

2012

## Conflicting Advice on Oral Citations in Top Public Speaking Texts

Katherine N. Kinnick  
*Kennesaw State University*

Emily Holler  
*Kennesaw State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca>

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), [Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons](#), [Mass Communication Commons](#), [Other Communication Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kinnick, Katherine N. and Holler, Emily (2012) "Conflicting Advice on Oral Citations in Top Public Speaking Texts," *Basic Communication Course Annual*: Vol. 24 , Article 11.  
Available at: <http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol24/iss1/11>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Communication at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Basic Communication Course Annual by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact [frice1@udayton.edu](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu), [mschlangen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu).

## **Conflicting Advice on Oral Citations in top Public Speaking Texts**

---

*Katherine N. Kinnick  
Emily Holler*

Learning to develop and deliver effective oral citations is an important speechmaking skill that helps to enhance the credibility of the speaker, increase the persuasiveness of the source, and reduce unintentional plagiarism. As experienced public speaking instructors, we have found that oral citation of sources is one of the most difficult aspects of speech-making for students. While many students come to the basic course with some level of experience in creating written reference pages and in-text citations, these skills typically do not translate to knowing when and how to cite sources out loud in an oral presentation. Instructors face a number of challenges: Most students will have had no previous instruction in writing or delivering oral citations in high school. In order to cover other essential topics and practice a variety of skills, only a small fraction of class time may be available to devote to oral citations. In addition, the communication discipline has no standardized “style manual” for oral citations, other than guidelines provided by class textbooks, and these vary from textbook to textbook. Lacking common standards, communication students may find that faculty at their own institutions, including instructors teaching different sections of the same introductory public speaking course, vary in their requirements as to what bibliographic content should be

Volume 24, 2012

included in an oral citation. These factors create hurdles for students and for educators hoping to produce effective and ethical speakers. Overcoming these hurdles is important, as the consequences of ineffective source citation may include loss of credibility and intentional or unintentional plagiarism, problems that can jeopardize students' success in the course and potentially, their future professional lives.

### **SPEAKER CREDIBILITY**

The importance of establishing speaker credibility has been a concern of rhetoricians since the time of the ancient Greeks, nearly 2,500 years ago. Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, published in the fourth century B.C.E., established the notion of *ethos* as perceptions of a speaker's reputation, character and goodwill toward the audience, and emphasized the role of *ethos* in the persuasiveness of the speaker (Aristotle, trans. 1984). Quintilian, the first-century Roman rhetorician, was also concerned with moral character, which he considered to be an essential quality for any aspiring orator. In his *Institutio Oratoria* (*Institutes of Oratory*), he characterized ethical public speaking as "...the good person speaking well" (Quintilian, trans. 1856/2011, XII.1.1.).

The modern study of speaker credibility began in the World War II era under Yale psychologist Carl Hovland, funded by the U.S. War Department to investigate persuasive variables related to propaganda and military morale. Hovland's work identified trustworthiness and expertise as the key components of source credibility (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953). Trustworthiness was

defined as perceptions of the speaker's sincerity and intention to persuade. Expertise was found to be related to age, position or status of the source, as well as similarity to the audience in terms of social background, values, or interests. Hovland's research concluded that communicators with high credibility are more likely to gain acceptance for their messages.

Berlo, Lemert, and Mertz (1969) added the element of dynamism as a third dimension of source credibility. Dynamism, or personal charisma, was found to interact with perceptions of trustworthiness and expertise to intensify audience perceptions of these attributes. Subsequent conceptualizations (Munter, 1986, 1987; Kenton, 1989) have further deconstructed the elements of the source credibility model. Kenton (1989), for example, delineates four constructs: goodwill and fairness, expertise, prestige, and presentation skills.

The literature on source credibility identifies specific speech-making techniques that can contribute to or detract from a communicator's ethos, including effective use of transitions (Oyer, 2004), the speaker's use of vocal variety (Beebe & Biggers, 1988), and language and style choices such as figures of speech (Kallendorf & Kallendorf, 1985), active voice (Enos, 1985), self-references through use of first person (Beason, 1991) and unintentional use of logical fallacies (Ramsey, 1981). Previous empirical research has focused on the credibility of the speaker, rather than on the credibility of sources cited by the speaker. Although modern textbooks often point to citation of sources as a means to enhance speaker credibility, we know little about the impact of effective versus ineffective construction of oral citations or effective versus ineffective delivery of oral

citations on speaker credibility or persuasiveness. Similarly, no previous articles were found about the unique challenges of teaching oral citation.

## **PLAGIARISM IN THE COLLEGE CLASSROOM**

Confusion about how and when to cite sources in a speech, combined with pressure to achieve high marks, may lead at best to ineffective or awkward citations, and at worst, to intentional or unintentional plagiarism. Even among nationally-ranked college forensics competitors, scholars have found repeated patterns of misleading and inaccurate source citation, including plagiarism (Cronn-Mills & Schnoor, 2003; Perry, 2003; Shafer, 2005; Wickelgren & Holm, 2008).

There are few empirical studies that examine plagiarism in the public speaking classroom and its link to citation skills. One study of communication students suggested a link between lack of information literacy skills and failure to cite sources properly (Meyer, Hunt, Hopper, Thakkar, Tsubakopoulos & Van Hoose, 2008). Among other findings, the study found that subjects who had participated in information literacy instruction were better able to cite a source correctly in APA style. Holm (1998) asked student subjects to rate 11 public speaking scenarios on a scale ranging from “definitely cheating” to “definitely not cheating.” The scenarios included changing the date of a source, citing secondary, rather than primary sources, and summarizing a magazine article without giving attribution. He found that all of the situations seemed to be gray areas for students, concluding, “nothing seems to be completely cheating

and nothing seems to be completely not cheating” for them (p. 11).

