

Richard Miles and Christopher Davanzo

**IMPROMPTU PRESENTATIONS:
THE JAPANESE LEARNERS' EXPERIENCES**

ABSTRACT. The authors conducted a semester long study to explore how Japanese university learners perceive the experience of impromptu speaking in English. Impromptu speaking is seldom discussed in the English presentation textbooks used in Japanese universities, but the authors of this paper are of the view that it should be an integral component of any public speaking curriculum. A qualitative analysis of responses to self-reflection questionnaires distributed following four separate impromptu presentations revealed insights into how learners perceive both the difficulty and the value of impromptu presentations. The study also examines the differences between English language majors and non-English language majors. The findings have important implications for improving the curriculum and teaching practice of educators.

Keywords: Impromptu presentations, Japanese EFL context, Learners' perspectives.

1. Introduction

Conventional wisdom and anecdotal evidence from teachers often indicate that impromptu presentations are notoriously difficult for Japanese university students, but at the same time they are a valuable learning experience. Impromptu presentations should be an integral component of any public speaking curriculum, although they are seldom featured in presentation textbooks for Japanese learners of English. Experience with impromptu presentations can serve as an invaluable training exercise for Japanese students to develop critical thinking skills, improve their ability to quickly organize information, and increase language fluency. The

ability to think on one's feet, speak clearly and coherently will also likely enhance employment prospects and career opportunities.

To explore how Japanese university learners perceive the experience of impromptu presenting, the researchers carried out a semester-long study in two different English presentation classes (one consisting of English majors and one of non-English majors). On four separate occasions, students were given topics to speak about in front of their peers with 10 seconds or less to prepare. Students were required to speak for three minutes each time. After each presentation, students filled out self-reflection questionnaires, where they rated a number of relevant factors pertaining to their impromptu presentations using a 5-point Likert-scale, and then answered several open-ended questions regarding their experience. A qualitative analysis of the responses revealed specific insights into how these Japanese students perceived both the difficulty and value of impromptu presentations. The findings have important implications for improving the curricula and teaching practices of English educators in Japan.

2. Background

There is a lot of research on oral presentations, but the focus has largely been on prepared presentations. The relatively few studies dealing with impromptu

presentations have mostly been descriptive in nature and simply showcased how to implement and utilize impromptu presentations. Some of these studies have demonstrated how to use impromptu presentations to develop presentation skills, whereas others have demonstrated how to use them as a tool to foster critical thinking and deepen learners' understanding of course content. Thompson et al. (2012) described a study in which the use of impromptu presentations promoted active learning and full engagement by the students and thus motivated them to take greater ownership of the course. Another study by Brigance (2004) introduced 'tag team' public speaking (speakers take turns and present together) as a form of impromptu presentation, with the idea that increased exposure and experience would reduce anxiety when presenting in the future. Ivic and Green (2012) demonstrated how to use impromptu presentations as a way to encourage students to model their delivery on that of Steve Jobs. In a more in-depth study, Sevian and Gonsalves (2008) challenged their graduate school science students to truncate and present research to their peers in unscripted explanations. One of the study's conclusions was that impromptu explanations (a form of impromptu presenting) were useful in identifying which students were able to succinctly organize their ideas and communicate them to peers who did not possess a scientific background.

Their success or failure in this task was taken as evidence of their future potential to become science professors.

Few studies, however, have sought to explore the learner's perspective on delivering impromptu presentations, particularly in Japan. However, one notable study by Nehls (2013) focused on the Japanese learner's perspective of the perceived value, enjoyment, and difficulty of delivering impromptu presentations. He found that while 90% of the learners in his class study at Yokohama City University (carried out over a three-year period) responded that impromptu presentations were very useful, 49.6% said they were not enjoyable, and a further 66% rated impromptu presentations as the most difficult activity in their course (Nehls 2013). Despite the lack of other research on impromptu presentations, there seems to be a consensus among instructors that they are indeed beneficial for students. The impetus for this study was to determine the validity of this sentiment, and to investigate how Japanese learners perceive the value and usefulness of impromptu presenting.

