

## **PechaKucha Presentations to Develop Multimodal Communicative Competence in ESP and EMI Live Online Lectures: A Team-Teaching Proposal**

Mercedes Querol-Julián (mercedes.querol@unir.net)  
Universidad Internacional de La Rioja, Spain

Vicent Beltrán-Palanques (vbeltran@uji.es)  
Universitat Jaume I, Spain

### **Abstract**

With the Covid-19 outbreak, many universities worldwide have been forced to undertake some changes to continue with the academic commitment, giving rise to a range of adaptations that pivoted around online teaching delivery and the use of technology and audiovisual materials. Against this background, this study discusses an adaptive response from face-to-face to live online lectures for ESP and EMI classrooms. These two settings are deliberately chosen as a way to best prepare ESP learners for EMI courses. For this purpose, the spoken genre of PechaKucha has been selected, which is characterized as a multimodal (e.g., language, visuals, images) and engaging presentation type. To deal with this genre and promote learners' multimodal communicative competence and multimodal literacy, we draw on a multimodal-centered genre-based pedagogy. This proposal explains the pedagogical adaptation from face-to-face to online lectures and discusses the challenges confronted when moving from one setting to the other. We also argue for a team-teaching approach. In addition, this study points to the need to train teachers to develop their multimodal interactional competence to equip them to cope with live online delivery.

*Keywords:* live online lectures, ESP-EMI team teaching, PechaKucha, multimodal communicative competence

### **Introduction**

As the sanitary crisis continues to disrupt face-to-face teaching, most universities have been obliged to adjust course delivery to online teaching or combinations of face-to-face and online teaching. As such, many teachers face the challenge of teaching in new environments where computer-mediated communication and online practices have come to the front. Adaptive responses need to be thoroughly planned to present learners with adequate opportunities to continue their learning process. In the case of language teaching, this translates into helping learners develop their overall communicative competence and skills. In online lectures, the teaching-learning process may revolve around synchronous interaction (e.g., videoconferencing platforms) and asynchronous interac-

tion (e.g., forum). Each type of interaction may have implications that can affect not only interaction among the main stakeholders (i.e., teachers and learners) but also the design, implementation, and evaluation of tasks. This becomes especially relevant in contexts involving the teaching/learning/use of English as a lingua franca (ELF), as in the two contexts considered in this article: English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and English-medium instruction (EMI) programs. The rationale behind this choice is based on the fact that ESP courses may have great potential to prepare learners for EMI courses (Arnó-Macià & Aguilar, 2018). Traditionally, ESP and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) courses are purposely designed to prepare learners for language use in professional and academic contexts, but not so much to equip them to deal with EMI programs. EMI generally refers to programs in which English is used to teach non-language academic subjects in contexts where it is not the first language (Macaro, 2018). The EMI classroom offers learners opportunities to use EFL for both professional and academic purposes, and therefore, language teachers (e.g., ESP) should not only equip learners to that end but also collaborate with content teachers as much as possible. Therefore, we propose team teaching between the language and the content teachers (Lasagabaster, 2018) to co-plan and co-evaluate learners' learning and outcomes. In so doing, learners can be provided with communicative tools in the ESP classroom that can be transferred to the EMI classroom, especially regarding genres (both written and spoken), typically addressed in ESP courses (Anthony, 2018).

## **Literature Review**

Concerning spoken genres, we found particularly relevant dealing with (professional) oral presentations that learners are frequently required to perform in both ESP and EMI classrooms. Oral presentations involve more than speech delivery, and they also require presenters to make use of a broad range of semiotic resources (e.g., language, visuals, gestures, facial expressions, intonation) to construct meaning. Furthermore, oral presentations are expected to be highly interactive and engaging, and as such, high demands are put on presenters who should not only disseminate knowledge but also engage the audience during the presentation. Learners are therefore confronted with the multimodal design of visual aids, the delivery –based on disciplinary-related content–, the use of ELF and embodied semiotic resources and the interactive and engaging nature of presentations.

To best prepare students for effective oral presentations, ESP teachers should go beyond discursive competence and focus on multimodal communicative competence, often defined as “the ability to understand the combined potential of various modes for making meaning” (Royce, 2002, p. 192). Multimodal communicative competence, seen as an extension of communicative competence (Hymes, 1972), is in line with multimodal literacy, regarded as the study of how to construct meaning effectively using varied communicative modes (Mills & Unsworth, 2017). Enhancing learners' multimodal communicative competence in the ESP classroom is critical for their professional development since they should become aware of how communication is constructed by varied semiotic resources and how they can exploit those resources to make meaning. Somewhat, this is also related to the suggestions provided by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (2018) as regards communicative ac-

tivities. Specifically, the CEFR also draws attention to reception (i.e., listening, reading, and audiovisual), production (i.e., spoken and written), and interaction (i.e., spoken, written, and online) activities. Thus, learners should be able to understand various (multimodal) input cues as well as to make meaning and interact utilizing different semiotic resources, especially in face-to-face interaction.

