

January 2019

Public Speaking Tasks across the University Curriculum

Gina Iberri-Shea

United States Air Force Academy, gina.iberri-shea@usafa.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/ctamj>

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Iberri-Shea, G. (2019). Public speaking tasks across the university curriculum. *Communication and Theater Association of Minnesota Journal*, 43, 73-100.

This General Interest is brought to you for free and open access by Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Communication and Theater Association of Minnesota Journal* by an authorized editor of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Public Speaking Tasks across the University Curriculum

Gina Iberri-Shea

Associate Professor

United States Air Force Academy

gina.iberri-shea@usafa.edu

Abstract

Oral communication proficiency is often highlighted as an outcome of U.S. university curriculum, yet it is often unclear how it manifests in the classroom. This paper presents a series of surveys investigating oral communication tasks across the university. The focus of the analysis is on public speaking tasks occurring across disciplines. Results demonstrate that there is a wide range of tasks found in university syllabi, that group and individual presentations are the most prominent, and that communication studies incorporates task types unique to the discipline. Descriptions of the task types found within disciplines are provided, along with an analysis of situational characteristics. In combination, these surveys provide a picture of where public speaking tasks are occurring in the university and what types of tasks are assigned.

Keywords: *Public Speaking, Classroom Discourse, Oral Communication, University Curriculum, Student Speech*

Oral communication is often included as part of the mission statement or goals of general education for undergraduate programs in the United States, yet it is often unclear how this is translated in the curriculum. The Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University (1998) stated that undergraduate education must include strong written and oral communication skills, and that these skills should be integrated in content courses. Still, many of the curricular policies supporting oral communication in higher education are opaque. An increased focus on academic oral communication is an important step toward our understanding of students' language needs. Specifically, there is growing support for

investigations of academic public speech in the university. Mauranen (2002) has pointed to an increasing demand for presentation skills in academia, and when Kim (2006) asked international graduate students to evaluate skills they felt were crucial to academic success, formal oral presentations, along with listening comprehension, were named most important in graduate study. Additionally, Clennel (1999) cited presentation as a useful English for academic purposes activity, and an increase in spoken language tasks has been promoted in EFL curricula (Carter, Goold, & Madeley, 1993). Although most of the research on academic public speech has relied on teaching, a few studies have examined student presentations. These studies have concentrated on discipline specific language and the unique characteristics of public presentation. Darling (2005) studied public presentation in the Mechanical Engineering curriculum and described discipline specific language that focused on technology and away from personal experience. Chanock (2005) looked at oral presentations in archaeology and compared, or contrasted, this oral register with disciplinary writing. The observations related to effective presentations utilizing an “oral grammar,” which embodied a less distancing style when translating the information from a written to an oral mode. Yet, despite this recent attention toward academic public speech, and institutional objectives supporting improved performance, it is unclear how it is realized in the curriculum.

Instruction and assessment issues have heavily influenced the perceptions of academics with respect to the “place” of oral communication in the curriculum. This discussion of “place” is one of the primary issues presented in the literature. There are three main positions to this debate: oral communication should uniquely be taught within communication departments, oral communication should be incorporated across the curriculum, and oral communication needs to be experienced both as a subject and across disciplines. Oral communication across the

curriculum (OCXC) is part of a larger movement, communication across the curriculum, which incorporates communication assignments into courses across disciplines with the goal of enhanced education and communication skills. The advantages and disadvantages of oral communication across the curriculum were discussed in Cronin, Grice, and Palmerton (2000), who presented the benefits of increased learning, the dangers of inexperienced staff, and the lack of assessment methods. Advocates of OCXC have compared it to writing across the curriculum (WAC). While pointing out theoretical parallels, Morello (2000) underlined important distinctions that may disenfranchise OCXC such as a lack of process oriented activities. Dannels (2001) presented a slightly different approach to OCXC, with communication in the disciplines, and argued that context is imbedded in communication and that discipline specific policy would enhance instruction. Arguments for oral communication across the curriculum have often centered on the variation in oral communication practices in different academic contexts. Crosling and Ward (2002) studied the communication needs of business students and found that they required multiple forms of communication in various contexts. Dannels (2002) looked at oral communication in engineering, identifying themes specific to the discipline, and The Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University (1998) concluded that communication skills should be integrated in all subject matter, in every course.