3. Methodology

The research design for this qualitative study spanned the duration of a Japanese university semester (15 weeks) in 2015. The study was conducted at a

private liberal arts university in Japan and the research was carried out on two separate groups of participants, but relied on identical research procedures, data collection methods, and coding analysis techniques for each group. The data from both groups were analyzed separately and then compared and integrated to further detail the Japanese learner's experience delivering impromptu presentations in English. The findings from analysis of the data will be illustrated and discussed in Section 4, and the implications for teachers will then be presented in Section 5.

3.1. Participants

All the participants in both groups were Japanese. The participants in Group 1 (G1) were enrolled in an elective course entitled "English Presentations." The class was comprised of 20 second-, third-, and fourth-year students ($n=20$); all except three were non-English majors. The remaining 17 were business, economics, humanities, and European language majors. Eleven of the participants were female and nine were male. None of the participants dropped out of the course during the semester. The class sessions were conducted once a week for 90 minutes over the course of the 15-week semester. There were initially 22 participants in Group 2 (G2), all of whom were English majors and either in their third or fourth year of studies. These participants enrolled in an elective course called "Intermediate

English Skills,” which also met once a week for 90 minutes. During the semester, two participants dropped out, and their data was subsequently omitted from the final analysis. G2 consisted of 16 female and 4 male participants ($n=20$). While the English level of the participants varied in both groups (particularly in G1), the participants in G2 likely had a higher level of English oral ability, due to the fact they had all taken at least two years of intensive English classes, compared to the one year of standard English classes the bulk of the participants in G1 had experienced. In addition, a large number of the participants in G2 had studied abroad for a year in English speaking countries. While exact recent TOEIC scores were not obtained from the participants in either group, the researchers estimated (based on their teaching experience) that the scores likely ranged from 600-800 in G1 and from 700-900 in G2. The participants in G2 also had a great deal more experience delivering English presentations in their compulsory English classes. The three English majors in G1 had a comparable level of English and a similar background in presenting to the participants in G2.

3.2. Courses

The course goals of the instructor teaching G1 were to enable the students to develop self-confidence and become effective public speakers. To accomplish these

goals, the students learnt the most important fundamentals of presenting and then practiced them regularly during class. Throughout the semester, students received the instructor's feedback and advice on how to improve. In addition, the instructor coached them on vital aspects of presentations including choosing topics, preparation and organization, delivering a presentation with maximum effect, and doing impromptu presentations. Student presentations in class fell into two categories, prepared and impromptu. Furthermore, students were filmed for two of their prepared presentations, and wrote a detailed self-evaluation and analysis on both of these presentations. In principle, students delivered a prepared presentation every two weeks, and in between, they received further instruction and worked on delivering impromptu presentations.

One-third of the semester's classes were dedicated to practicing impromptu presentations. The underlying philosophy behind the frequent practice is that it is an important training tool to help students rapidly progress toward the course's stated goals of developing self-confidence and becoming competent public speakers. As students realize that they are able to stand up in front of a group of people and coherently express themselves, they gain confidence and carry this assurance into their prepared presentations. Moreover, through this experience, students can feel more secure in the knowledge that if they lose their thoughts, they

can still continue speaking in an unscripted manner. Finally, students can develop the ability to take a sudden insight that may occur to them during a prepared presentation, and smoothly incorporate it into their presentation. Therefore, in many respects, practicing impromptu presentations is equally as important as giving prepared presentations.

For the instructor in charge of G2, the primary focus of the course was to develop delivery and language skills. As the students all had extensive experience delivering prepared presentations during their first two years of university, most were already fairly comfortable presenting. When designing the course, the instructor intuitively felt the students mostly needed to improve *how* they presented. A further goal of the instructor was to prepare the students to present in their seminars and overseas institutions of higher education. To help students improve how they presented, the focus of the course was primarily on language and delivery techniques. Examples of language techniques taught in this course were tripling, repetition, knockdowns, rhetorical questions, signposting, book-ending, and inclusive language. Examples of delivery techniques included hand gestures, sweeping eye contact, foot position, and gesturing to visuals. Proper use of these techniques formed the basis for assessing the three prepared presentations delivered during the course. All of the prepared presentations were filmed, for the purpose of

having students watch, reflect and self-evaluate. In between these assessed presentations, there were lessons focusing on different techniques, with opportunities to practice in front of small groups and not worry about being assessed.