In a subsequent study, Holm (2002) surveyed 307 students about their own and others’ academic honesty in the public speaking course. More than half of the respondents admitted to one or more cheating behavior, most commonly, turning a magazine or newspaper article into a speech and making up information for a bibliography page. Students also admitted to lying about where they found information. Holm’s survey did not link fabrication of sources to students’ oral citations. Hale (1987) found that communication students were able to recognize examples of plagiarism from written examples, and concluded from students’ admissions as well as their skill in identifying plagiarism that his subjects knowingly plagiarized in their own writing.

Plagiarism is a growing concern in higher education, as evidenced by the annual International Plagiarism Conference for college faculty (Plagiarismadvice.org, 2009). Thirty-six percent of undergraduates admit to plagiarizing in written papers (Plagiarism.org, 2010). Although a similar statistic is not available for student speeches, public speaking instructors should not assume their students are immune to either intentional or unintentional plagiarism.

Not surprisingly, the bulk of the literature on plagiarism in the college classroom has come from the English discipline. Teaching techniques, when provided in the literature, almost exclusively relate to helping students avoid written plagiarism. For example, a leading book often used in doctoral programs, *The Ethics of Teaching: A Case Book* (Keith-Spiegel, Whitley,

Balogh, Perkins, & Wittig, 2002), does not include any content on plagiarism in student presentations.

Although the standard instruction that students receive in many disciplines is to cite any information that is not common knowledge, Shi (2011) notes that confusion over what is common knowledge is a widespread problem among undergraduates. Online media, file sharing, music downloading, easily-accessible digital editing programs and cut-and-paste technology have created a “remix culture” that has blurred the traditional boundaries of the ownership of ideas, according to Blum (2009). Scholarly interest in plagiarism instruction and prevention has likewise been revitalized due to the Internet and students’ unprecedented access to information. The technology age may be aiding college professors in detecting plagiarized material in written papers and speeches (Keith-Spiegel et al., 2002). Search engines like “Google” and “Yahoo” allow instructors to enter suspected plagiarized material to see if it matches previously published material. Universities may also subscribe to services like Turnitin.com, that require students to submit their papers online, and provide the instructors and the students a color-coded version of the paper showing similarities between student writing and text already existing in the online world. While many see the educational value in such services, they can be faulted for only “policing” plagiarism and not teaching students how to avoid plagiarism to begin with.

Both colleges and individual educators have struggled with various approaches for helping public speaking students avoid plagiarism. Blum (2009) notes that historically, colleges have employed top-down approaches to academic integrity that frame plagiarism

either as a moral issue, often involving honor codes, or as a law to be enforced. A more effective approach, Blum argues, is to treat academic integrity as “a set of skills to be learned” (p. A35). We have observed that in the public speaking classroom, the same students we have turned in for plagiarizing parts of their speeches have come to college able to repeat the mantra they’ve heard in high school to “cite the source,” and agree in principle that plagiarism is a bad thing that they should avoid. However, knowing that plagiarism is bad and having the skills to a) recognize what types of content should be cited; and b) how to cite the source out loud in a speech rather than in a written bibliography are very different matters.

The need to teach public speaking students when and how to cite sources is reinforced by the poor examples provided by public officials caught up in embarrassing plagiarism accusations. High profile examples include then-Presidential candidate Barack Obama’s alleged plagiarism of a 2008 speech from Massachusetts Governor Deval Patrick (Zelany, 2008), and similar allegations against Joe Biden (Sabato, 1998), Hillary Clinton (Zelany, 2008), and state officials (Neff, 2005; Woodson, 2005). Higher education is not immune. In 2002, the president of Hamilton College in New York apologized for failing to cite a number of sources in a convocation speech he presented to the freshman class and subsequently resigned (Margulies, 2002). Richard Sauer withdrew his candidacy for the presidency of North Dakota State University in 1988 in the midst of allegations that he plagiarized part of a speech that he had given to many different audiences (Blum, 1988). The dean of Boston University’s College of Communica-

tion faced charges of plagiarism in 1991 for a commencement speech that copied, nearly word-for-word, sections from a PBS article (Butterfield, 1991). For more evidence that plagiarism among public officials is a problem, see the lengthy compilation of cases by Howard (2007).

### **TEXTBOOK USAGE IN THE PUBLIC SPEAKING COURSE**

In the limited literature related to ethics and public speaking instruction, a content analysis of public speaking textbooks was completed by Pearson, Child, Mattern, and Kahl (2006). This analysis of the top ten public speaking texts identified the subjects given the most attention in ethics chapters, as determined by number of paragraphs. The study found that ethics chapters devoted the most text to the subject of plagiarism, including defining plagiarism and consequences of plagiarism. However, the findings do not address whether the content on plagiarism included practical instruction for avoiding plagiarism, such as guidelines for proper source citation. Other topics frequently covered in contemporary textbooks' ethics chapters are ethical listening, ethnocentrism, hate speech, and First Amendment rights. An analysis by Fiordo (2010) of 19 introductory public speaking texts found that they gave little, if any, attention to deception theory, including intentional lying and misinformation.