There are arguments against oral communication across the curriculum as well. Schneider (1999) has criticized OCXC as a threat to the discipline. The author posited that content instructors have little or no experience with the discipline of communication, and that integrity is lost. Without training in the instruction and assessment of communication, inclusion in the curriculum may be detrimental. He also voices concerns about the impact that teaching communication in content classes may have on support for communication departments. Others

have argued that oral communication activities will absorb finite classroom hours that should be devoted to content (Cronin et al., 2000).

The process of finding the place where oral communication fits into the curriculum was elaborated in Engleberg (2001), where a general education course was proposed in addition to OCXC. The author contends that both are required for adequate development of oral communication. The inclusion of a required general education course augmented by OCXC was the recommendation made by the National Communication Association (Schneider, 1999), but there is no general consensus on the best curricular strategy.

With effective oral communication emphasized in the mission statements and goals put forward by institutions, it is important to understand how this educational value is expressed through policy and practice. Questions regarding the “place” of oral communication in the curriculum have not yet been fully answered in the university context. To begin to answer these questions, the current study describes the public speaking practices in classrooms at one university in the southwestern United States. This study contained three surveys, the third of which will be the focus of this paper. The first two surveys were sent to instructors to gather information about the presence of public speaking tasks across the university. Once the presence of public speaking was established, a task assignment survey was conducted, reviewing course syllabi from the disciplines with the greatest response. The overall purpose of these surveys was to gain an understanding of the public speaking tasks that students perform, and to inform further data collection. The disciplinary review of syllabi allowed for a more complete understanding of potential variation related to discipline, context, and task.

Survey 1: Oral Communication in the University

In order to explore what types of oral communication occur in the university, and better understand the tasks involved, an initial survey was conducted. A convenience sample of instructors and professors from each college on campus, and teaching assistants in the English department, were contacted and asked to describe spoken activities and their assessment of oral communication in courses they teach. The term “public speaking” was not used in this survey. The goal of this survey was to determine whether or not public speaking was included as part of the oral communication in university classrooms, and to see if instructors identified public speaking as a classroom activity when asked about oral communication. Since the objective was simply to determine the presence of public speaking in the curriculum, no disciplines were targeted or excluded. The survey instrument contained questions related to the courses in which oral communication is included, description of activities and assessments, definitions of oral communication, and open comments about oral communication in the curriculum (see Appendix A). The content of the survey was designed to explore the types of oral communication occurring in the curriculum while leaving definitions, activities, and assessment measures open to description by the respondents.

The responses to survey questions were thematically organized according to content, and differences between respondents were recorded. Twenty-four of the 125 surveys were returned, and of these, 22 instructors responded that oral communication activities were used in their classes. Instructors commented on 28 different courses, distributed across business administration, communication, English, natural science, education, forestry, health promotions, hotel and restaurant management, and political science.

The most common activity type was the group presentation, listed by respondents from eight of nine departments. Respondents from the School of Communication described the widest variety of tasks, detailing the use of 8 of the 11 activities described across disciplines. Speaking activities varied in the perceived amount of class time used (5%-100%, M= 37%), and the percentage of the student's final grade (3%-80%, M=27%); there were not enough responses to these questions to indicate an average for individual departments.

Overall, the survey of oral communication in the university supported the assumption that public speaking is occurring within content courses across the curriculum. This preliminary survey suggested that there are a number of classroom tasks that may be described as public speaking and that the type and frequency of these tasks may vary by discipline. These preliminary results supported further investigation of student public speaking in the university, and led to a more focused survey of public speaking tasks.

