiving people.
nowadays, unfortunately, forgiveness has become rarely existing in our hearts, it is a fact that we cannot deny. we have become unable to forgive each other and the reason is our misunderstanding of forgiveness. actually many people see that forgiving others is a weakness and being under control, that is if you forgive somebody you will be weak and you will give him the chance to control you. in addition, forgiveness is seen as an acceptance to humiliation as much as leading the others to repeat doing mistakes again and again. as a consequence, this misunderstanding increases on on forgiveness which reflects negatively on ourselves. in fact psychologists maintain that any anormal thing happens to you is just because of lacking of the ability the unan the ability to forgive others and when you carry malignancy, anger and suspicion in your heart, you find yourself having a negative energy which affects you. certainly, this can lead to a range of psychological problems. furthermore, a research done by the faculty of medicine in san francisco 1986, had shown that 80 per cent of the persons thought and ideas are negative and work against him, consequently, they can cause to him different types of diseases. Also, conflicts with others make us lose part of our power, this increases our efficiency and hinders us from reaching our goals. on the other hand, forgiveness is an important element that make us connected with Allah, gain his love, live in stability, tranquility and happiness. when the person becomes forgiving, his way of thinking will become obviously proper. thus, he will have a balance in the spiritual energy which provides him with an emotional balance as well as sss physical balance. another important thing is that,, by forgiving we will get rid of all the negative energy, hence, we reach a peaceful state of mind, a self satisfaction and feel happy. all these positive aspects provide us with a big energy which help us to focus on our present life and on reaching our objectives. to conclude, forgiveness is a features of the powerful, as it strengthen our connection with God, also it makes us connec it make us stable, happy and successful , so, forgive and feel the beauty
429 words

Appendix 8: Error analysis transcript example

Djahida: I saw in the internet a title of an article which attracted me, and the article was titled as ‘Jobless Generation’ so I read it. And it was talking about many young people graduated and with degrees, are unable to find jobs. And when I met my friend Nomedia; I told her about this article and me being concerned.

Djahida: Hi Nomedia, good morning.

Nomedia: Hi Djahida good morning.

Djahida: How are you?

N: I’m fine thank you, how about you?

D: I’m fine

N:emm FP, but you don’t look fine, are you sure you are good?

D: emm FP honestly, I’ve been thinking about this article that I’ve read in the internet, it was about unemployed graduates

N: emm FP

D: even though they have degrees they are jobless

N: Yeah

D: and that’s what I’m concerned about

N: but I don’t understand what exactly makes you worried

D: what makes me worried is is R that if we graduate this year P, we gonna have to look for a job, and honestly, I’m not sure that we’re gonna ,, SP have we’re gonna R find one Co. What what R about you Nomedia, aren’t you worried about getting a job after graduating

N: actually, you know, I didn’t think it would be that, it would be R that hard. I was thinking that if I have my degree, it would be easy to find a job in the future, I feel disappointed after you told me that, I’mmmm FP but why you think we have this problem

D: in my opinion I think that our government doesn’t make plans for the new graduated young people

N: yeah

D: to provide them with jobs, and even if we search for Ar job, the first thing that the employers insist on is at least four or five years of experience

N: yeah, but if no one accept P to hire us and give us a chance from where we will get the experience needed, and we can't get a job because we have no experience, and in order to get a job, we need a job for work experience, see this is our problem

D: and in addition to that nowadays a lot of people with less qualification Plu can get a job easily

N: yeah

D: not to mention some officials have been R have been in the same position for too long and they don't give the chance for the new generation to come up with new ideas and give new possibilities for the future

N: so, unfortunately, it's a problem in organization and the government doesn't give any attention and care of Pre graduate graduate Rstudents and also they don't do a very g aaa FP don't do mm FP much effort in training us out before graduate VF to prepare us to get a job, however, we need to be positive and do our best and work hard to higher our level so by that we can rise our chances of getting a job in the future

Types of errors	Error freq
P	02
Ar	01
Pre	01
Plu	01
VF	01
R	05
SP	01
FP	03
C	01
Total	15

