COURSE UNIT (MODULE) DESCRIPTION

Course unit (module) title	Code
Public Speaking (C1) / Viešasis kalbėjimas (C1)	

Academic staff	Core academic unit(s)
Coordinating: Dr. Adam Mastandrea adam.mastandrea@flf.vu.lt Other(s): Lekt. Aušra Dapšienė	Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University

Study cycle	Type of the course unit
First cycle (Bachelor's)	Compulsory

Mode of delivery	Semester or period when it is delivered	Language of instruction
Face-to-face (interactive lectures, seminars, group work)	Spring semester	English

Requisites	
Prerequisites: None	Co-requisites (if relevant): None

Number of ECTS credits allocated	Student's workload (total)	Contact hours	Individual work
5	135	48	87

Purpose of the course unit

To develop students' ability to research, construct, deliver, question and defend arguments in English in academic and public settings. Students learn to find and evaluate credible sources, to analyze how arguments are structured, and to evaluate arguments by asking what an argument explains, what it overlooks, and whom it serves.

The course is built around a sequence of speaking projects in which every speaker's argument is challenged and must be defended: a persuasive speech on a public policy followed by audience questions, a published-exchange mini-debate, a cross-examination debate, and a panel discussion on disinformation. Through these projects students develop fluency and accuracy in academic spoken English; the ability to find, evaluate, integrate and reference information from academic journals, research databases, data visualizations and fact-checking resources; and the critical media literacy needed to recognize and avoid emotionally manipulative argumentation and counter it with evidence.

Learning outcomes of the course unit	Teaching and learning methods	Assessment methods
Find, evaluate and integrate credible sources (academic journals, research databases, data visualizations, fact-checking resources), cite them orally, and reference them in APA 7th edition.	Library and database workshops; lateral-reading practice; data visualization workshop; guided reading.	Assessment 1 (Preparation outline); Assessment 2 (Persuasive speech); Assessment 4 (Cross-examination debate); Assessment 5 (Disinformation panel discussion).
Plan, outline and deliver a research-based persuasive speech on a public policy, adapted to the audience, and answer audience questions on it.	Interactive lectures; outlining workshops; rehearsal with peer feedback.	Assessment 1; Assessment 2.
Analyze the structure of spoken and written arguments (standpoints, reasons, and single, multiple, coordinative and subordinative argumentation) and evaluate them by asking	Interactive lectures; argument-mapping workshops; analysis of a published academic exchange.	Assessment 3 (Published-exchange mini-debate); Assessment 4.

what an argument explains, what it overlooks and whom it serves.		
Question and challenge an opposing argument using cross-examination techniques and respond to challenges while maintaining one's own line of reasoning.	Cross-examination workshop; pair practice; structured debate.	Assessment 3; Assessment 4.
Identify emotionally manipulative argumentation and disinformation discourse using the four semantic markers and counter it with evidence-based alternative explanations.	Collecting and coding a real discourse sample; six-step reply writing; panel discussion.	Assessment 5.
Give constructive feedback using the course speaking rubric, act on feedback, and reflect on one's own development as a speaker of English.	Peer feedback; video self-review; reflection session.	Assessment 2 (peer feedback); Assessment 4 (written self-review).
Use digital tools and generative AI critically and responsibly to research, rehearse and test arguments, verifying every source and claim.	Workshops; AI-as-sparring-partner practice with verification.	Assessment 4; Assessment 5.

Content	Contact hours							Individual work: time and assignments	
	Lectures	Tutorials	Seminars	Workshops	Laboratory work	Internship	Contact hours, total	Individual work	Tasks for individual work
1. Introduction to the Course: Public Speaking as Argumentation Course aims, projects and speaking rubric; one-minute introduction speech; the critical lens: what an argument explains, what it overlooks, and whom it serves.			1				**1**	2	Give a one-minute intro speech; set personal speaking goals.
2. Finding and Evaluating Sources Turning a topic into a research question and search terms; searching the databases available through the VU Library and Google Scholar; peer-reviewed research, reports and news sources; reading abstracts to judge relevance; lateral reading to check credibility (Wineburg & McGrew, 2019); APA 7th edition references and in-text citations.	1			3			**4**	8	Read Wineburg & McGrew (2019, selected sections) and Kriaučiūnienė & Arcimavičienė (2023, units as assigned); find and evaluate at least five sources on your persuasive speech topic; draft an APA reference list.
3. Persuasive Speaking on Public Policy Audience analysis; ethos, pathos and logos; emotional language as a persuasive strategy, and an introduction to the four semantic markers (negative feelings, distrust, personal values under threat, external enemy); policy claims; organizing a persuasive speech (problem–cause–solution, Monroe's motivated sequence); writing a full-sentence preparation outline; speaking from notes; oral citation of sources.	2			2			**4**	7	Choose a policy and draft a full-sentence preparation outline with an APA reference list (Assessment 1).