There were also four impromptu presentations delivered at points throughout the semester. The purpose for having students deliver these impromptu presentations was the same as for G1, but also to give students a further opportunity to incorporate some of the language and delivery techniques they had learnt in class. As documented by Miles (2013), small impromptu presentations in groups of three can provide Japanese learners with opportunities to practice specific language and delivery techniques. Examples of such techniques can include sweeping eye contact, interactive questions, or signposting distinct points, and these can be experimented with in an authentic situation, without the presenter having to excessively focus on the content of the presentation or worry about being formally assessed. Presenting in this manner also provides the two other group members who are observing with a chance to learn how other presenters utilize certain techniques, and as a result, to improve their own presentation skills.

3.3. Data collection methods

The data was collected immediately following four separate impromptu presentations for both groups. Each impromptu presentation had a different theme, within which there were a range of specific topics. The four themes were arranged so that the easier ones appeared earlier in the semester and the more difficult ones later, after students had gained more experience. Additionally, to help students acclimatize themselves and to build confidence the instructors divided their students into small groups for the first two sessions. Then, for the final two impromptu presentations, students spoke in front of the entire class. The students had to speak for three minutes on a specific topic each time; instructors kept track of time and indicated to speakers when they had 15 seconds to conclude. The general themes of the four impromptu presentations with several more specific examples in brackets were as follows:

Table 1. Impromptu presentation themes

Impromptu Presentation	Theme
1	People (family members, friends, etc.)
2	Personal experiences (trips, successes, etc.)
3	Things or objects (onions, chopsticks, coffee, etc.)
4	Persuasive stances (the best restaurant to visit, the best place for summer vacation, etc.)

Following the last impromptu presentation of the day, all the participants were given a one-page self-reflection report to complete. They were given ten minutes to write their responses and were informed that this report was not a test, nor an assessed part of the course, but rather the task served two purposes: to provide students with the opportunity to reflect on their presentations, and to provide the researchers data and feedback in order to analyze Japanese students' experiences of impromptu presenting. Consenting to take part in the research was optional for the students, but all of them expressed a desire to do so. After the self-reflection reports had been collected, they were copied and stored in a locked cabinet to ensure privacy. The originals were returned to the students the following week, along with comments and feedback from the instructor regarding both their presentations and reflections.

Each self-reflection report began with six prompts, asking the participants to rate items on a Likert-scale, from one to five points. Instructions for these prompts stated that participants should provide a score indicating how difficult or easy they felt each task had been. These prompts were given for each of the four self-reflection reports and are listed along with the rating scale in Table 2.

Table 2. Self-reflection numerical prompts

Prompt number	Prompt
1	Beginning your impromptu presentation
2	Continuing to talk without breaks or pauses
3	Making sweeping/moving eye contact
4	Structuring your presentation
5	Concluding your presentation
6	Doing this impromptu presentation

(1=very easy, 2=easy, 3=average, 4=a little difficult, 5=very difficult)

*Half scores were also accepted

In addition to these numerical prompts, the participants were also asked to answer several open-ended questions with written responses. They were free to write as much or as little as they felt necessary. These open-ended questions are listed below in Table 3.

Table 3. Self-reflection open-ended questions

Self-reflection report	Questions/prompts
1	What did you find easy to do? What was difficult to do? Do you think doing impromptu presentations is valuable/important? Why or why not?
2	How did the experience of doing today's presentation compare with the first impromptu presentation you did?
3	Describe your experience of giving today's impromptu presentation in front of the whole class. Comment on both your general topic (the card you drew) and your specific topic, the one that formed the main body of your presentation.

4	Did it become easier to do impromptu presentations during this course? Provide an example of something that became easier. Do you think practicing impromptu presentations will be useful/applicable for your future? Can you provide an example?
---	--

Under each open-ended question, blank space was provided where students were free to respond. During this ten-minute period, they were also free to use their dictionary or to consult with other students on any matters related to the self-reflection reports. When they had completed the reports, they were handed in directly to the instructor.