P : Pronunciation

Ar: article misuse

Pre: Preposition

Plu: Plural

VF: Verb Form

R: Repeats

SP: Silent pause

FP: filled pause

C: Correction

Appendix 9: Task one assessment rubric

Criteria	Superior	Advanced	Intermediate	Novice
Fluency	<input type="checkbox"/> continuous speech with almost no pauses or hesitations	<input type="checkbox"/> continuous speech with some pauses to search for adequate words	<input type="checkbox"/> frequent pauses to organize thoughts and/or for lack of vocabulary	<input type="checkbox"/> frequent long pauses with incomplete thoughts
Grammar	<input type="checkbox"/> no or almost no errors	<input type="checkbox"/> some minor errors that do not obscure meaning	<input type="checkbox"/> many errors that do not obscure meaning	<input type="checkbox"/> major errors that obscure meaning
	<input type="checkbox"/> no or almost no errors	<input type="checkbox"/> some minor errors that do not affect communication	<input type="checkbox"/> many errors that do not affect communication	<input type="checkbox"/> major errors that affect comprehension
Pronunciation & voice	<input type="checkbox"/> appropriate use of intonation and rhythm	<input type="checkbox"/> some errors in using intonation and rhythm	<input type="checkbox"/> inappropriate use of intonation and rhythm	<input type="checkbox"/> use of mother tongue intonation and rhythm
	<input type="checkbox"/> loud & attractive voice addressed to whole group	<input type="checkbox"/> loud voice but not attractive	<input type="checkbox"/> low & unattractive to whole group	<input type="checkbox"/> quite low & unattractive voice to near colleagues
Vocabulary	<input type="checkbox"/> rich use of handout vocabulary	<input type="checkbox"/> some use of handout vocabulary	<input type="checkbox"/> rare use of handout vocabulary	<input type="checkbox"/> misuse of words for lack of vocabulary
	<input type="checkbox"/> no use of native language	<input type="checkbox"/> rare use of native language	<input type="checkbox"/> use of native language for about half the speech	<input type="checkbox"/> frequent use of words and phrases from the native language
Comprehension	<input type="checkbox"/> fully understands what is said and gives appropriate responses	<input type="checkbox"/> understands most of what is said and responds appropriately	<input type="checkbox"/> understands some of what is said and responds appropriately	<input type="checkbox"/> doesn't understand what is said. Needs paraphrasing or rewarding.

Adapted from Auda (2013)

Speaking Rubric for Conversation Classes. Available from:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269037645_Speaking_Rubric_for_Conversation_Classes

Appendix 10: Task two assessment rubric (adapted from Yoshida, 2001)

Yoshida-28

Appendix 1: Analytic Scoring Rubric for Formal Speaking

	1	2	3	4	5
Comprehensibility	Cannot be understood at all.	Can be understood with great difficulty.	Most can be understood.	Almost everything can be understood.	Everything can be understood.
Fluency	Stops for too long a time and too many times.	Stops for a long time several times.	Stops for a short time several times.	Speaks fluently with a few stops.	Speaks very fluently.
Speed	Speaks too fast or too slowly.	Speaks very fast or very slowly.	Speaks sometimes fast or slow.	Speaks almost always at the right speed.	Speaks always at the right speed.
Clarity of pronunciation	Pronounces words too ambiguously to be heard.	Pronounces many words very ambiguously.	Pronounces some words ambiguously.	Pronounces almost all words clearly.	Pronounces all words very clearly.
Loudness	Cannot be heard at all.	Can barely be heard.	Sometimes difficult to be heard.	Easy to be heard most of the time.	Always loud enough to be heard.
Vocabulary	Too many misuses of words and very limited vocabulary.	Many misuses of words and limited vocabulary.	Several misuses of words and insufficient vocabulary.	A few misuses of words and rich vocabulary.	Use of vocabulary and idioms is always correct.
Grammar	Too many errors in grammar and word order.	Frequent grammar and word order errors.	Several errors in grammar and word order.	A few errors in grammar and word order.	Grammar and word order are very accurate.

Appendix 11: A sample of the coding process of students' interview responses

Q1: What are the difficulties that you usually meet when speaking English?

Students	Responses
Djahida	Vocabulary, sometimes it's grammar but mostly vocabulary
Nomedia	well, I have many difficulties while speaking English for example lack of vocabulary, pronunciation and sometimes grammar mistakes.
Salima	Sometimes I lose words and I mispronounce some words. When it's not pre-organized I usually stop to think about what I'm going to say
Sihem	Vocabulary, as I try to look for the vocabulary I lose it. This is what usually happens during my speech
Yousra	I think I speak really too fast
Adel	I lose the words, I stop for a long time before thinking of the right word

Codes:

Yellow: Vocabulary

Blue: grammar

Grey: pronunciation

Red: lack of spontaneity and hesitations

Green: speech delivery

Category that emerged was: **Students linguistic problems**

Q2: Do you think that students can improve their speaking?