The spoken genre selected for this study is PechaKucha (PK) presentations. The visual support of PKs is mainly by images. These presentations consist of 20 slides, with each slide lasting 20 seconds (20x20) and advancing automatically, i.e., a total of 6 minutes and 40 seconds. This type of presentation can be rather challenging as it forces speakers to communicate the content without digression (Courtney Klentzin et al., 2009). Due to their multimodal nature, PK becomes complex. Presenters should carefully think of what relevant content should be disseminated, the design of the slides, the visual aids, how to synchronize speech and visuals, as well as how to structure the presentation effectively and persuade and engage the audience. The level of complexity increases even more so when delivered in ELF.

In this study, we present a proposal framed within an ESP-EMI team-teaching methodology to teach the genre of PK presentations. For this purpose, we follow a multimodal-centered genre-based pedagogy based on multimodal discourse analysis that has been revealed to be effective in the teaching-learning of the genre of conference presentations (Querol-Julián & Fortanet-Gómez, 2019). Coccetta (2018) has also shown the positive impact of guided multimodal analysis tasks to foster learners' awareness of the integration of different semiotic resources. Similar pedagogies have proven the development of multimodal literacy from multimodal discourse analysis perspectives for genre awareness, for instance, in the case of Product Pitches and Research Pitches (Ruiz-Madrid & Valeiras-Jurado, 2020).

As discussed in this article, our proposal represents an adaptation from the face-to-face context to the online one, both sharing the same macrostructure. This proposal will also shed some light on the complexity of moving the traditional context to a digital experience, pointing to the need for specific teacher training to develop their interactional competence in online contexts. Although teachers may generally transfer some strategies from the face-to-face context to the online one, and the other way round, professional development to fully support and expand their interactional strategies would be highly advisable.

## **Pedagogical Proposal**

In this section, we present the adaptation to the virtual context of a task that will contribute to the development of university learners' multimodal communicative competence in ELF. The task will consist of the performance of a PechaKucha presentation. The target group will be a group of 30-40 students with a language proficiency level of B2 (according to the CEFR) enrolled in an ESP and an EMI course that will be part of the same university degree. Team teaching between the language teacher and the content-subject teacher is proposed.

The task has been designed to be developed in two and a half live online lectures of a duration of two hours each, i.e., about five hours. In the first and second sessions, learners will get familiar with the genre of PK in the ESP class (about three hours).

Then, during the third session, learners' PKs will be presented and evaluated in the EMI class (two hours). Two weeks before the first session, the ESP teacher will briefly introduce the task in class and will relate it to the two subjects. Learners will be asked to form groups of 4-5 people (PK groups hereafter) and decide on the topic of the presentation. They will have to complete an electronic form with this information before the first session. The ESP and the EMI teachers will have access to this information. To deliver the live online lectures, synchronous online technology will be used. This technology, such as Blackboard Collaborate, Adobe Connect, Google Meet, or Zoom, incorporates videoconferencing and instant messaging that allows for video-, audio-, and/or text-based communication.

The genre-based pedagogy or teaching-learning circle (Dreyfus et al., 2015) will be the approach used to teach and learn the PK genre. We will follow Querol-Julián and Fortanet-Gómez's (2019) adaptation of the model. These authors proposed a learner-led pedagogy for the teaching-learning of an interactive oral genre that fosters thinking-based learning and multimodal awareness. Likewise, in the present study, learners will be engaged in a process of active and collaborative deconstruction and construction of the PK and will carry out authentic activities in content and language learning. We will exploit the pedagogical potential of this audiovisual genre to develop ESP/EMI learners' multimodal literacy and multimodal communicative competence.

This teaching-learning cycle has three stages: modeling and joint deconstruction, joint construction, and independent construction. As follows, we propose the application of the model in ten steps from a team-teaching approach and its adaptation to the digital context (see a summary of the pedagogical proposal in Annex A).

#### *A) Modeling and Joint deconstruction of PechaKucha presentations*

The modeling and joint deconstruction of the PK will be achieved from two different perspectives: learners' previous experience and/or predictions and data analysis. First, learners will be engaged in a process of individual self-reflection based on their experience and/or predictions about oral presentations, as we assume that for most of them, PK will be a new genre (Step 1). Individual self-reflection will aim to foster learners' awareness of the importance of some aspects that may lead to successful presentations: i) visual aids –slides that support the oral presentations–, ii) interaction with slides during the presentation, iii) interaction with the audience during the presentation, iv) the use and combination of different embodied semiotic resources –kinesics (e.g., facial expressions and hand gestures) and paralinguage (e.g., intonation and syllabic prominence)– in making meaning, v) speech organization, and vi) presentation rehearsal. Self-reflection will be enhanced through an online survey after having introduced the task two weeks before, as it could be done in a face-to-face context. While completing the survey, learners' academic reading and writing skills (i.e., EAP) will be developed. The survey will consist of both Likert scale questions to measure their perceptions and short open questions to justify some of their responses (Annex B). As this will be completed asynchronously, learners will have ample time to think and elaborate their responses as well as to revise language. During the proposal, learners will have opportunities to participate spontaneously and prepare their contributions.