Other studies using a content analysis methodology to examine leading public speaking texts have focused on a variety of topics, including the readability levels of

the textbooks (Schneider, 1992), coverage of communication apprehension (Pearson, DeWitt, Child, Kahl, & Dandamudi, 2007; Pelias, 1989), coverage of technology in information-gathering chapters (Child, Pearson, & Amundson, 2007), and representations of gender (Cawyer, Bystrom, Miller, Simonds, O'Brien, & Storey-Martin, 1994; Gullicks, Pearson, Child, & Schwab, 2005).

It should be noted that teaching the ethics of public speaking has not always been universally embraced. Jensen (1959) reported that a body of literature had emerged in speech communication journals in the 1950s questioning whether or not a speech teacher should be teaching ethical speaking in addition to teaching speaking techniques. The consensus of these articles was that instructors had an ethical duty to their discipline to teach public speaking ethics. However, Jensen notes, "The literature discusses predominately only the general ethical aims of speech education rather than the specific methods of achieving those aims" (p. 219). In 1970, Johnson (1970) posed Jensen's question again in a survey of public speaking instructors: "Does the speech teacher have a responsibility to discuss the ethical issues of speech?" (p. 58). Although 90% of public speaking instructors answered "yes" to this question, in practice, only 28% of them actually conducted a classroom lecture or discussion dedicated to ethics. They were also divided about the amount of class time that should be devoted to the subject of ethics. Johnson (1970) also reported on the coverage of ethics in textbooks used by the instructors he surveyed. At that time, only one of the fifteen books actually had an entire chapter about ethics and speaking, four failed to mention ethics at all, while the rest contained discussions broaching the subject of

ethics or “responsible speaking” (Johnson, 1970, p. 60). As Pearson et al. (2006) note, the National Communication Association did not develop its Credo for Ethical Communication until 1999. Its first principle of ethical communication provides a framework for addressing plagiarism in public address, but is more philosophical than instructive: “We advocate truthfulness, accuracy, honesty, and reason as essential to the integrity of communication” (National Communication Association, 1999).

Given the discipline’s 20<sup>th</sup> century ambivalence toward ethical instruction and very limited scholarship addressing either source citation or plagiarism in the public speaking classroom, we must question whether the practical issues in ethics are being covered in our classrooms as much as the broader philosophical understanding that all speakers have an ethical responsibility. Because the concept of orally citing sources can be difficult for students, and the consequences of plagiarism through poor source citation are costly, the textbooks we teach from are critical tools for establishing a foundation of understanding about ethical citation of sources. As Gullicks et al. (2005) note, “Textbooks are often viewed by students as authoritative, and therefore have the potential to influence a significantly large and impressionable audience” (p. 247).

## **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The purpose of the study is to determine the extent to which leading public speaking textbooks are provid-

ing consistent and thorough advice about how to cite sources out loud in a speech.

**RQ1:** *How do the leading public speaking textbooks instruct students to orally cite their sources?*

Specifically, we seek to learn whether the textbooks reflect agreement about content that should be included in oral citations and how oral citations should be delivered. In addition, we examine whether the textbooks are internally consistent, following the authors' own guidelines in examples.

**RQ2:** *How thoroughly do leading public speaking textbooks cover oral citations?*

Categories used to answer this question include quantity and variety of examples, instruction in incorporating citations into speaking notes, quantity of text devoted to oral citations versus written bibliographies, and supplementary practice exercises, activities, and video examples of oral citations.

## METHOD

**Sample.** The top three textbooks in terms of sales for the 2008-2009 academic year were identified through the College Textbook National Market Report by R.R. Bowker, LLC (2009). These texts are: *The Art of Public Speaking* (10<sup>th</sup> edition), by Stephen E. Lucas (McGraw-Hill); *A Speaker's Guidebook* (4<sup>th</sup> edition), by Dan O'Hair, Rob Stewart and Hannah Rubenstein (Bedford/St. Martin's); and *Public Speaking Handbook* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition) by Steven A. Beebe and Susan J. Beebe (Allyn & Bacon/Pearson). For purposes of conciseness, the texts

will be referred to as “Lucas,” “O’Hair” and “Beebe” in the remainder of this paper.

Together, these texts dominate the public speaking textbook market, comprising more than 55% of the market. The Lucas text, at number one, represents 41% of the public speaking textbook market. Some 105,000 students used one of these three texts in the 2009-10 year.

Rank	Authors	Market Share	Publisher	Title	Edition
1	Lucas	41.0%	McGraw-Hill	The Art of Public Speaking	10 <sup>th</sup>
2	O’Hair, Stewart & Rubenstein	8.1%	Bedford/St. Martin’s	A Speakers’ Guidebook: Text and Reference	4 <sup>th</sup>
3	Beebe & Beebe	6.5%	Pearson Education	Public Speaking Handbook	3 <sup>rd</sup>

*Note.* The source used to determine the top textbooks was College Textbook National Market Report by R.R. Bowker, LLC (2009). This is a proprietary document available to subscribers and made accessible to the researchers by special permission of a leading textbook publisher.