Students	Responses
Djahida	Yes
Nomedia	Yes they can improve their speaking by practicing English outside the classroom

Salima	Yes, everything starts from the bottom
Sihem	Of course, with practice, because I'm doing this and I see the difference even if I face many problems, but I see that I'm improving my speaking through practicing it.
Yousra	Yes of course
Adel	Yes, I noticed that the more I practice the language the more I develop my speaking

Categories:

Yellow: **Students' reflection on improvement of their speaking**

Red: **Practice as a way to improve speaking**

Green: **Students' linguistic problems**

Q3: What are the differences did you find between conversations task and presentations task? Which one do you prefer and why?

Students	Responses
Djahida	In a conversation recordings you have to make the balance in turns taking between you and your partner, but in a presentation you record it as you wish, the presentation one is more comfortable.
Nomedia	I noticed that in conversations it was more helpful than presenting individual. Conversation is better because I can speak naturally
Salima	I noticed that presentation recording is little bit less difficult than the conversation ones, because during presentations I know what I'm gonna say.
Sihem	I prefer presentation because I'm alone, whereas in conversations I don't pay too much attention to my speaking but also to my friends, trying to correct them, but in presentation I can correct myself more than my friends
Yousra	There is less anxiety during recording because you know that you are not facing people. there is less pressure during the conversation recording because it's a collaborative work, if it's a presented it's more difficult but if it's recorded it's easy.

Adel	In the presentation, I was more confident because I knew what I was about to say.
------	---

Codes:

- Purple: Students self-focus
- Grey: Pre-organization
- Dark grey: Positive psychological attitude
- Red: Naturalness of the task
- Blue: Collaboration
- Light blue: Individual

Category:

Students preferences for implemented tasks

Q4: In both types of recordings (conversation and presentation) the teacher asked you to self-correct your work. Do you think that self-assessment is a useful way in improving students' speaking skill?

Students	Responses
Djahida	Not really, sometimes I can't notice the mistakes, so I need someone who master the language better than me so that he can notice the mistakes I'm doing
Nomedia	In some way it helps, but I prefer the teacher's feedback
Salima	Yes it is, it is acknowledging student's work
Sihem	Yes it's useful, but at many times I don't know what to correct. It's not that I don't make mistakes but it's difficult to find them
Yousra	After you listen to yourself you realize your mistakes
Adel	Yes it was helpful. Sometimes you are tired and you don't pay attention to the mistakes, here comes the teacher and helps you in correcting yourself

Categories:

- Yellow: **Students' reflection on self-assessment**
- Green: **Students' difficulty in tracking their mistakes**
- Red: **Students dependence on teacher's feedback**

Q5: Did the teacher's feedback help you? If yes, in what way?

Students	Responses
Djahida	Very much, I could notice some mistakes that I worked on them, the teacher's feedback was very accurate and specific. Somehow, I thought the teacher is really interested about my work, he is aware of my mistakes to make my speaking better. The more the teacher is interested the harder I tried to make it better.
Nomedia	Yes, for example I did have some mistakes in the final "ed" that I didn't notice before.
Salima	I didn't notice the mistakes I have done until I've heard the teacher's feedback, I didn't know where to look
Sihem	Yes, it did. For example intonation, I started to pay more attention to the intonation
Yousra	Yes, I didn't notice that I speak in monotone or speaking too fast until I read the feedback.
Adel	Sure and a lot, there are some mistakes you would never find without the help of the teacher

Categories:

Green: **Students inefficiency in tracking their mistakes**

Purple: **Teacher's sense of presence**

Yellow: **Efficiency of teacher's feedback**

Q6: At the end of the study, do you feel that you improved your speaking skill?

Student	Responses
Djahida	I wasn't sure of the level of my speaking, but after the teacher's feedback and questions he asked, I had the chance to assess my speaking, so now I know my level of speaking. I didn't know how well I can speak English, I didn't participate too much, so after this experiment I became more confident.
Nomedia	pronunciation

Salima	I don't think I improved my speaking, I improve my speaking daily; however, I improved another thing, it's how to correct myself
Sihem	Yes I noticed that there is some changes in conversation skills.
Yousra	Not really but I work on improving the way I speak, I start to speak more slowly now. It was helpful because I noticed mistakes provided in the teacher's feedback
Adel	Not 100 per cent but there are positive things such as confidence, I became more confident now when doing a presentation

Categories:

Yellow: **Speaking improvement**

Green: **Efficiency of the teacher's feedback**

Light blue: **Areas of improvement**

Q7: Do you think that the e-portfolio provides more time to practice English outside the classroom?