Survey 2: Public Speaking in University Classrooms

The second survey was conducted to determine the extent and variation among public speaking tasks required in university courses across campus. In order to provide a data point for comparison, and to target disciplines that would be most fruitful for future analysis, the second survey mirrored discipline selection of the TOEFL 2000 Spoken and Written Academic Language (T2K-SWAL) corpus.¹ This second survey requested information only on public speaking tasks, with the goal of obtaining more specific information on the variation and frequency of public speaking tasks in university classrooms. The survey was distributed to

¹ The T2K-SWAL project was sponsored by the Educational Testing Service, and included the construction of a large corpus of spoken and written university registers and the description of language use in the university based on analysis of that corpus. The corpus was designed to represent major academic disciplines, academic levels, and both academic and institutional registers. The corpus was collected from four U.S. geographic regions: west coast, rocky mountain west, mid-west, and the deep south. The corpus was collected from four types of academic institutions: teacher's college, mid-size regional university, urban research university, and a Research 1 university (Biber, 2006).

major academic disciplines (business, education, natural science, social science, engineering, humanities), and in the case of large disciplines with a wide range of sub disciplines (i.e. natural science, social science), a department within each discipline was chosen to represent the discipline according to the number of faculty listed on the department website and/or brochure. These broader disciplines were represented by biology and political science. These selections were made in order to control for sub-disciplinary variation and to maximize response rates. While still a discipline of interest, communication was excluded from this second survey, as the frequency and range of tasks had already been established in the initial survey.

The survey provided a brief summary of the research and consisted of two questions on public speaking activities in the classroom: 1) Do any public speaking activities occur in the classes you teach? 2) What types of activities are included in which courses? Thirty-one faculty provided information on 51 classes, with positive responses from faculty in education, business administration, biology, political science, and engineering. Individual and group presentations of projects were the most frequently cited activity types, although the range of public speech activities reported included lesson demonstration, poster presentations, presentation of readings, moot court, and leading the class in a game. In order to gain information on the contextual elements surrounding university student public speech, a third survey targeting course syllabi was conducted.

Survey 3: Course Syllabi

In addition to the surveys designed to determine where student public speech was happening, an in-depth survey of course syllabi was conducted in five disciplines. These disciplines were selected based on the response rates of earlier inquiry. Education and business had reported the highest frequencies of public speaking activities, followed by biology and

political science. Each discipline included in collection reported public speaking activities in a minimum of three distinct courses. The goal of this survey was to better understand the range of tasks taking place in university classrooms across the curriculum. Communication studies was included for comparison, and in order to gain a fuller picture of the activities students might encounter both across the curriculum and within the department that houses the core course. This survey provided information at two levels: first, a review of public speech tasks in business and education supplied information on the relevant context, discipline, and task characteristics; second, the inclusion of three additional disciplines in the survey of course syllabi allowed for a more complete picture of the types of public speech tasks students are likely to encounter. The survey of course syllabi in business administration was conducted first and is the most extensive, followed by education, biology, communication studies, and political science.

Survey of Student Public Speech Activities in Business Administration Courses

All course syllabi for one semester were collected from the College of Business Administration. This is the most extensive survey, as syllabi from the entire college were centralized and available. Each syllabus was reviewed, and all spoken tasks assigned or described in the syllabus were separated. A working definition of student produced academic public speech was developed and used to help categorize speaking activities. Since the purpose of this survey was to determine the types of public speech activities that occur in the classroom, public speaking was defined broadly as those activities where one or more students speak in front of an audience of one or more observers. When the task description was not explicit enough to categorize and describe the activity, additional information was collected through instructor interviews, course websites, and additional project documentation.

Syllabi were collected from courses at all levels in the college, resulting in information collected for 140 sections of 77 distinct courses, taught by 68 faculty members. The College of Business Administration is represented by six departments: accounting, computer information systems, economics, finance, management, and marketing.