The results of the survey will be shared by the teacher on the web-based learning management systems (LMS) that the universities use to access and manage online

course learning materials and communicate (such as Canvas or Moodle). Asynchronous video discussion will be enhanced through an application such as Flipgrid or Vialogues (Step 2). Although discussion could be held in class, as it is generally done in a face-to-face context, we propose the use of this type of chat to attract a major number of participants. The learners will have the opportunity to develop listening, speaking, and interacting skills. The video chat will facilitate listening comprehension as learners will be able to watch their peers' and teacher's comments as many times as they need, and to prepare their videos for discussion. The asynchronous nature of the activity will possibly increase their participation too. Teachers may work on their "social presence" to make the chat alive, which refers to "[the] ability of participants in a Community of Inquiry to project their personal characteristics into the community, thereby presenting themselves to other participants as 'real people'" (Garrison, et al., 2000, p. 89).

During the group discussions proposed in this model, the teacher will play the role of a coach, not being judgmental and asking questions that will guide learners to find solutions to the "problems" presented. The teacher will foster the use of audio/video communication tools, although, on some occasions, as it will be described below, text-mediated communication among peers and teacher will also be promoted. Thus, group discussion will allow the development of five language communicative skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking, and interacting) and the use of EAP and ESP. The design of the group discussion will be the same as the one that could be found in a face-to-face setting; nevertheless, in this case, communication will be mediated by technology. As Thurlow et al. (2004, p. 19) pointed out, "with such things as video conferencing, webcams and voice recognition, technological changes are taking us nearer and nearer to the kind of face-to-face (or just FtF) communication we've been used to all along". Nonetheless, limitations of technology-mediated communication, such as not being able to see always all the interlocutors, may have an effect on learners' listening comprehension, spoken production, and spoken interaction skills in the ESP/EMI context where ELF is used. Communication is multimodal, and language is just only one of the many ways we have to construct meaning. Thus, not having access to the whole range of semiotic resources (e.g., kinesics) in which verbal messages are packed would probably pose a challenge when interacting in the lingua franca. The teacher's role during the episodes of interaction in live online lectures will be central. On the one hand, the teacher will act as a facilitator in the comprehension process; on the other, they will have to create a positive affective environment that will lead to learning through interaction, e.g., acknowledging learners' individual contributions through different strategies such as repeating their utterances, selecting some keywords, and paraphrasing (Querol-Julián, 2021). In so doing, learners will feel that they are important for the teacher and the group and that their contributions are relevant; moreover, their motivation will increase as they develop a feeling of belonging to the group (Mortiboys, 2012).

The modeling and joint deconstruction of the PK based on data analysis will be carried out in four stages. First, the teacher will perform a PK in class or will video record it in advance and play it in class to present its main features and to provide an example of the genre (Step 3). Afterward, group discussion will be opened for reflection about likenesses and differences between PKs and other oral presentations (Step 4). The aspects considered in the survey will run the discussion. The interaction will be enhanced by clickers or CRS (Classroom Response Systems), i.e., applications employed to collect immediate learners' responses to questions that can be instantly displayed and

shared with the whole class (Caldwell, 2007). CRS will possibly increase participation since most of them allow for anonymous responses (e.g., Mentimeter or Wooclap). Moreover, the learners will be allowed to discuss the group responses.

Finally, a repertoire of linguistic and non-linguistic semiotic resources to foster engagement will be shared in class (Annex C). The learners will use it to work on the joint deconstruction of an authentic professional PK (Step 5). The PK will be about a content-specific topic related to the EMI course. The ESP and EMI teachers will select it together, considering content and language adequacy for the learners.

First, the learners will watch the PK in class soundless in an attempt to draw their attention to non-verbal cues. In this way, we will be contributing to the development of their multimodal awareness. Some questions about the presenter's non-verbal language and visual aids will be posted, as well as on the PK format. These questions will be displayed on the screen while watching the PK (Annex D). To discuss the questions, each PK group will be moved to a different virtual room. Then, one member of each group will share their answers with the whole group in not more than one 1-minute using audio or audio and video. The teacher will conclude the discussion and will ask questions to encourage group reflection. The learners will be invited to use the written chat to participate.

The learners will watch the video again, but this time with sound. On the screen, the teacher will display some questions about: time synchronization of slides and speech, conceptual synchronization of the message conveyed by visual aids and speech, interactive strategies (linguistic and non-linguistic) used to engage the audience, and presentation rehearsal (Annex D). Subsequently, a discussion will be opened. Learners will be encouraged to participate orally or through the chat. The proposed modeling and joint deconstruction stage follow the same macrostructure in the two live lectures, online and onsite, except for Step 2. Yet, the proposal could be implemented similarly in the two contexts.