The study employed standard content analysis methodology (Holsti, 1969; Kassarian, 1977) designed to yield description of textbook content. Because public speaking textbooks vary in where they place content on oral citations, and many include content related to oral citations in more than one chapter, ten public speaking textbooks were reviewed to generate a list of index terms found to refer to oral citations. This list was used to systematically identify pages in each textbook that

may contain content about oral citations. Any of these pages containing a mention of oral citations was included in the analysis. In addition, because students often use as models the sample student speeches printed out in their entirety in public speaking textbooks, we also included the first sample student informative speech and the first sample student persuasive speech in each textbook in the pages to be analyzed. The first three oral citations from each of these student speeches were included in the analysis.

**Measures.** A coding instrument was constructed to evaluate the textbooks. The codesheet contained a variety of measures that provided a detailed examination of the treatment of oral citations. Basic information about the format, length and location of text related to oral citations was recorded, including the chapter(s) in which this information was located; the number of pages devoted to oral citations, and, for comparison, the number of pages devoted to written bibliographies or works cited pages. Coding categories examining source citation content were defined as follows:

*Rationale for proper source citation.* This item identified whether the text provided reasons why speakers should orally cite sources, including avoiding plagiarism and enhancing the credibility of the speaker.

*Instructions for citation content.* This coding category examined the text's instructions for oral citation content, including bibliographic elements that should or should not be mentioned in an oral citation, such as author's name, author's credentials, article name, book or publication title, website name, website URL, and publication date. Codesheet items also identified whether the text offered instructions for how to highlight

the credibility of the source and whether it specifically noted any differences between oral citation and written bibliography content.

*Analysis of oral citation examples.* Examples of oral citations in chapter text and sample student speeches were examined for frequency and type. Type of citation was coded as quote or paraphrase. Source of citation was coded as online source, book or report, print periodical, personal interview, speech/lecture, movie or television program, other, and can't determine. The bibliographic elements (date or recency, author, article title, periodical name, book or report title, website name, website URL) mentioned in each citation example were recorded. In-chapter citations were coded as "good" examples of what to do or "bad" examples of what not to do. Bad examples were defined as ineffective citations intentionally provided by the author to point out their flaws and how they might be corrected. The specific problem noted by the author was coded as "missing information," "not conversational," "not clear when direct quote begins or ends," "doesn't describe credentials of source," "plagiarizes," or "other."

*Instructions for citation delivery.* Codesheet items identified whether the text encouraged or discouraged use of the phrases "and I quote" and "quote...end quote" in the delivery of oral citations.

*Instructions for speaking notes.* The codesheet identified whether instructions for writing oral citations on speaking notes/delivery outlines were included in the text.

*Student exercises and supplementary resources.* The codesheet identified the presence in the text of any student exercises focusing on oral citations, as well as any

references to a supplementary CD-ROM, DVD or online resource specifically recommended to help with online source citation.

**Procedures.** Three undergraduate students who had completed the public speaking course were trained as coders. The coders were not informed about the specific research questions and worked independently. In an initial training session, coders were provided with written and verbal coding definitions and instructions and coded two "practice" textbooks that were not included in the analysis. Intercoder reliability was computed using percentage of agreement (Kassarjian, 1977). Intercoder reliability scores for the training texts ranged from 87.5% to 88.9%. After the training session, several codesheet items were modified and instructions to coders clarified to address items where disagreements had occurred. Then, each of the three chapters was coded by two coders. Disagreements between coders were resolved by a third independent coder. Subsequent intercoder reliability ranging from 88% to 96% on the three textbooks (mean = 92%) was achieved.

## RESULTS

All three textbooks located instruction on oral citations in their "Supporting Materials" chapters, as well as in chapters or sections pertaining to ethics, in the context of discussions about avoiding plagiarism. Beebe also included additional content showing how sample oral citations should be incorporated into speaking notes in its "Outlining and Editing" chapter.

***RQ1: How do the leading public speaking textbooks instruct students to orally cite their sources?***

Avoidance of plagiarism is presented as a rationale for learning proper source citation in all three texts. Only Lucas also notes that proper source citation can also enhance the speaker's own credibility. Lucas and O'Hair make the point that there is no set or universally agreed-upon format for orally citing sources. They acknowledge that a typical oral citation will be less complete than a formal written citation in a bibliography.

Of the bibliographic elements that could potentially be included in an oral citation, all the authors agree that an oral citation should include the author or sponsoring organization's name and the publication date. Beebe and O'Hair also note that speakers should specify the type of resource (online article, for instance). There is disagreement as to whether titles need to be mentioned: Only Beebe suggests that article titles should be mentioned; Lucas specifies mentioning book and periodical titles, but not article titles. O'Hair suggests that a description of the source, e.g., "an article on sharks" (p. 75) is sufficient. In terms of guidance for which bibliographic elements may be left out of an oral citation, Lucas urges students not to cite URL addresses out loud, and O'Hair notes that full names, dates, titles, volume and page numbers need not be included (p. 75). The latter statement contradicts O'Hair's recommendation on the same page that publication dates be cited.

While the texts differ on bibliographic details that should be included, all three emphasize the importance of describing the credentials of the source, and all pro-

vide examples that demonstrate how this enhances the credibility of the citation.

All the texts note that sources should be cited for direct quotations and paraphrases. O'Hair and Beebe are more specific than Lucas, also noting that statistics and any information that is not common knowledge should be cited. Only Beebe also notes that non-original visual materials, including graphs and pictures, should be cited.

In addition to citation content, the textbooks offer differing advice about citation delivery. Lucas and Beebe discourage use of the phrase "and I quote" to introduce a citation, as well as using "quote" and "end quote" to set off a quotation. Beebe recommends instead pausing before and after quoting. O'Hair recommends using "and I quote" to call attention to a source's exact wording (p. 76).