Results. Results of this analysis show that 47% (n=36) of courses taught and 46% (n=65) of the class sections included at least one public speaking activity. This number is actually quite high considering the inclusion of several mathematics and technical courses offered in the school. There was a clear difference in the frequency of public speaking activities based on the level of the business courses, with most student produced public speaking occurring in upper division and graduate courses. See Table 1 for a breakdown of courses reporting public speaking activities at each instructional level. Public speaking activities were assigned the most in management courses, which accounted for 38 of the 65 positive responses.

Table 1: Level breakdown of distinct courses reporting public speaking (ps)

Level	Courses reporting ps	Courses not reporting ps	Total # of courses	% of courses reporting at least 1 ps activity
100	2	3	5	40%
200	1	8	9	11%
300	15	17	32	47%
400	12	9	21	57%
Graduate	6	4	10	60%
Total	36	41	77	47%

Nine different student produced public speech activities were identified based on the descriptions provided in the data. These included both individual and group presentation of projects, readings, and instructional activities. The length of speaking time varied from less than 5 to 50 minutes for an individual presentation and 15 to 75 minutes for a group presentation. Among those courses that did include student public speech activities, the number of speaking activities in the class ranged from 1 to 17 ($m=2.38$, $s.d. = 2.58$). See Table 2 for the distribution of public speaking tasks across class sections.

Table 2: Public speaking (ps) tasks distributed across class sections

Level	Class section with 1 ps activity	Class sections with >1 ps activity	Total class sections reporting ps activities
100	2	0	2
200	1	0	1
300	20	18	38
400	11	7	18
Graduate	3	3	6
Total	37	28	65

Group project presentations made up the majority of assigned public speaking tasks, followed by individual presentations. Two of the presentations were explicitly described as formal, and the majority of the presentations required business casual or business attire. Additional tasks found in the College of Business Administration included: group course readings/discussion leader, group course content instruction, group problem demonstration,

group debate, individual mock interviews, individual outside readings, and individuals presenting a course of action/solution.

Survey of Course Syllabi in Education

Within the College of Education, syllabi were collected from 31 sections of 23 distinct undergraduate courses, taught by 26 faculty members during one semester. Using the same working definition of student produced academic public speech developed during the survey in business administration, speaking activities were categorized. When the task description was not explicit enough to categorize, additional information was collected through interviews and project documentation.

Results. In the surveyed courses, 35 public speaking assignments were found. These assignments were made up of individual project presentations, role-play, group project presentations, groups presenting course content, and a group poetry slam presentation. Due to the nature of the discipline, many of the projects included the demonstration of instructional activities. Presentations which included instructional demonstration were categorized as project demonstrations when the students created, collected, or analyzed information for their presentations. Activities where students presented material from the textbook, assigned readings, or lecture were categorized as presentation of course content. The group poetry slam presentation was separated from the group project presentations because it was the only activity that was performance based. All of the student produced public speech activities found in the college occurred in upper division courses. It is important to note that the education curriculum includes student teaching, which occurs in K-12 classrooms outside of the university. Because this activity occurs in many locations, involves children, and happens outside of the university, the language used by student teachers in this context was not examined.

These assignments describe the public speaking tasks included in the College of Education syllabi for the reviewed semester. As in business administration, the group and individual project presentations were the most dominant tasks assigned. The review of course syllabi in education revealed disciplinary differences, as the description of projects and the types of assignments are not identical to those in business administration. Although the basic assignment (e.g. group project presentation) may be the same, the expectations, content, and intended audience vary between the two disciplines. This information helps to provide a description of the tasks required of students in these contexts. In order to expand the understanding of public speech tasks within disciplines, and to reveal similarities as well as differences across the curriculum, three additional disciplines were surveyed: biology, communication studies, and political science.

Survey of Courses in Biology, Communication Studies, and Political Science

Syllabi were collected from an additional 60 undergraduate courses in biology, communication studies, and political science, with biology and political science chosen to represent the respective natural and social science disciplines. This resulted in the review of syllabi from 89 sections of 60 distinct courses in these departments. The collection represented 80% of the courses offered during the targeted spring semester.