### *B) Joint construction of PechaKucha presentations*

The modeling and joint deconstruction of the PK will set the grounds for the development of the next stages of the model. The second stage, the joint construction, will be done through different techniques to foster critical and creative thinking in two steps. First, we will problematize PK presentations to promote individual thinking and group discussion. We will follow the Six Thinking Hats technique (De Bono, 2017), which is based on a metaphor where each hat has a different color that embodies a way of thinking (i.e., white hat for facts, red hat for feelings/emotions, yellow hat for benefits, black for difficulties/challenges, green hat for solutions, and blue hat manages the discussion and concludes). Accordingly, the class will be split into six teams.

The puzzle technique will be followed to develop the Six Thinking Hats discussion (Step 7). First, each team will be moved to a different virtual room to discuss PK presentations from one way of thinking. The teacher will ask some questions to guide thinking in each team (Annex E). Then, each member of the team will be moved to a thinking group. The members of a PK group will be part of different teams and will enter the same thinking group when possible. Table 1 illustrates an example of how three PK groups of four members each could be organized into two thinking groups.

Table 1  
*The organization of PechaKucha groups into thinking groups.*

	PK Group 1	PK Group 2	PK Group 3	
White hat	●		◆	● Thinking Group A
Red hat	●	◆		◆ Thinking Group B
Yellow	●	◆		
Black hat		●	◆	
Green hat		●	◆	
Blue hat	●		◆	

The thinking groups will discuss PK presentations from the five perspectives. It will be expected that during the discussion, learners will use EAP and ESP. The blue hat will control and monitor discussion, will make comments, and will summarize and draw conclusions in agreement with the group. The conclusions of each thinking group will be presented by the blue hat on an online mind map. The teacher will share the mind maps with the whole group in class, will underscore likenesses, and will pose some questions to encourage reflection. Learners will be invited to make their contributions on the written chat. In a face-to-face context, a similar procedure could be followed; however, if Step 2 is done in class, the time left for the Six Thinking Hats discussion will be significantly reduced. Alternatively, Step 2 could be done asynchronously, as proposed for the digital context.

The second part of the joint deconstruction of the PK will be completed by the PK groups in class, who will work in different virtual rooms. They will have to fill in an online template of “Guidelines for effective Pecha Kucha presentations” (Annex F) (Step 8). The procedure will be the same as the one that could be followed in a face-to-face setting. After the session, the teacher will revise the guidelines of each group and then, drawing on that, will create a single document trying to include the most remarkable ideas. This final document will be in accordance with the criteria of the evaluation rubric previously designed by the two teachers. The document will be shared with the learners on the LMS so that they can follow it when creating their PKs. As in the modeling and joint deconstruction stage, we have designed similar learning situations for the two contexts to jointly construct the PK genre.

### *C) Independent construction of PechaKucha presentations*

The independent construction stage involves learners putting all the pieces together to create an example of the genre without the support of the teacher and the whole group. Nevertheless, this does not mean that learners will necessarily work individually. They can do it in groups, as proposed in this article. Cooperative learning principles and strategies will be used to encourage mutual helpfulness in the groups and the active participation of all members. The independent construction will be developed in two steps: the learners will plan the design of the PK in class, and then they will work on the preparation of the PK outside the classroom.

First, the PK groups will work synchronously in separated virtual rooms in class. An adaptation of the cooperative learning technique Numbered Heads Together (Kagan, 1992) will be used. This technique consists of four steps:

1. Each student in the group will get a number, e.g., if the group has four members: 1, 2, 3, or 4.
2. The teacher will ask questions about the PK planning: the objective of the PK, the topic and subtopics, the structure of the presentation, the type of images, the linguistic and non-linguistic resources used to engage the audience, and the members of the group that will be responsible for designing and presenting each slide.
3. The members of the group will put their “heads together” to discuss and come up with answers.
4. The teacher will call a number (e.g., from 1 to 4), and the person with that number will explain their group’s answers.

This technique will encourage successful group work for two reasons. All members will need to know and be ready to explain the group’s answers. In addition, during the discussion, they will help themselves and their whole group since the response belongs to the whole group, not just to the group member giving it. In our proposal, PK groups will be engaged in about 30 minute-discussion. Then, the person with the number called by the teacher will explain their group’s answers to the class in 2 minutes maximum through audio and video (Step 9). In the next step of the process, the learners will design the PK and will practice it individually and in a group. The learners will have two weeks to do it outside the classroom (Step 10).

The final stage of the model, aligned with the previous stages, tries to facilitate the teacher’s adaptation of the task from the face-to-face context to the virtual one.

#### *Presenting and evaluating learners’ PechaKucha in the EMI class*

The last part of the task will involve the presentation and evaluation of the learners’ PKs. This will be done in the EMI class, and the ESP and EMI teachers and the learners will take part.

#### *D) PechaKucha presentations and question-and-answer sessions*

The members of each PK group will turn on their cameras to present their PKs in the virtual class. The teachers could also ask learners to video record their PKs in advance with the condition that they do it as they would do it in class; that is, all the members of the group will have to be in front of the camera when another member of the group is presenting. In this case, videos will be watched synchronously by the whole group.