**Internal consistency.** Internal consistency refers to whether the examples provided by the authors or by the student speakers whose speech texts are included in the analysis follow the guidelines for oral citations noted in the text. In the Lucas textbook, five of eight examples the author provides did not follow his own advice by noting the date or recency of the source. Two out of eight examples did not include the author or organization name. For example, Lucas offers the following as an example of an oral citation, even though it doesn't note the date or recency of the source:

In their book, *When Children Work*, psychology professors Ellen Greenberger of the University of California and Lawrence Steinberg of Temple University note that intensive levels of work among youth tend to produce higher truancy and lower grades. According

to Greenberger and Steinberg, one study after another has found that working more than a few hours a week has a negative impact on teenagers' academic performance. (p. 159)

Similar problems with consistency were found in the student speeches. In both the student informative and persuasive speeches, the students did not follow Lucas' instructions to note the date or recency of any of the six citations studied. Each speaker paraphrased a periodical but did not provide the author's name or date of the publication. In the sample informative speech, the student cited a book and a periodical, but did not note the date of either, or the author of the periodical article: "A study in the *Annals of Internal Medicine* confirms that acupuncture can relieve low-back pain" (p. 317). In three of six cases, the coders could not determine what the source of the citation was—whether it was a book, periodical, or online source, from the citation given.

In the O'Hair text, five of 16 examples did not mention date or recency, and two did not provide an author's name. In three examples, it was impossible for coders to determine what the source of the citation was, such as a book, website, periodical, etc. Citations in sample student speeches also did not comply with the author's guidelines for oral citations. Three of six citations did not include a mention of data or recency. In four of six citations, the source of the citation could not be determined. For example, the following citation is not linked to an article, online source, or personal interview:

According to experts on the frontline, such as Dr. Brent Eastman, Chief Medical Advisor at Scripps Health Hospital in San Diego, America's emergency

rooms are in a crisis that could jeopardize everyone in this room and all their loved ones. (p. 26)

In the Beebe text, while the authors instruct students to provide a date, type of resource, article title and author or sponsoring organization (p. 56), subsequent examples of citations leave out type of resource and title (p. 190); and article titles and authors (pp. 191, 212). There are no examples of citations in the sample informative student speech. In the student persuasive speech, one citation does not reveal type of resource and another leaves out the article author and title.

***RQ2: How thoroughly do leading public speaking textbooks cover oral citations?***

Lucas and O'Hair devoted the most text—approximately four pages if combined from various sections of the textbooks—to oral citation instructions. Beebe devoted approximately two and a half pages to oral citations. By comparison, O'Hair devotes four times as much text to the written bibliography—an appendix of 16 pages covering the written bibliography and various style guides. Beebe devotes three pages to written bibliographies and Lucas devotes two pages. Only Beebe provides specific examples of how to write citations in speaking notes.

**Examples of oral citations.** The textbooks varied in the number of examples they included and whether they provided examples of both effective oral citations and ineffective oral citations. They also differed in the variety of sources for citations that were used in examples (books, periodicals, online sources, personal interviews, speeches/presentations, television or movies); and whether they showed students how to handle “second-

hand” quotations used by another author. For instance, a second-hand citation might say, “Barbara Jones was quoted in a 2008 Time magazine article, saying that ‘Healthcare is the number one concern of senior citizens.’”

Lucas offered eight examples of proper oral citations in the text, and two examples of ineffective citations, both dealing with failure to describe the credentials of sources. O’Hair provided 16 examples of proper oral citations, and one example of an ineffective citation, also dealing with failure to describe the credentials of a source. Beebe provided five examples of proper oral citations and no examples of ineffective citations. In addition, Beebe’s sample student informative speech did not contain a single source citation.

In examples of proper oral citations offered by the textbook authors, Lucas provided examples of citations from books, periodicals and online sources, but not personal interviews, speeches/presentations, television or movies. Lucas provided examples of direct quotes and paraphrases. Two of the examples could be classified as second-hand quotations, showing how to quote or paraphrase someone who had been quoted by another author.

O’Hair provided examples of sources cited from a wider variety of sources, including books, periodicals and online sources, as well as public speeches/presentations, but not personal interviews, television or movies. Many of these were examples of lead-ins to citations to show students how to introduce a citation. But because they were incomplete, in seven cases it was impossible for the coder to determine whether the lead-in was setting up a direct quote or a paraphrase. O’Hair

included no examples that would show students how to handle a second-hand quote.

The Beebe textbook offered examples of citations that cited an online source and print periodicals, but no examples citing public speeches/presentations, personal interviews, television or movies. Four of the five examples were direct quotes; one was a paraphrase. Two examples reflected second-hand quotes.

None of the texts included any examples of ineffective second-hand quotes. In addition, in their chapters on visual aids, none of the textbooks provided guidance to students on citing sources of images, such as photographs or charts, used in their visual aids.

**Supplementary resources.** None of the textbooks included student exercises to help students construct oral citations. Lucas referred students to additional written examples of citations online. O'Hair referred students to an online chapter quiz.