Results. One hundred and one assignments were found in the classes surveyed. In addition to the activity types found in business administration and education, descriptions of two new activities were found: formatted speech and moot court. These additional surveys also provided an expansion to the debate activity previously cited in one business administration course. The following (Table 3) is a summary of activities found across five disciplines.

Table 3: Public speech activities in business (BUS), education (ED), biology (BIO), communication (COM), and political science (PS).

	BUS	ED	BIO	COM	PS	Total
Formatted Speech				35		35
Group Project Presentation	67	13	3	22	5	110
Individual Project Presentation	51	17	4	12	4	88
Debate	1			7	1	9
Group Presentation of Course Content	6	2		3	3	14
Moot Court					2	2
Other/Discipline Specific	10	3				13
Total	135	35	7	79	15	271

The biology, communication studies, and political science syllabi contained many of the same types of public speaking assignments found in education and business administration, with the three additions described above. After the formatted speech categorization, individual and group project presentations made up the task types occurring most frequently. The frequent presence of group and individual project presentations among student public speech assignments is consistent across disciplines. The additional assignments also highlighted some important disciplinary differences.

In this survey, formatted speech assignments were numerous, but were described only in the communication syllabi. The communication syllabi also differed in the placement of student produced public speech activities. Whereas the highest frequency of these tasks occurred in upper division courses in all other disciplines surveyed, communication courses frequently

assigned student public speech tasks in lower division courses. In fact, 67 of the 82 activities found in the communication syllabi (82%) were assigned in lower division courses. This appears to be directly related to core curricular differences in communication studies. The communication discipline includes lower division courses on presentation and oral communication skills, and therefore is quite unlike other disciplines in the nature of the presentations assigned in these courses. Here, a much stronger focus is placed on format and delivery of the speech, as that is part of the course content. There are also several sections of the lower division core course, which is open to all majors. These differences highlight the importance of looking at disciplinary variation and point toward activities in communication as rich ground for further study. The wide gap between typical presentations in communication studies and other disciplines may support the argument for oral communication both across the curriculum and as a required course.

Analysis of Tasks in Five Disciplines

The survey of syllabi in five disciplines uncovered descriptions of a range of student public speech assignments. A number of factors were considered while analyzing and categorizing these assignments in order to target representative types. Ways of framing the situational context of a speech event have been discussed by several researchers (see Biber, 1988; Hymes, 1974), providing a method for describing the context in order to evaluate elements that are either characteristic or varied across a speech situation. These situational factors are important in describing the associations between linguistic features and characteristics of the texts. Informed by previous work and experience with public speech, the following situational characteristics were taken into consideration when evaluating the academic public speech

contexts: purpose, subject matter, format, preparation, reference, evidence, style, addressor, audience, and setting.

The purpose of the speech situation describes the intended goals or expected outcomes of the speech. In academic public speech, the purpose may be to persuade the audience or inform the audience. Subject matter is the content of the speech, which may be chosen or assigned to the speaker. Depending on the context, there may or may not be an assumption of shared knowledge on the subject matter. Additionally, the format or organization of the speech itself may follow pre-determined guidelines or adapt to the production circumstances.

The body of the speech may vary in a number of ways. The time to prepare for speaking may vary from just a few minutes to several weeks. Speakers may refer to information and sources outside of the production situation or refer to contextual elements during production. The evidence used in a speech may include several types, such as narrative, data, testimony, examples, general knowledge, and citation. Even the style of speaking changes according to situation, with formality and preparation affecting the tolerance for error, pauses, and other aspects of online delivery to varying degrees.

The addressor refers to characteristics of the assigned speaker and may involve an individual or a group ranging in the number of participating speakers. Audience is also a major factor among speech situations. There may be an addressee, an audience, or both, and the relationship between the speaker and these other participants helps to define the speaking context. Additional considerations include the extent of shared time and space among participants, and the physical setting. Overall, these factors combine to develop a suitable framework for analyzing the situational characteristics of various academic public speech

activities. Please see Appendix B for a summary of the situational characteristics of the primary classroom presentation activities across disciplines.