4. Data Analysis

At the end of the semester, all of the raw data (responses on the self-reflection reports) from both groups was compiled for coding and analyzing. Numerical scores from the first six prompts represented the first form of data, while written responses to the open-ended questions represented the second form of data. The written responses were coded adhering to Saldaña's (2013) work and following his definition of each coding process. The first coding process to be applied to the data was *focused coding*. This process involved grouping together all the written responses to each prompt from each self-reflection paper. For this step, the two

groups were coded separately. *Thematic coding* was then applied in order to categorize responses together that were similar in terms of their content and properties. Following this step, the data in each category was recoded into more specific sub-categories based on more specific similarities in the content, in order to analyze the data in greater detail.

In addition to coding the written responses, descriptive statistics were collected for the numerical scores given to the first six prompts. After analyzing averages and interesting trends in the statistics, evidence and possible explanations were sought in the written responses, representing *grounded theorization*, as defined by Charmaz (2014). The results from the analysis on the two forms of data are presented in the following section.

5. The Findings

The first important finding originates from the written responses on the self-reflection reports, and addresses the central research question in this study. On the first and the last self-reflection report, the participants were asked how valuable and useful they thought impromptu presentations were. All the participants indicated that they perceived the experience of delivering impromptu presentations as valuable and useful. In fact, none of the participants wrote anything negative about

the experience other than it was difficult, or that they had failed to improve in a certain area.

Through analyzing the written responses, the researchers became cognizant that the two groups (G1 and G2) had different primary reasons for their unanimous endorsement of the impromptu presenting experience. For G2 students, enhancing their employment prospects in the future was the primary reason they regarded impromptu presenting as worthwhile. As G2Mo stated, *“I think it is important. It will be required after we graduate university and get a job,”* and as G2Mi1 added, *“the job interviews are coming in the near future. I think this practice can be a practice for these interviews that I have to think and talk soon.”* Even those students who were in their third year of studies and yet to fully begin seeking employment were under the impression that impromptu presentations could help their future career prospects, as evident from G2Mi3, who noted *“I’m not starting the job hunting yet, however I have learned how to give a short answer or give my opinion to others persuasively.”* In total, ten of the twenty participants in G2 specifically mentioned vocational purposes when explaining why they thought impromptu presenting was a necessary and important exercise.

Contrary to this finding, not one participant in G1 offered future employment as a reason. The G1 participants were more focused on holistic rationale, such as *“I*

can make myself better understood” (G1Di), and *“this training can make my skills higher”* (G1To). A possible explanation for this distinction between the groups was that the majority of participants in G1 were second-year students, who had yet to experience the demands of the Japanese ‘job-hunting season’, as the participants in G2 had experienced or were about to experience. Although their reasons differed, the participants in G1 and G2 unanimously agreed on the importance and usefulness of impromptu presentations.

One of the interesting findings from the descriptive statistics relates to whether participants felt impromptu presentations had become easier to deliver as they garnered more experience (Question 6 on all the self-reflection reports). Intuitively, the researchers expected that students would report decreasing levels of difficulty, though this trend might be tempered by the increasing difficulty of the topics, and moving from small group audiences for the first two presentations to whole class presentations for the latter two. While the first impromptu presentation was simply descriptive, the last one was a more challenging persuasive task. A comparison of the average scores (1=very easy and 5=very difficult) regarding the perceived difficulty of the first and last impromptu presentations suggests they became slightly easier, despite the progression to more challenging tasks and larger audiences. This data would suggest that repeated exposure to impromptu speaking

had the desired effect of aiding students to become more confident and able to deal with the task.