## DISCUSSION

Without question, textbook authors have a difficult task in writing comprehensive books that carefully balance theory and application. With a vast amount of material to cover—including instruction on gathering supporting material, organizational strategies and delivery of a speech—it is not surprising when we see more breadth than depth on any one topic. In addition, we recognize that textbooks may take different approaches to the same content areas to ensure their distinctiveness. We wish to emphasize that we do not argue that lack of consistency among textbooks equates to poor

quality instruction in oral citation. Rather, we propose that clear and thorough common guidelines for oral citations across public speaking textbooks would enhance understanding and acceptance of standards for effective and ethical speaking, with benefits for students, instructors, and the discipline as a whole. As one communication ethics scholar has noted, “Teachers find that such matters as fair use of material, plagiarism, acceptability of language, and use of particular motivational appeals (or even topics for speeches) become sources of difficulty when students, teachers, parents, and administrators do not share common standards” (Andersen, 1999, p. 459).

The current study finds that the most widely-used public speaking textbooks do not present a unified front to instructors or students as to what should be included in an oral citation, when an oral citation should be used, or how an oral citation should be delivered. In addition, internal inconsistencies within the texts between the guidelines given by the authors and examples of citations in chapter text or student speeches which do not follow these guidelines are likely to confuse students.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING TEXTBOOKS**

In general, we believe that students would benefit from a greater degree of explicitness in the textbooks’ guidelines for what bibliographic elements to include in oral citations and what not to include. While some texts were more prescriptive than others, ambiguity is more likely to lead to unintentional plagiarism or simply less

effective citations. Authors should not forget the audience for these textbooks: the typical first-year student much prefers concrete guidelines to general advice. O'Hair's emphasis on flexibility, as excerpted below, may leave students with more questions than it answers:

Unlike a written bibliography, there is no set format for orally citing sources. As long as you clearly identify where your information came from and provide your listeners with enough context to accurately interpret it, you can vary your wording to suit your needs. (p. 133)

Based on this statement, students might legitimately wonder, "How much is enough context?" and "Does identifying where my information came from mean I don't have to cite the author?"

Another practice found in all the textbooks that may contribute to student confusion is the use of partial lead-ins as examples. These assume that students will know what bibliographic elements are needed to complete the citation, and miss an opportunity to showcase what a complete oral citation would sound like. For example, textboxes in O'Hair list opening words for citations that end in ellipses ("..."): "As published in the October 2008 edition of Nature..." (p. 143) does not reveal to the student reader whether they should include the author's name. "According to John Miller, one of the three founders of the community's rapid-transit committee..." (p. 138) does not reveal to the student whether they should include the source of this information (e.g., personal interview? printed account?) or the date of the statement. Replacing partial lead-ins with full citations would enhance understanding of the essential source

information that should be included and how to make citation phraseology complete, yet conversational.

Most importantly, textbooks should correct internal inconsistencies by making sure that examples in the text and in sample student speeches actually conform to the authors' guidelines for oral citations. This was perhaps the most surprising, and easily correctable, finding. In addition, we believe that students would benefit from seeing more examples of ineffective oral citations that illustrate common mistakes that students make and how they can be corrected. Similarly, students would appreciate seeing models of citations from a wider range of sources, including personal interviews, public lectures, television shows, and other media. All textbooks should explicitly address what to do when Internet sources do not provide authors, dates, or other bibliographic information, and give examples of what these citations would sound like in oral citations.

In terms of textbook organization, authors should consider whether dispersing information about oral citations across chapters might inadvertently weaken its impact. In O'Hair, for example, the most explicit information is located in the ethics chapter, not where students may look for it in the supporting materials chapter. Students whose instructors do not assign all chapters may miss critical information. At a minimum, in-text cross-references to information about oral citations in other chapters are needed.

Finally, authors should supplement textbook content with exercises and video examples that specifically address oral citations. For example, to help students practice constructing oral citations, textbooks might provide bibliographic information from a variety of sources and

instruct students to convert it to conversational citations. Supplementary video clips that allow students to hear ineffective oral citations, identify why they are ineffective (e.g., awkward, un-conversational lead-ins? Critical information missing?) and then hear how they can be transformed into effective oral citations would be valuable learning tools.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EDUCATORS AND THE DISCIPLINE**

Coverage of oral citations should be a factor considered in textbook selection. Instructors should read their texts thoroughly to see if they believe the guidelines for oral citations satisfy their expectations and grading criteria, and are adequately clear to students. Textbook selection should consider the quantity and quality of oral citation examples from a variety of sources in both the text and student speeches, where this information appears in the textbook (i.e., dispersed throughout or located primarily in one chapter?), and the teaching ideas and materials available in instructor's manuals and supplementary media. Regardless of the textbook chosen, instructors may need to devote extra class time to oral citations. In particular, they should consider reviewing the types of content that must be cited, differences between bibliography entries and oral citations, the essential bibliographic elements that they expect to hear in oral citations, and a class activity that requires students to turn bibliographic information into conversational-sounding oral citations. Textbooks that facili-

tate these learning goals should be given positive consideration in textbook selection decisions.

To maintain consistency in rigor across sections of public speaking, instructors may consider proposing a uniform policy for their campus about what bibliographic elements are expected to be included in oral citations. Although this may address problems at the level of the communication department, it does not address the larger issue of inconsistencies across the discipline and outside of the discipline. In a potential worst-case scenario, conflicting institutional policies could lead to greater confusion on a national level as numerous institutions promoted their own guidelines. Ideally, we would like to see the National Communication Association recommend common standards for oral citation style, much as the Modern Language Association and the American Psychological Association have done for written style in their respective disciplines. This would enable educators from all disciplines to refer students to a standard resource when an oral presentation is assigned. In the absence of such a resource, however, greater uniformity among leading textbooks would go a long way to help establish commonly-held expectations in the communication discipline. While learning to craft effective citations may never be easy for beginning public speaking students, it is a skill that can be more easily mastered, and evaluated, by the presence of clear standards.