The purpose of the project presentations in each discipline was to inform or persuade the audience, and the subject matter for most of the presentations was chosen by the students. One clear deviation from this was the business group simulation project, where students reported on what had happened during a semester long simulation assignment, and some variables were out of the students' control. Predetermined expectations for the delivery format of the presentations were only found in some communication courses. Communication courses also included the widest range of types of evidence in their presentations, and were the only courses where limits to preparation time were found for presentations.

Disciplinary differences were found when looking at the addressor and audience relationships. For instance, in some business group presentations, the audience members were participants in the simulation activity being presented; this also influenced the amount of shared knowledge in the presentations. The situational characteristics were also unique in individual business presentations. In these presentations, the audience voted on related class actions based on the student's presentation. In addition, most of the descriptions of business assignments included guidelines for dress and/or formality.

Many of the education presentations included lesson demonstration. Here, the students were presenting what they would do in a classroom. In some cases, the students presented rationale or suggestions for their work, and in other cases they simply modeled their teaching. The characteristics of this activity were different from those assigned in other disciplines. The education presentations included more interaction and less formal presentation, and the

audiences were frequently asked to participate at some point in the presentation. None of the education presentations included guidelines for dress.

Some of the public speech assignments are frequently repeated in one course but do not occur elsewhere. The surveys made it possible to target tasks that are most representative of public speech assignments across the university. The criteria used to identify the most representative tasks, included assignment types that occurred in more than two different courses in different disciplines, based on the surveys. This resulted in targeting group and individual project presentations.

Both group and individual project presentation assignments are considered primary research. Primary research tasks include the presentation of student work. When students are presenting information resulting from the collection or analysis of data, or the creation of new material, the task is categorized as primary research.

The addressor in group and individual project presentation tasks is either an individual or a group. Public speech tasks are categorized as individual when they are assigned to one student. Group tasks involve two or more students. Group presentations are by far the most frequent type of student produced public speech in the surveyed courses. Ferris and Tagg (1996) found that when English as a second language students were required to make oral presentations in class, these tasks were typically assigned as a group activity rather than an individual one. Although the current study is more broadly based, it provides another important data point to this conversation.

The group and individual project presentation assignments occurred in all five of the disciplines surveyed and are believed to best represent the student public speech that is occurring in university classrooms. The survey of syllabi from five academic disciplines presents a picture

of student public speech activities occurring within university classrooms. The activities which were found in the course syllabi vary according to discipline and course, yet there are similarities across disciplines. The survey also uncovered clear distinctions in the way that student public speech tasks were realized in disciplinary classrooms. The results of this survey have provided information on the types of public speaking activities encountered by students in the university, the representativeness of assignments across disciplines, and assignments unique to select disciplines.

Summary of the Surveys

The surveys of oral communication in the university, public speaking in university classrooms, and the syllabi of five disciplines provide an overview of public speaking tasks in the university. The surveys provide a rich description of public speech tasks in the university classroom and indicate that public speech tasks are a part of university student life. The surveys also confirm that the types of assignments encountered by students may vary by discipline, context, and task. While important tasks, such as individual and group presentations, are repeated across the curriculum, it is important to note that formal speeches are still primarily housed in the communication discipline. By reviewing syllabi in five unique disciplines, we are able to gain a better understanding of the expectations students face when it comes to public speaking in the university classroom. The results support discipline specific investigations of student public speech, as public speech tasks are occurring within the disciplines. The analysis of situational characteristics uncovers unique task variation that is tied to discipline and associated purpose, and helps to distinguish between possibly influential variables. Further study of these situational variables may lead to improved assignment and preparation of public speech tasks.

As discussed earlier, students who aim for success in graduate school and beyond are in need of experience with both formal oral presentations and discipline specific oral communication. This snapshot of the state of university student public speech tasks would indicate that the practice of oral communication both as a subject and across disciplines is required to meet that goal.