Table 4. Perceived difficulty of impromptu presentations

Difficulty ratings	1 st Impromptu presentation	4 th Impromptu presentation
G1-Non-English majors	3.87	3.57
G2-English majors	3.73	3.47

While the perceived difficulty of delivering impromptu presentations became moderately easier, participants still interpreted it as a difficult task overall. In addition, despite the participants in G2 having considerably more experience delivering presentations, there was no substantial difference between the two groups. G2 students still found these extemporaneous tasks challenging perhaps because although they had extensive experience presenting, that experience was almost exclusively giving prepared presentations. As G2Mi2 simply put it, *“doing impromptu talk is the most difficult thing because we can’t prepare what we talk.”*

Although the descriptive statistics were only moderately supportive of the idea that impromptu presentations became easier with repeated exposure and practice, the individual comments written on the last self-reflection report (when prompted by this same question), were much more strongly supportive. Nineteen of the

twenty participants in G1 responded that they did think it became easier, and then provided examples or reasons to justify their position. The only participant who did not clearly state that it had become easier was ambiguous in her reply, and responded that further practice was required (G1Ka). All of the participants in G2 thought impromptu presenting had become easier, although many mitigated their comments by adding examples of things they were still not good at, and suggested they needed further practice.

An unexpected finding from the descriptive statistics was that participants in both groups deemed eye contact relatively easy to make. According to G1Ea, *“Eye contact was easy.”* G1Ka stated confidently, *“I could make eye contact with every member,”* and G2Mu concurred by noting, *“making eye contact in a small group is not difficult for me.”* However, G1Ma realized that *“I found to make eye contact is a little easy in our small group, but I think I won’t be able to make eye contact in front of many people.”* This last comment indicates a possible lack of confidence and experience and could help to explain the anomaly in the table below. While the average scores indicated making eye contact was not overtly challenging for the participants in either group, it became more difficult over the semester for the participants in G1. Conversely, it became easier for the participants in G2. In total, eleven of the twenty participants in G1 and seven of the 19 in G2 mentioned eye

contact as something they found easy to do in the first impromptu presentations. Many of the seven participants in G2 who listed eye contact as easy, merely listed it without any explanation, perhaps indicating their comments were self-explanatory. G2Ra did state explicitly that “*eye contact is easy for me*” with G2Mi stating exactly the same thing. These two comments were reflective of many of the other comments from G2 participants regarding eye contact.

Table 5. Perceived difficulty of making eye contact

Eye contact	1st Impromptu presentation	4th Impromptu presentation
G1-Non-English majors	2.25	2.80
G2-English majors	2.68	2.27

A possible explanation for the contrasting trends observed in Table 5 is that the G2 participants all had extensive experience with prepared presentations, which meant they were initially more aware of the difficulties in making consistent eye contact, but then came to feel it was relatively easier as they gained experience doing impromptu presentations. In contrast, the participants in G1 had little to no experience with presentations of any kind, and therefore may have initially felt eye contact was fairly uncomplicated and undemanding. However, once they started giving presentations, and learned new presentation skills and techniques, they

might have found it more challenging to simultaneously make eye contact and incorporate those new skills into their impromptu presentations. Unfortunately, there were no specific comments from the G1 participants to directly support this hypothesis.

While eye contact may have been relatively easy for these Japanese learners, the most challenging aspect of an impromptu presentation appears to have been the conclusion. Furthermore, concluding their presentations actually became even more difficult for both groups throughout the semester. As G1To summed up, *“it was difficult for me to conclude my presentation.”* A possible explanation for why concluding was difficult can be found in a comment by G2Di who stated, *“Concluding is very difficult. We start talking without thinking about structure, so it is the reason.”* G2Mi agreed by noting, *“If the structuring goes well, then concluding the presentation becomes easier.”*

Table 6. Perceived difficulty of concluding

Concluding	1st Impromptu presentation	4th Impromptu presentation
G1-Non-English majors	3.40	3.55
G2-English majors	3.00	3.35

After further analysis of the coded comments regarding the difficult aspects of impromptu presenting, a reasonable explanation as to the problems the participants had concluding their talks could be attributed to the challenges they had structuring their presentations. As G2So2 commented, “*Structuring is difficult while I’m talking.*” Indeed, seven participants in G1 and six in G2 specifically cited structuring as a problem they had in doing their first impromptu presentation. The authors therefore deduce that because of the difficulty of structuring and organizing their talks on the spot, the participants could not succinctly summarize or make an impact with their conclusions. In addition, since participants were not allowed to use watches or timers during their talks, many of them when under the pressure of speaking in front of their peers, were unaware of exactly how much time had elapsed and were forced to suddenly conclude when the instructor announced the 15 second warning. The short time frame participants had to deliver a solid conclusion is likely another plausible reason behind the scores that indicated the conclusion was the most difficult part of impromptu presenting.