We strongly recommend not to follow the two procedures simultaneously with the same class group as some contextual factors may influence PKs presentations and, consequently, the evaluation of the learners’ performance. In the first situation, live presentations will be similar to those they could make in a face-to-face setting. The main difference will be the lack of eye contact with the audience, which may influence their performance. In the second situation, we identify two main influencing factors:

lack of immediacy as regards time and audience. That is, learners could video record the PK as many times as necessary and/or edit it before submitting it. Besides, not having an immediate audience will create an “artificial” situation when presenting the PK that may discomfort some learners.

After presenting each PK, the EMI teacher will open a question-and-answer session to the whole group. In a face-to-face situation, the discussion session will be usually carried out orally; however, in the virtual setting, learners will also have the opportunity to write their questions and comments on the chat, which will facilitate and possibly increase interaction.

### *E) Evaluating PechaKucha presentations*

The task will finish with the evaluation of the PKs. A rubric will be designed to evaluate the PK presentations. Its design will be based on the guidelines for effective PK presentations that include six main dimensions: content, language, format, visual aids, synchronization of speech and visual aids, and engagement (Annex G). The ESP and EMI teachers will work together in the design of the rubric.

CoRubrics application will be used to systematize, with the help of software, the evaluation process comprising: self-evaluation, peer evaluation, and ESP-EMI team teachers evaluation. The ESP teacher will be invited to this session. A single teacher evaluation will be given although they will work collaboratively in the process, i.e., the ESP teacher will evaluate language and format, the EMI teacher will evaluate the content, and both together will evaluate visual aids synchronization of speech and visual aids and engagement. CoRubrics will allow these stakeholders to evaluate the PKs using the same electronic form as the rubric. The application will automatically and immediately calculate the final mark according to the weight given to the evaluation of each agent (i.e., self, peer, and teacher evaluation) involved in the process. The PK groups will receive their mark immediately after the end of the session.

In the face-to-face context, alternatively, the rubric could be completed in paper and pen format, with the consequent manual calculation of the final mark. This setting would benefit from the professional development of teachers involved in online teaching who could transfer tools (such as the use of CoRubrics and other software mentioned in the proposal) and practices employed in live online lectures to the face-to-face lectures.

## **Conclusions**

With the Covid-19 outbreak, many universities have been forced to provide adaptive responses to continue delivering lectures. This article has provided a detailed pedagogical adaptation from the face-to-face lecture to the online lecture. For this purpose, we have chosen the audiovisual PK presentation, conceived as a highly interactive and engaging type of spoken genre. The pedagogical proposal has been devised following a multimodal genre-based approach and adopting a team-teaching approach (ESP-EMI teachers). As reported, the pedagogical proposal attempts to engage learners in three stages to construct the PK presentation. In so doing, learners are provided with opportunities to develop their communicative skills, especially speaking, while becoming aware of the variety of semiotic resources that intervene in the meaning-making process of a

PK. This proposal tries to foster learners' multimodal awareness, which is necessary for them to effectively communicate not only in academic domains, like the EMI classroom but also in their future professional settings. Learners not only will understand the importance of multimodality but also produce a multimodal artifact, i.e., a PK, and become aware of the importance of interacting and engaging with the audience during oral presentations.

Concerning the ESP-EMI team teaching suggested in this proposal, we consider that cooperation between the language teacher and the content teacher is necessary to best support learners to succeed in the EMI classroom. The ESP classroom offers learners rich opportunities to deal with, for example, communicative skills and specialized and academic knowledge, and specific genres that will be required in EMI courses. Therefore, ESP-EMI team teaching becomes prominent to enhance learners' overall communicative competence and professional development in ELF. Additionally, this proposal thoroughly explicates how to proceed with the adaptation from the face-to-face to the online teaching-learning process, the required methodological shift, as well as the variety of digital and technology-enhanced teaching and learning recourses that can be employed. Thus, this article points to the importance of preparing learners for internationalized professional markets that will be characterized by technology and the use of ELF. Furthermore, regarding teachers, this study also calls for professional development and/or training programs online teaching, with special attention paid to the development of (multimodal) interactional competence. The proposal presented here has been designed to parallel, as far as possible, face-to-face contexts. Nevertheless, it should be noted that teaching online may pose some challenges, such as group creation and management, using some new tools and videoconferencing systems, and more importantly, fostering and managing interaction in the live online lectures.

This study is not without limitations, the main one being that the proposal has not been implemented yet. Its implementation would certainly shed some light on the potential of the adaptation of this task from the physical to the virtual context and teachers' and learners' involvement in an online context. Further research would be necessary to explore the effectiveness of this proposal.