References

- Biber, D. (2006). *University language: A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. John Benjamins: Philadelphia, PA.
- Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University. (1998). *Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities*. NY: State University of New York.
- Carter, N., Goold, R., & Madeley, C. (1993). The new mombusho guidelines, part two. *The Language Teacher*, 17(3-7).
- Chanock, K. (2005). Investigating patterns and possibilities in an academic oral genre. *Communication Education*, 54, 92-99.
- Clennel, C. (1999). Promoting pragmatic awareness and spoken discourse skills with EAP classes. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 53(2), 83-91.
- Cronin, M., Grice, G., & Palmerton, P. (2000). Oral communication across the curriculum: The state of the art after twenty-five years of experience. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 29(1), 66-87.
- Crosling, G., & Ward, I. (2002). Oral communication: The workplace needs and uses of business graduate employees. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21, 41-57.
- Darling, A. (2005). Public presentations in mechanical engineering and the discourse of technology. *Communication Education*, 54, 20-33.
- Dannels, D. (2001). Time to speak up: A theoretical framework of situated pedagogy and practice for communication across the curriculum. *Communication Education*, 50(2), 144-158.

- Dannels, D. (2002). Communication across the curriculum and in the disciplines: Speaking in engineering. *Communication Education, 51*(3), 254-268.
- Engleberg, I. (2001). *General education standards for speech communication in Maryland higher education*. Paper presented at the summer conference of the National Communication Association, Washington, D.C.
- Ferris, D., & Tagg, T. (1996). Academic oral communication needs of EAP learners: What subject-matter instructors actually require. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(1), 31-58.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kim, S. (2006). Academic oral communication needs of East Asian international graduate students in non-science and non-engineering fields. *English for Specific Purposes, 25*(4), 479-489.
- Mauranen, A. (2002). "One thing I'd like to clarify..." Observations of academic speaking. In A. Nurmi (Ed), *Helsinki English Studies Vol. 2: Corpora in Today's English Studies*.
- Morello, J. (2000). Comparing speaking across the curriculum and writing across the curriculum programs. *Communication Education, 49*(1), 99-113.
- Schneider, A. (1999). Taking aim at student incoherence. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 45*(29), 16-18.

Appendix A

Oral Communication Survey Text

Can you tell me if oral communication activities or exercises are used in any of the courses you teach?

If yes, which courses?

Can you briefly describe the activities?

Are these activities assessed? How are they assessed?

What percentage of your class time relies on spoken language activities?

What percentage of a student's final grade relies on spoken language activity?

How would you define oral communication?

Additional comments on oral communication in the curriculum:

Appendix B

Summary of Situational Characteristics of the Primary Classroom Presentation Activities across Disciplines

Business and Education

	Business		Education	
	Individual Project Presentation	Group Project Presentation	Individual Project Presentation	Group Project Presentation
Purpose				
Persuade audience	X	X		X
Inform audience	X	X	X	X
Affirm/Refute positions				
Motivation for speaking (voluntary, required for class, required for program)	Required for class	Required for class	Required for class	Required for class
Subject Matter				
Origin-self or assigned	Self	Self or assigned	Self	self
Assumption of shared knowledge	No	Some shared knowledge for simulation activities	No	No
Speech Format/ organization				
Pre-determined/ expected				
contextual	X	X	X	X
Reference				
Outside text		X		X
Contextual	X		X	X

Evidence				
Narrative		X	X	X
Data/scientific research	X			
Personal Testimony		X	X	X
Examples		X	X	X
General academic knowledge	X	X	X	X
Citation	X		X	X
Locally available		X	X	X
Relationship to data (primary, secondary)	Both	Primary	Both	Both
Visual support (e.g. PowerPoint)	X	X		
Preparation				
Planning time	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited
On-line adaptation	X	X	X	X
Production Constraints	X	X	X	X
Addressor				
Individual	X		X	
Group		X		X
Audience				
Co-participants				
Interaction	X			
Relationship to Addressee	Class members	Class members	Simulated students and class members	Simulated students, colleagues, class members
Power Relationships	Vote on rec. of presenter	Observer	Student/teacher	Student/teacher or observer
Expected Style				
Overt opinion	X	X		Sometimes
Formal monologic presentation	X	X		
Appearance/dress	No guideline	Business attire	No guideline	No guideline

