# PRISMA 2020 Main Checklist

| **Topic** | **No.** | **Item** | **Location where item is reported** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TITLE** |  |  |  |
| **Title** | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review. | - YouTube as a Learning Tool to Improve Students’ Speaking Skills as Perceived by EFL Teachers in Secondary School |
| **ABSTRACT** |  |  |  |
| **Abstract** | 2 | See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist |  |
| **INTRODUCTION** |  |  |  |
| **Rationale** | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge. | - |
| **Objectives** | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses. | - This study aims to identify English language teachers’ perceptions of using YouTube in developing speaking skill, to identify their attitudes towards YouTube usage and to identify the best ways to use YouTube in EFL classes in the secondary school in Saudi Arabia. |
| **METHODS** |  |  |  |
| **Eligibility criteria** | 5 | Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses. | - |
| **Information sources** | 6 | Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted. | - |
| **Search strategy** | 7 | Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used. | - |
| **Selection process** | 8 | Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | - |
| **Data collection process** | 9 | Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | -page 14 |
| **Data items** | 10a | List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect. | - |
|  | 10b | List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information. | - |
| **Study risk of bias assessment** | 11 | Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | - |
| **Effect measures** | 12 | Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results. | - |
| **Synthesis methods** | 13a | Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item 5)). | - |
|  | 13b | Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions. | -page 14 |
| 13c | Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses. | - |
| 13d | Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used. | -page 15 |
| 13e | Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression). | - |
| 13f | Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results. | -page 15 |
| **Reporting bias assessment** | 14 | Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases). | - |
| **Certainty assessment** | 15 | Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome. | - |
| **RESULTS** |  |  |  |
| **Study selection** | 16a | Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram. | - |
|  | 16b | Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded. | - |
| **Study characteristics** | 17 | Cite each included study and present its characteristics. | - |
| **Risk of bias in studies** | 18 | Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study. | - |
| **Results of individual studies** | 19 | For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots. | -page 16 |
| **Results of syntheses** | 20a | For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies. | -page 16 |
|  | 20b | Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect. | - |
| 20c | Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results. | - |
| 20d | Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results. | -- |
| **Reporting biases** | 21 | Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed. | - |
| **Certainty of evidence** | 22 | Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed. | - |
| **DISCUSSION** |  |  |  |
| **Discussion** | 23a | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence. | - page 16 |
|  | 23b | Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review. | -page 16 |
| 23c | Discuss any limitations of the review processes used. | -page 16 |
| 23d | Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research. | -page 16 |
| **OTHER INFORMATION** |  |  |  |
| **Registration and protocol** | 24a | Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered. | - |
|  | 24b | Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared. | - |
| 24c | Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol. | - |
| **Support** | 25 | Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review. | - |
| **Competing interests** | 26 | Declare any competing interests of review authors. | - |
| **Availability of data, code and other materials** | 27 | Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review. | - |

YouTube has been shown to be a rich source for teaching speaking in EFL contexts. However, the use of YouTube is developing speaking skills is still understudied in the Saudi EFL context. The full use and awardees of YouTube resources are not well articulated by many EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia. This study attempted to examine the perceptions of English instructors of using YouTube to improve the speaking skills of the students in the secondary stage in Saudi Arabia. The English instructors’ attitudes towards YouTube and the best ways to use YouTube in the class were examined. The descriptive and analytical approaches have been applied in order to design the research. For data collection, a questionnaire has been designed to addresses the research topic. It was distributed on a sample of English language instructors (30 EFL instructors) in the secondary stage in Riyadh city in Saudi Arabia. The findings of the study showed that English language instructors see that YouTube is a highly beneficial instructional tool in improving the speaking skills of the secondary school students. It was found that the instructors have positive attitudes towards YouTube. They expressed that YouTube lessens the students’ anxiety and allow the students to learn faster, retain attention for a long time and motivates the students to learn the language. On the other hand, the findings showed that YouTube can be used in different ways in the class such as asking the students to comment on a particular video or to give some details, discuss, pose questions and give answers. YouTube gives a real chance for the students to interact in the class and to speak freely and get improved in pronunciation. The study recommended using YouTube as an integral instructive tool in English language classes. Key words: YouTube, Speaking skill, EFL, Attitudes, Instructors
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