## CONCLUSION

We agree with Blum (2009) that it is not enough to get students to philosophically agree that citing sources is important; they must have skills to convert others' words and ideas into an oral citation. Although it is important to help the students understand the definition of plagiarism or even to distinguish between intentional or unintentional plagiarism, a theoretical treatment of the negatives of plagiarism may not help the students avoid wrongdoing in their next speech. Students need clear lessons of how to avoid plagiarism. Both textbooks and individual instructors can help with this.

We believe that it is important for the communication discipline to establish greater uniformity in its recommendations for oral citation content. An "anything goes," "use your best judgment" approach is much more difficult for college students to grasp and model than the specific recommendations and examples found in style manuals for writers. A lack of commonly held standards blurs the line as to what constitutes an adequate reference, potentially leading to intentional or unintentional plagiarism that we see among both students and adult professionals. Greater uniformity between textbooks would be helpful in establishing common standards. In addition, the internal inconsistency within textbooks, in which authors did not model their own guidelines in student speeches and other examples, must be addressed.

## LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

A limitation of this study is that it included only the top three public speaking texts. While these texts account for more than half of the market, the findings cannot be generalized to other public speaking texts. Future scholarship might include more textbooks to generate a larger data set that would allow for statistical analysis of findings. The content analysis methodology could also be used to analyze the video examples of student speeches offered as supplementary resources by leading textbook publishers to see if students in these videos are actually following the textbooks' guidelines for oral citations. Future research might also supplement the content analysis with a measure of student comprehension of oral citation content in each text. Actual student speeches could be analyzed to determine the extent to which students are citing sources completely and accurately after exposure to instruction. Finally, a question that remains is, does teaching students how to cite sources effectively actually reduce plagiarism? Future research might examine whether adherence to common standards for oral citations results in fewer instances of plagiarism, as well as audience perceptions of enhanced speaker credibility. Overall, this study underscores the need for greater scholarly examination of academic honesty within the oral tradition, and greater attention and creativity from educators and textbook authors in helping students learn to cite sources effectively in their speeches.

## REFERENCES

- Andersen, K.E. (1999). Ethical issues in teaching. In J.A. Daly, G.W. Friedrich, & Vangelisti, A. L.'s *Teaching communication: Theory, research and methods* (pp. 459-469). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Aristotle. (1984). *Rhetoric*. (W.R. Roberts, Trans). New York: Modern Library. (Original publication date unknown).
- Beason, L. (1991). Strategies for establishing an effective persona: An analysis of appeals to ethos in business speeches. *Journal of Business Communication*, 28, 326-346.
- Beebe, S.A., & Beebe, S.J. (2010). *Public speaking handbook* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Beebe, S.A., & Biggers, T. (1988). *Emotion-eliciting qualities of speech delivery and their effect on credibility and comprehension*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Berlo, D.K., Lemert, J.B., & Mertz, R.J. (1969). Dimensions for evaluating the acceptability of message sources. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 33, 563-576.
- Blum, D.E. (1988, July 27). Plagiarism in speeches by college presidents called 'capital offense' and 'ultimate sin.' *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 34(46), A11-A12.

- Blum, S.D. (2009, February 20). Academic integrity and student plagiarism: A question of education, not ethics. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(24), A35.
- Butterfield, F. (1991, July 3). For a dean at Boston University, a question of plagiarism. *The New York Times*. Retrieved February 12, 2010, from <http://www.nytimes.com/1991/07/03/us/for-a-dean-at-boston-u-a-question-of-plagiarism.html?pagewanted=1&pagewanted=print>
- Cawyer, C.S., Bystrom, D., Miller, J., Simonds, C., O'Brien, M., & Storey-Martin, J. (1994). Communicating gender equity: Representation and portrayal of women and men in introductory communication textbooks. *Communication Studies*, 45, 325-331.
- Child, J.T., Pearson, J.C., & Amundson, N.G. (2007). Technology talk: Public speaking textbooks' coverage of information retrieval technology systems. *Communication Quarterly*, 55, 267-281.
- Cronn-Mills, D. & Schnoor, L. (2003). Evidence and ethics in individual events: An examination of an AFA-NIET final round, *National Forensics Journal*, 21, 35-51.
- Enos, T. (1985). *The technical writer's voice: An empirical study of "ethos."* Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Minneapolis, MN.
- Fiordo, R. (2010). Integrating deception theory into public speaking classes: A study in communication edu-

- cation. *Journal of the Communication, Speech & Theatre Association of North Dakota*, 23, 31-48.
- Gullicks, K.A., Pearson, J.C., Child, J.T., & Schwab, C.R. (2005). Diversity and power in public speaking textbooks. *Communication Quarterly*, 53(2), 247-258.
- Hale, J.L. (1987). Plagiarism in classroom settings. *Communication Research Reports*, 4, 66-70.
- Holm, T.T. (1998). *Ignorance of the crime is no excuse: Do public speaking students even know what cheating is?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, New York, NY.
- Holm, T.T. (2002). Public speaking students' perception of cheating. *Communication Research Reports*, 19(1), 66-76.
- Holsti, O. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hovland, C.I., Janis, I.L., & Kelley, H.H. (1953). *Communication and persuasion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Howard, R.M. (2007, November 1). *Famous cases of plagiarism and fraud in academia, athletics, government, journalism, politics, etc.* Retrieved February 11, 2010, from <http://wrt-howard.syr.edu/Bibs/PlagFamous.htm>
- Jenson, J.V. (1959). An analysis of recent literature on teaching ethics in public address. *The Speech Teacher*, 8(3), 219-228.