4. Persuasive Speech on a Public Policy Students give a 5–6-minute speech supporting or opposing a specific local, national, EU or global policy, citing at least four credible sources orally, followed by 5 minutes of audience questions. Classmates give rubric-based peer feedback. ***Assessment 1: Preparation Outline; Assessment 2: Persuasive Speech on a Public Policy***			4				**4**	9	Revise and submit the preparation outline (Assessment 1); rehearse the speech; give written rubric-based feedback to two classmates (Assessment 2).
5. The Structure of the Argument Standpoints, reasons and unexpressed premises; single, multiple, coordinative and subordinative argumentation (Snoeck Henkemans, 2000); argument mapping.	2			2			**4**	7	Map the argument structure of your persuasive speech and of one opinion article.
6. Published-Exchange Mini-Debate Students speak as one author of a published academic exchange: they present the author's standpoint and argument structure (3 minutes) and put two prepared questions to the opposing "author". ***Assessment 3: Published-Exchange Mini-Debate***			2				**2**	6	Map your author's argument; prepare a 3-minute position statement and two questions for the opposing author (Assessment 3).
7. Research-Based Reasoning Line Building a line of reasoning from evidence; integrating evidence into speech (signal phrases, oral citation, hedging); anticipating counterarguments; using generative AI as a sparring partner to find counterarguments and verifying its output.	1			3			**4**	6	Build an evidence file of at least five verified sources for your debate motion, including the strongest evidence for the other side.
8. Questioning and Answering: Cross-Examination Purposes of cross-examination (clarify, expose, gain a concession); question types (clarification, evidence, commitment, hypothetical, consequence, contradiction); building a question funnel; answering strategies (concede and reframe, reject the premise, refuse a false choice, return to your case); hedging language.	1			3			**4**	6	Plan one question funnel against the opposing side; prepare answers to three likely questions on your own case.
9. Cross-Examination Debate Two-against-two debates on motions about language, education and media (e.g., "Machine translation makes foreign-language degrees unnecessary"). Each first speech is followed by a two-minute cross-examination; second speakers are assessed on how they use the concessions won. ***Assessment 4: Cross-Examination Debate***			6				**6**	11	Prepare the team case and your speech; after the debate, watch the recording and write a 300-word self-review (Assessment 4).

10. Disinformation Discourse and Counter-Argumentation Misinformation and disinformation; the "prosumer" model of media literacy; emotional language and the four semantic markers (Mastandrea, 2023); collecting and coding a real discourse sample; replying to disinformation with alternative explanations and by raising suspicion, without emotional language (the six-step reply).	1			3			**4**	8	Read Mastandrea (2023); in panel teams, collect a discourse sample on a current topic using claims documented by fact-checkers (e.g., EUvsDisinfo, LRT Faktai), verifying every item at its original source; code it with the four semantic markers.
11. Data Visualization as Evidence Choosing and designing charts and infographics; interactive visualization; presenting data honestly and explaining it to an audience.	1			1			**2**	4	Turn your team's coding results into one chart or infographic for the panel.
12. Disinformation Panel Discussion Panel preparation and rehearsal, then panels of 4–5 students present and discuss their coded discourse samples. Each panellist gives a 5–6-minute research-based argumentative statement with an evidence-based alternative explanation; a student chair moderates; audience members act as fact-checkers and question the panel using lateral reading. ***Assessment 5: Disinformation Panel Discussion***			6	2			**8**	11	Prepare your panel statement and visual; write a reply to one post from the sample using the six steps (Assessment 5).
13. Reflection Session Reviewing speaking development across the course; course feedback.			1				**1**	2	Compare your diagnostic and panel recordings; write a short reflection on progress against your two speaking goals.
Total	**9**		**20**	**19**			**48**	**87**	