Students	Responses
Djahida	it was helpful
Nomedia	yes, it encouraged me to practice outside the classroom with my classmates
Salima	Yes especially for me, it was a chance for me to practice English outside the classroom because it was obligatory and I had to do it. Because if it wasn't obligatory I wouldn't even have the idea to do it
Sihem	Yes it helps and it's very important practice, because I know I really improved myself while speaking
Yousra	Yes because I don't usually practice or record myself or any of it
Adel	Yes I think this is a very good way to practice English when you're not in the classroom or university.

Categories:

Yellow: **Students' reflection on the portfolio as a practice device**

Purple: **Students' unfamiliarity with digital tools in improving their speaking**

Green: **Speaking improvements**

Q8: Do you think that portfolio decreases anxiety when speaking English?

Students	Responses
Djahida	not very much, the feedback may help you to be more confident
Nomedia	for me somehow and fair enough
Salima	Yes because normally you practice, you speak, you know that someone else is gonna hear your recording.
Sihem	May be but I still have problems with anxiety
Yousra	No, but when recording I feel less anxious
Adel	There is an improvement somehow, I start to become more confident in my presentations

Categories:

Yellow: **Students' reflection on anxiety**

Green: **Efficiency of the teacher's feedback**

Appendix 12: example of teacher's feedback

Feedback on 'presentation's recordings'

Student: Nomedia.

Thank you for the recordings, the overall quality in terms of language comprehensiveness (almost everything can be understood) and the different parts of the speaking such as intonation, rhythm were highly acceptable.

Intonation in these two recordings compared to the conversation recordings has considerably been improved (this is my opinion). Keep it up.

A rich vocabulary

However, I noticed some grammatical errors:

Eg: At the beginning you have said " Do you **wanna to** be successful',,, 'wanna' is the abbreviation of 'want to' ,,,,,,so whether you say 'want to be' or "wanna be".

'if you don't have **a goals**' at 1:08,, the article must be omitted here, only if 'goals' is put in singular 'goal' ,,,,, this was a slip of the tongue and I am sure because the same expression have been repeated correctly later at 1:51.

Pronunciation was very clear and I must say it was very good at some points, however, I noticed that you have some issues with the words ending with 'ed' in some words such as helped, faced, based, achieved. The 'ed' in these words is pronounced differently (d-t-id): helped: helpt- faced:feist-based:beizd.

A copy of these rules will be sent in a link, check it.

So, in general the topic was enjoyable and interesting. The main points were stated clearly. The fact that you add some personal experience added some credibility to the topic and will attract any audience.

Thank you

ملخص

الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو معرفة إمكانية تأثير استعمال تقنية اليورتفوليو على تطوير القدرات الشفوية في الانجليزية كوسيلة لرفع وعي الطلبة نحو قدراتهم الشفوية لمجموعة من طلبة السنة الثالثة من التعليم العالي قسم انجليزية جامعة الجزائر 2.

الدراسة شملت 12 طالبا سنة ثالثة قسم ليسانس من قسم الانجليزية من جامعة الجزائر 2 أبو القاسم سعد الله. بحيث أن الطلبة المشاركين خاضوا تطبيقين مختلفين وهما التطبيق الشفوي الانفرادي و التطبيق الشفوي التحواري.

ويكمن هاذين التطبيقين في جعل المشارك من إنشاء تسجيلات صوتية لكلا التطبيقين والعمل على تطوير قدراته الشفوية باستخدام هذه التقنية. الطلبة مدعوون إلى مراقبة أدائهم الشفوي من خلال التركيز على أخطائهم الشفوية و العمل على تصحيحها خلال مراحل مختلفة.

استعمل الباحث استطلاعين بالإضافة إلى مقابلات مع الطلبة المشاركين لمعرفة مدى تأثير هذه التقنية على مجمل قدراتهم الشفوية في استعمال الانجليزية كما استعمل الباحث تقنية دراسة الاخطاء التي ارتكبها الطلبة محاولة منه لمعرفة هل الاخطاء تم تصحيحها

النتائج المحصل عليها دلت على أن لهذه التقنية تأثير ايجابي في رفع وعي الطلبة نحو قدراتهم الشفوية بالاضافة الى التقليل من القلق الناجم عن استعمال اللغة الاجنبية كذلك اظهرت النتائج تطوير الطلبة لقدراتهم على تصحيح الاخطاء اللغوية بالاضافة الى ان البورتفوليو يشجع على استعمال اللغة الانجليزية خارج نطاق الجامعة أو القسم و بالتالي زيادة نسبة ممارسة اللغة مما يؤدي إلى تطويرها و تحسينها.