Additional Considerations				
Setting				
What larger activity is text part of (competition, course, program, campus)	Course assignment with outside application	Simulation or other class project	Teaching	Teaching or other class project

Biology and Political Science

	Biology		Political Science	
	Individual Project Presentation	Group Project Presentation	Individual Project Presentation	Group Project Presentation
Purpose				
Persuade audience				
Inform audience	X	X	X	X
Affirm/Refute positions				
Motivation for speaking (voluntary, required for class, required for program)	Required for class	Required for class	Required for class	Required for class
Subject Matter				
Origin-self or assigned	Self or assigned	Self or assigned	Self	Self
Assumption of shared knowledge	Some shared knowledge	Some shared knowledge	Some shared knowledge possible	Some shared knowledge possible
Speech Format/ Organization				
Pre-determined/ expected				
Contextual	X	X	X	X
Reference				
Outside text	X	X	X	X
Contextual	X	X	X	X

Evidence				
Narrative			X	X
Data/scientific research	X	X	X	X
Personal Testimony			X	X
Examples	X	X	X	X
General academic knowledge	X	X	X	X
Citation	X	X	X	X
Locally available	X	X	X	X
Relationship to data (primary, secondary)	Both	Both	Both	Both
Visual support (e.g. PowerPoint)	X			
Preparation				
Planning time	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited
On-line adaptation	X	X	X	X
Production Constraints	X	X	X	X
Addressor				
Individual	X		X	
Group		X		X
Audience				
Co-participants				
Interaction				
Relationship to Addressee	Class members	Class members	Class members	Class members
Power Relationships	Observer	Observer	Observer	Observer
Expected Style				
Overt opinion				Sometimes
Formal monologic presentation	X	X	X	X
Appearance/dress	No guideline	No guideline	No guideline	No guideline
Additional Considerations				
Setting				
What larger activity is text part of (competition,	Course assignment	Course assignment	Course assignment	Course assignment

course, program, campus)				
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--

Communication

	Communication		
	Individual Project Presentation	Group Project Presentation	Formatted Speech
Purpose			
Persuade audience			X
Inform audience	X	X	X
Affirm/Refute positions			
Motivation for speaking (voluntary, required for class, required for program)	Required for class	Required for class	Required for class
Subject Matter			
Origin-self or assigned	Self or assigned	Self or assigned	Self
Assumption of shared knowledge			
Speech Format/ Organization			
Pre-determined/ expected			X
contextual	X	X	X
Reference			
Outside text	X	X	X
Contextual	X	X	X
Evidence			
Narrative	X	X	X
Data/scientific research	X	X	X
Personal Testimony	X	X	X

Examples	X	X	X
General academic knowledge	X	X	X
Citation	X	X	X
Locally available	X	X	X
Relationship to data (primary, secondary)	Both	Both	Both
Visual support (e.g. PowerPoint)	Possible	Possible	
Preparation			
Planning time	Unlimited	Unlimited	May be limited
On-line adaptation	X	X	X
Production Constraints	X	X	X
Addressor			
Individual	X		X
Group		X	X
Audience			
Co-participants			
Interaction			
Relationship to Addressee	Class members	Class members	Class members
Power Relationships	Observer	Observer	Observer
Expected Style			
Overt opinion			Sometimes
Formal monologic presentation	X	X	X
Appearance/dress	No guideline	No guideline	Business/professional
Additional Considerations			
Setting			
What larger activity is text part of (competition, course, program, campus)	Course assignment	Course assignment	Course assignment