## References

- Anthony, L. (2018). *Introducing English for specific purposes*. Routledge.
- Arnó-Macià, E., & Aguilar, M. (2018). ESP, EMI and interculturality: How internationalised are university curricula in Catalonia?. *ESP Today*, 6(2), 184–207. <https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2018.6.2.3>
- Caldwell, J. E. (2007). Clickers in the large classroom: current research and best-practice tips. *CBE-Life Science Education*, 6(1), 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.06-12-0205>
- Cocchetta, F. (2018). Developing university students' multimodal communicative competence: Field research into multimodal text studies in English. *System*, 77, 19–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.01.004>
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*. Routledge.

- Council of Europe. (2018). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume with new descriptors*. <https://rm.coe.int/cefr-companion-volume-with-new-descriptors-2018/1680787989>
- Courtney Klentzin, J., Bounds Paladino, E., Johnston, B., & Devine, C. (2010). Pecha Kucha: using “lightning talk” in university instruction. *Reference Services Review*, 38(1), 158–167. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00907321011020798>
- De Bono, E. (2017). *Six thinking hats*. (4th ed.). Penguin.
- Dreyfus, S. J., Humphrey, S., Mahboob, A., & Martin, J. R. (2015). *Genre pedagogy in higher education: The SLATE project*. Palgrave.
- Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (1999). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 2(2–3), 87–105. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516\(00\)00016-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6)
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride, & Holmes, J. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (269–293). Penguin.
- Kagan, S. (1992). *Cooperative learning* (7th ed.). Resources for Teachers, Inc.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2018). Fostering team teaching: Mapping out a research agenda for English-medium instruction at university level. *Language Teaching*, 51(3): 400–416. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000113>
- Macaro, E. (2018). *English medium instruction: Content and language in policy and practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Mills, K. A., & Unsworth, L. (2017). Multimodal literacy. In G.W. Noblit (Ed.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of education*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.232>
- Mortiboys, A. (2012). *Teaching with emotional intelligence: A step-by-step guide for higher and further education professionals*. Routledge.
- Thurlow, C., Lengel, L., & Tomic, A. (2004). *Computer mediated communication*. Sage.
- Querol-Julián, M. (2021). How does digital context influence interaction in large live online lectures? The case of English-medium instruction. *European Journal of English Studies*.
- Querol-Julián, M., & Fortanet-Gómez, I. (2019). Collaborative teaching and learning of interactive multimodal spoken academic genres for doctoral students. *International Journal of English Studies*, 19(2), 61–82. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.348911>
- Royce, T. (2002). Multimodality in the TESOL classroom: Exploring visual-verbal synergy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(2), 191–205. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588330>
- Ruiz-Madrid, N., & Valeiras-Jurado, J. (2020). Developing multimodal communicative competence in emerging academic and professional genres. *International Journal of English Studies*, 20(1), 27–50. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.401481>

## Annexes

### Annex A: Summary of the pedagogical proposal

Stage 1

*Modelling and joint deconstruction of PechaKucha presentations in live lectures. (ESP class)*

		Face-to-face lecture		Live online lecture		
		Time	Activity, language, and language skills	Time		
<b>Modelling and Joint deconstruction</b>	<b>from learners' previous experience and/or predictions</b>	Step 1. <b>Self-reflection</b>	1 week [1 week before Session 1]	<i>Online survey</i> EAP Reading and writing		1 week [2 weeks before Session 1]
		Step 2. <b>Discussion</b>	15 min [Session 1]	<i>Synchronous whole group discussion in class</i> EAP Listening, speaking, and interacting	<i>Asynchronous online discussion through audio chat</i>	1 week [1 week before Session 1]
	<b>from data analysis</b>	Step 3. <b>Teacher's PK</b>	6.40 min [Session 1]	<i>Synchronous (video) watching in class</i> EAP Listening		6.40 min [Session 1]
		Step 4. <b>Discussion</b>	15 min [Session 1]	<i>Synchronous whole group discussion in class enhanced by CRS</i> EAP Reading, writing, listening, speaking, and interacting		15 min [Session 1]
		Step 5. <b>Topic-specific PK</b>	13.20 min [Session 1]	<i>Synchronous video watching in class (soundless and with sound)</i> ESP Multimodal listening		13.20 min [Session 1]
		Step 6. <b>Discussion</b>	30 min [Session 1]	<i>Synchronous discussion in small groups (video soundless and with sound)</i> EAP & ESP Reading, writing, listening, speaking, and interacting		30 min [Session 1]
	15 min [Session 1]		<i>Synchronous whole group discussion</i> EAP & ESP Reading, writing, listening, speaking, and interacting		15 min [Session 1]	

## Stage 2

*Joint construction of PechaKucha presentations in live lectures. (ESP class)*

		<b>Face-to-face lecture</b>		<b>Live online lecture</b>
		<b>Time</b>	<b>Activity, language, and language skills</b>	<b>Time</b>
<b>Joint construction</b>	Step 7. <b>Discussion</b>	25 min [Session 1]	<i>Synchronous Six Thinking Hats group discussion in class</i> EAP & ESP Reading, writing, listening, speaking, and interacting	40 min [Session 1]
	Step 8. <b>Guideline for effective PK presentations</b>	20 min [Session 2]	<i>Synchronous small group elaboration</i> EAP Reading, writing, listening, speaking, and interacting	20 min [Session 2]