Assessment strategy	Weight, %	Deadline	Assessment criteria
Assessment 1: Preparation Outline (persuasive speech)	10	Week 4	A full-sentence preparation outline: a specific purpose and a clear policy standpoint; introduction, main points, supporting points and conclusion written as full sentences; a clear organisational pattern (problem–cause–solution or Monroe's motivated sequence); transitions marked; each main point supported by evidence with APA in-text citations; a reference list of at least four credible sources correctly formatted in APA 7th edition.
Assessment 2: Persuasive Speech on a Public Policy	20	Weeks 4–5	A clear policy standpoint; effective organisation; quality of research evidence and oral citation of at least four sources; audience adaptation and appropriate, non-manipulative use of appeals; handling of audience questions; extemporaneous delivery from notes within 5–6 minutes; fluency and accuracy; rubric-based peer feedback on two classmates.
Assessment 3: Published-Exchange Mini-Debate	15	Weeks 6–7	Accurate reconstruction of the author's standpoint and argument structure; use of evidence from the text; application of the critical lens (what the argument explains, what it overlooks, whom it serves); quality of the two questions put to the opponent and of the responses to the opponent's questions; fluency and accuracy of spoken English.
Assessment 4: Cross-Examination Debate	25	Weeks 10–11	A clear case with an explicit standpoint and well-structured reasons; research evidence integrated into the speech and cited orally; quality of cross-examination questions (focused, purposeful, built as a funnel); responses under challenge (answering strategies, hedging); use of concessions won in cross-examination in the second speech; delivery, fluency and accuracy; written self-review based on the recording.

Assessment 5: Disinformation Panel Discussion	30	Weeks 14–16	Rigor of the discourse sample (every item verified at its original source) and accuracy of coding with the four semantic markers; clarity and honesty of the data visualization; an evidence-based alternative explanation free of emotional language; responses to the fact-checkers' questions; contribution to the discussion (and chairing, where assigned); a six-step reply to one post from the sample; fluency and accuracy.

All speaking assessments are graded with the course speaking rubric, which covers argumentation, use of evidence, interaction and response to challenge, organization, delivery, and language accuracy and fluency.

Grading scale: 100–95% = 10; 94–85% = 9; 84–75% = 8; 74–65% = 7; 64–55% = 6; 54–45% = 5; 44–35% = 4; 34–25% = 3; 24–15% = 2; 14–5% = 1; 4–0% = 0.

Gen-AI use statement: Some course assignments will allow the use of AI and some will not; the instructor will specify when and how AI use is allowed during the course, following the GenAI-use guidelines adopted by the Faculty of Philology.

In this course, students may use generative AI to search for sources and counterarguments, to rehearse cross-examination, and to check their language, provided that they verify every source and claim themselves and keep a brief AI-use log. AI may not be used to write speech scripts, panel statements or the six-step reply, and students may not present AI-generated text as their own. Students may be asked to explain and defend their sources and reasoning orally.

Ethical conduct is mandatory, and students who breach ethical principles bear the responsibility provided for in VU legal acts.

Author (-s)	Publishing year	Title	Issue of a periodical or volume of a publication	Publishing house or web link
Required reading				
Kriaučiūnienė, R., & Arcimavičienė, L.	2023	English for academic purposes and research (C1)	Units as assigned; ISBN 9786090707906	Vilnius University Press
Schechter, S.	2023	Public speaking for today's audiences	Chapters as assigned	BCcampus. https://pressbooks.bccampus.ca/speaking
Snoeck Henkemans, A. F.	2000	State-of-the-art: The structure of argumentation	Argumentation, 14(4), 447–473	https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007800305762
Truscott, J.	1996	The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes	Language Learning, 46(2), 327–369	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x
Ferris, D.	1999	The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996)	Journal of Second Language Writing, 8(1), 1–11	https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80110-6
Wineburg, S., & McGrew, S.	2019	Lateral reading and the nature of expertise: Reading less and learning more when evaluating digital information	Teachers College Record, 121(11), 1–40	https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811912101102
Mastandrea, A.	2023	Countering disinformation discourse in the English language classroom	English Teaching Forum, 61(4), 2–9	https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1416489
Recommended reading				
American Psychological Association	2020	Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.)		American Psychological Association. https://apastyle.apa.org

Truscott, J.	1999	The case for “The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes”: A response to Ferris	Journal of Second Language Writing, 8(2), 111–122	https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80124-6
van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R.	2004	A systematic theory of argumentation: The pragma-dialectical approach		Cambridge University Press
Zudilova-Seinstra, E., Adriaansen, T., & van Liere, R.	2009	Overview of interactive visualisation	In R. van Liere, T. Adriaansen, & E. Zudilova-Seinstra (Eds.), Trends in interactive visualization	Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84800-269-2_1
Seifert, C. M.	2002	The continued influence of misinformation in memory: What makes a correction effective?	In B. H. Ross (Ed.), The psychology of learning and motivation (Vol. 41, pp. 265–292)	Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-7421(02)80009-3
Colliander, J.	2019	“This is fake news”: Investigating the role of conformity to other users’ views when commenting on and spreading disinformation in social media	Computers in Human Behavior, 97, 202–215	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.03.032
Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E., & Zou, J.	2023	GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers	Patterns, 4(7), Article 100779	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.100779

Updated 11-11-2026