- Johnson, R.C. (1970). Teaching speech ethics in the beginning speech course. *The Speech Teacher*, 19(1), 58-61.
- Kallendorf, C., & Kallendorf, C. (1985). The figures of speech, ethos, and Aristotle: Notes toward a rhetoric of business communication. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 22, 35-50.
- Kassarjian, H.H. (1977). Content analysis in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 4, 8-18.
- Keith-Spiegel, P., Whitley, B.E., Jr., Balogh, D.B., Perkins, D.V. & Wittig, A.F. (2002). *The ethics of teaching: A casebook* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kenton, S.B. (1989). Speaker credibility in persuasive business communication: A model which explains gender differences. *Journal of Business Communication*, 26, 143-157.
- Lucas, S.E. (2009). *The art of public speaking* (10<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Margulies, J. (2002, September 25). President of Hamilton College, in N.Y., apologizes for failing to cite sources in speech. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Meyer, K.R., Hunt, S.K., Hopper, M., Thakkar, K. V., Tsubakopoulos, V., & Van Hoose, K.J. (2008). Assessing information literacy instruction in the basic communication course. *Communication Teacher*, 22, 22-34.
- Munter, M. (1986). *Guide to managerial communication*, (2nd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- National Communication Association. (1999). *NCA credo for ethical communication*. Retrieved February 15, 2010, from <http://www.natcom.org/index.asp?bid=514>
- Neff, E. (2005, March 4). Gibbons' speech plagiarism: 15 paragraphs came from copyrighted talk by Alabama woman. *Las Vegas Review-Journal*. Retrieved February 3, 2010, from [http://www.reviewjournal.com/lvrj\\_home/2005/Mar-04-Fri2005/news/25992087.html](http://www.reviewjournal.com/lvrj_home/2005/Mar-04-Fri2005/news/25992087.html)
- O'Hair, D., Stewart, R., & Rubenstein, H. (2010). *A speaker's guidebook: Text and reference* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Oyer, S.A. (2004). Effects of use and quality of transitions and mode on speaker credibility, message comprehension, and message evaluation. *Florida Communication Journal*, 32, 5-13.
- Pearson, J.C., DeWitt, L., Child, J.T., Kahl, D.H., Jr., & Dandamudi, V. (2007). Facing the fear: An analysis of speech-anxiety content in public-speaking books. *Communication Research Reports*, 24(2), 159-168.
- Pearson, J.C., Child, J.T., Mattern, J.L., & Kahl, D.H., Jr. (2006). What are students being taught about ethics in public speaking textbooks? *Communication Quarterly*, 54(4), 507-521.
- Pelias, M.H. (1989). Communication apprehension in basic public speaking texts; an examination of temporary textbooks. *Communication Education*, 38, 41-53.

- Perry, L.A. (2003). Engaging ethos: Source citation accuracy in intercollegiate forensics. *The National Forensic Journal*, 21(1), 52-66.
- Plagiarismadvice.org. (2009). *Plagiarism conference 2010*. Retrieved February 6, 2010, from <http://www.plagiarismadvice.org/conference.html>
- Plagiarism.org. (2010). *Facts about plagiarism*. Retrieved February 6, 2010, from <http://www.plagiarism.org/index.html>
- Quintilian. (2011). *Institutes of oratory*. L. Honeycutt, Ed., (J.S. Watson, Trans.). Retrieved June 6, 2011, from <http://honeyl.public.iastate.edu/quintilian/> (Original translation published 1856).
- R.R. Bowker, LLC. (2007). *College textbook national market report*. New Providence, NJ.
- Ramsey, A. (1981). Rhetoric and the ethics of “seeming.” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 11, 85-96.
- Sabato, L.J. (1998). Joseph Biden’s plagiarism; Michael Dukakis’s ‘Attack Video’—1998. *Washington Post*. Retrieved February 6, 2010, from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpsrv/politics/special/clinton/frency/biden.htm>
- Schneider, D.E. (1992). A comparison of readability levels of textbooks in public speaking and interpersonal communication. *Communication Education*, 41, 400-404.
- Shafer, R. (2005). Nothing more than a little white lie: An examination of ethics in extemporaneous speaking. *Speaker & Gavel*, 42, 28-34.

- Shi, L. (2011). Common knowledge, learning, and citation practices in university writing. *Research in the Teaching of English, 45*, 308-334.
- Wickelgren, B.F., & Holm, T.T. (2008). The role of the coach and the organization in addressing plagiarism. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 93*(1), 3-17.
- Woodson, D. (2005, March 3). Gibbons speech was plagiarized. *Elko Daily Free Press*. Retrieved February 11, 2010, from <http://www.elkodaily.com/articles/2005/03/03/news/local/news1.txt>
- Zelany, J. (2008, February 19). Clinton camp says Obama plagiarized in speech. *The New York Times*. Retrieved February 7, 2010, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/19/us/politics/19campaign.html>