## Stage 3

*Independent construction of PechaKucha presentations in live lectures. (ESP class)*

		<b>Face-to-face and live online lecture</b>		
		<b>Activity, language, and language skills</b>		<b>Time</b>
<b>Independent construction</b>	Step 9. <b>PK planning</b>	<i>Synchronous Numbered Heads Together discussion in small groups</i> EAP & ESP Reading, writing, listening, speaking, and interacting		40 min [Session 2]
	Step 10. <b>PK preparation &amp; practice</b>	<i>Asynchronous and synchronous work</i> EAP & ESP Reading, writing, listening, speaking, and interacting		2 weeks [after Session 2 and before Session 3]

Learners' PechaKucha presentations and discussion. (EMI class)

		<b>Face-to-face lecture</b>	<b>Live online lecture</b>	<b>Time</b>
		<b>Activity, language, and language skills</b>		
<b>Learners' PK presentations</b>	<i>Synchronous presentations watching</i>		<i>Asynchronous o Synchronous presentations</i>	60 min [Session 3]
	EAP Listening, speaking			
<b>Question &amp; answer session</b>	<i>Synchronous discussion</i>		Reading, writing, listening, speaking, interacting	30 min [Session 3]
	EAP & ESP Listening, interacting, speaking,			

### Annex B: Survey: Self-reflection on oral presentations (Step 1)

- 
1. How important do you think are visual aids (slides) that support your oral presentations?  
 Not very important     Slightly important     Important     Quite important     Very important

Briefly justify your answer.

---

2. Do you refer to the content of the slides during your oral presentation?  
 Never     Rarely     Sometimes     Often     Always

If you refer to it, briefly explain how you do it.

---

3. Do you interact with the audience during your oral presentation?  
 Never     Rarely     Sometimes     Often     Always

If you interact, briefly explain how you do it.

---

4. How important do you think is the use of hand gestures, facial expression, posture, intonation, word/ syllable stress, etc. when presenting?  
 Not very important     Slightly important     Important     Quite important     Very important

Briefly justify your answer.

---

5. How important do you think is to organise your speech before presenting?  
 Not very important     Slightly important     Important     Quite important     Very important

Briefly justify your answer.

---

6. How important do you think is to practise before presenting?  
 Not very important     Slightly important     Important     Quite important     Very important

Briefly justify your answer.

---

### **Annex C: Repertoire of linguistic and non-linguistic semiotic resources to foster engagement during a Pechakucha presentation in ELF in ESP/EMI contexts (Step 3)**

---

#### **linguistic resources to interact with the audience and visual aids**

---

Rhetorical questions that do not expect a direct response  
 Self-personal references (e.g., “I live in the city centre”)  
 Self-professional references (e.g., “my project/ design”)  
 Referential “you” to address the audience directly (e.g., “I think most of you...”)  
 Impersonal “you” to address anyone or everyone in general not a person in particular (e.g., “you should visit it”)  
 Inclusive “we”, presenter and audience as a community (e.g., “we as architects”)  
 Exclusive “we”, the professional community the presenter belongs to (e.g., “we developed our project”)  
 Jokes  
 Cultural references  
 References to the audience’ culture  
 Draw audience attention to visuals (e.g., “as you/we can see...”, “what you see...”)

---

#### **non-linguistic resources**

---

- Eye contact with audience
  - Body position (e.g., front position)
  - Focus on camera
  - Facial expression
  - Hands and arms gestures
  - Diction
  - Emphasis on key information (e.g., words, syllables)
  - Tone of voice
  - Speech rate
  - Intonation
  - Pauses
- 

### **Annex D: Questions to guide discussion on an authentic Pechakucha (Step 3)**

---

#### **After watching video soundless**

---

1. Does the PK follow the format 20x20?
  2. What do you think body language tells you about the presenter? Do you think he/she is nervous, calm, insecure, confident? Why?
  3. What kind of information do the slides contain?
  4. Do you think the images are suitable for a professional context?
  5. Do you think that the content of the slide is attractive to the audience? Why?
- 

#### **After watching video with sound**

---

6. Does the presenter’s speech start and finish at the same time as the slide he/she is referring to does? Does the presenter remain silent waiting for the next slide to come up? Does the presenter refer to the content of a slide that has not appeared yet? Does the presenter refer to the content of a slide that has already disappeared?
  7. Does the content of the speech always refer to the content of the slide that accompanies it?
  8. What linguistic and non-linguistics strategies does the presenter use to interact with the audience?
  9. What linguistic and non-linguistics strategies does the presenter use to interact with
-

---

visual aids?

---

10. Do you think the presenter has practised before presenting? Why?

---

### **Annex E: Questions to guide Six Thinking Hats discussion on Pechakucha presentations (Step 7)**

White hat (facts)	<p>What is the PK presentations format?</p> <p>What is the content of the slides mostly?</p> <p>What kind of images are used?</p> <p>Are visual aids and speech synchronised in time and content?</p>
Red hat (feelings/emotions)	<p>How does presenter may feel when preparing the PK? Why?</p> <p>How does presenter may feel when presenting the PK? Why?</p> <p>How does the audience may feel when attending a PK presentation? Why?</p>
Yellow hat (benefits)	<p>What can be the benefits of preparing a PK?</p> <p>What can be the benefits of presenting a PK?</p> <p>What can be the benefits of attending a PK presentation?</p>
Black hat (difficulties/challenges)	<p>What can be the difficulties and/or challenges of preparing a PK?</p> <p>What can be the difficulties and/or challenges of presenting a PK?</p> <p>What can be the difficulties and/or challenges of attending a PK presentation?</p>
Green hat (solutions)	<p>How can we overcome the difficulties and/or challenges of preparing a PK?</p> <p>How can we overcome the difficulties and/or challenges of making a PK presentation?</p> <p>How can we overcome the difficulties and/or challenges of attending a PK presentation?</p>
Blue (manage discussion and draw conclusions)	<p>How can the discussion be organised in terms of time? Should each hat have a given time to present its position?</p> <p>Which should be the order of participation of the different hats?</p> <p>What is the best way to draw and agree on the conclusions?</p>

### **Annex F: Guidelines template for effective PechaKucha presentations in ELF in ESP/EMI contexts (Step 8)**

Content	
Language	
Format	
Visual aids design	
Synchronisation of speech and visual aids (temporal and conceptual)	
Engagement	Interaction with the audience
	Interaction with visual aids
Practise before presenting	

**Annex G: Evaluation rubric for Pechakucha presentations in ELF in ESP/EMI contexts**

(The rubric has been validated by three experts in the field)

		Level 1 (D)	Level 2 (C)	Level 3 (B)	Level 4 (A)
Content	Knowledge command	Limited knowledge of the topic rarely supported by clear explanations	Sufficient knowledge of the topic sometimes supported by clear explanations	Good knowledge of the topic usually supported by clear explanations	Full knowledge of the topic generally supported by clear explanations
	Knowledge transmission	Limited ability to transfer knowledge	Sufficient ability to transfer knowledge	Good ability to transfer knowledge	High ability to transfer knowledge
	Critical thinking	Poor reflection supported with flawed arguments	Poor reflection supported with valid arguments	Good reflection from a critical perspective supported with strong arguments	Deep reflection from a critical perspective supported with strong arguments
	Coherence and cohesion	Limited and not always adequate use of basic cohesion and cohesive devices	Limited but adequate use of basic cohesion and cohesive devices	Mostly adequate use of a range of cohesion and cohesive devices	Adequate use of a range of cohesion and cohesive devices
Language	Grammar and lexicon	Limited grammar control of simple and complex forms Limited range of vocabulary on specialized topics	Sufficient grammar control of simple and complex forms Sufficient range of vocabulary on specialized topics	Good grammar control of both simple and complex forms Good range of vocabulary on specialized topics	High grammar control of complex forms Wide range of vocabulary on specialized topics.
	Intelligibility	Speech is rarely well-paced, fluid, and clear. Many difficulties with pronunciation or intonation patterns affect overall comprehension	Speech is sometimes well-paced, fluid, and clear. Some difficulties with pronunciation or intonation patterns affect overall comprehension	Speech is often well-paced, fluid, and clear. Some difficulties with pronunciation or intonation patterns do not affect overall comprehension	Speech is generally well-paced, fluid, and clear. Minor difficulties with pronunciation or intonation patterns do not affect overall comprehension
	Format	The presentation hardly follows the 20x20 format	The presentation partially follows the 20x20 format	The presentation mainly follows the 20x20 format	The presentation follows the 20x20 format

	Visual aids	Few of the visual elements (images, text) are relevant to support the speech The complexity and density of the visual aids is hardly adequate	Some of the visual elements (images, text) are relevant to support the speech The complexity and density of the visual aids is sometimes adequate	Many of the visual elements (images, text) are relevant to support the speech The complexity and density of the visual aids is usually adequate	Most of all the visual elements (images, text) are relevant to support the speech The complexity and density of the visual aids is fully adequate
	Synchronisation of speech and visual aids	Few of slides are synchronised with speech	Some of slides are synchronised with speech	Many of slides are synchronised with speech	Most of all slides are synchronised with speech
Engagement	Interaction with the audience	Linguistic and non-linguistic interactional resources are very rarely used	Linguistic and non-linguistic interactional resources rarely used	Linguistic and non-linguistic interactional resources are occasionally used	Linguistic and non-linguistic interactional resources are frequently used
	Interaction with the visual aids	Linguistic and non-linguistic interactional resources are very rarely used	Linguistic and non-linguistic interactional resources rarely used	Linguistic and non-linguistic interactional resources are occasionally used	Linguistic and non-linguistic interactional resources are frequently used