Prior to beginning the study, both researchers anticipated that the task or type of impromptu presentation would determine the perceived difficulty of delivering it. The result of this thinking was the development of four different impromptu presentation tasks, which represented a gradual progression from easiest to most

difficult. The first impromptu presentation was essentially descriptive in nature. The next two marked a shift towards more informative presentations, and then culminated with a final persuasive presentation. As discussed earlier, the scores provided by the participants indicate that the last impromptu presentation was moderately less difficult than the first one, thereby negating the idea that the type of impromptu presentation determined the level of perceived difficulty. According to the data, the third presentation was perceived as the most difficult. The participants in G1 scored it as 4.14, while the participants in G2 scored it at 3.88. The authors predicted that elaborating on an object or thing would be easier than persuading the audience to agree with something, but this assumption proved not to be the case. One explanation is that many of the participants in this study (especially in G2) were more familiar with delivering persuasive presentations, but were rather baffled by having to describe everyday objects in a structured and coherent way. In fact, G2Di commented that topics were what determined the difficulty of impromptu presenting, and G2Mi specifically stated on the final self-reflection report that, *“I noticed whether impromptu presentation is easy or not depends on the topic.”* These last results suggest that the specific topic seems to be a key factor in determining the difficulty of presenting, rather than the type of presentation or general task.

The findings that have been discussed herein are not the only findings that the data yielded, but are representative of the most relevant findings for teachers; at the same time these conclusions provide an interesting view of the Japanese learner's experience delivering impromptu presentations. Section 5 will explore the implications these insights have for university English teachers in Japan.

6. Implications for Teachers

In this study, both groups of Japanese learners felt that delivering impromptu presentations was a highly beneficial learning activity that enabled them to develop applicable language and presentation skills. Instructors that teach courses requiring students to give presentations could strengthen their curricula by adding an impromptu presenting section, and adapting some form of impromptu presentation practice into the classroom. Even instructors who teach oral communication or such related classes, can create impromptu presenting activities that the students will find challenging and constructive. The authors of this study had groups of students who were capable of attempting three-minute talks, but teachers could certainly reduce the speaking time to only one minute and still have a valuable training device at their disposal. After having the experience of giving impromptu presentations, and watching their classmates, Japanese university students appear to

appreciate their educational value, and also express the desire to continue utilizing them as practical learning activities.

Once an instructor has decided the objective parameters for a given impromptu presentation activity, such as length of talk or audience size, he or she must determine the topics. One important result of this research is that students found the *specific topic* the most important determinant in the difficulty level of a particular presentation, rather than the *general topic* or category of talk. Therefore, teachers must carefully consider each individual topic they assign with great scrutiny in order to accurately mete out topics of the difficulty level they want.

The student self-reflection reports clearly indicated that effectively concluding their impromptu presentations was the hardest part for both groups of Japanese learners. Therefore, instructors need to direct more time and attention on coaching students how to effectively conclude their impromptu presentations. Instructors should give students guidelines on how to end specific types of impromptu presentations, model those methods for them, and provide non-threatening class activities in which they can practice their conclusions. Hopefully through guided practice and experience, students can more quickly hone their conclusion skills, gain confidence, and become better speakers.

7. Conclusion

The main purpose of this study was to gather and analyze Japanese university students' perceptions of practicing and delivering impromptu presentations. As experienced presentation teachers, both co-authors of this study strongly believe in the efficacy and utility of impromptu presenting as a training device to help students develop confidence and nurture various speaking skills. In addition, the researchers in this study share the consensus view that impromptu presentations are particularly difficult for students. This study found that students unanimously felt that impromptu presenting was a worthwhile classroom activity, and that they had directly benefitted from participating in it, and would also benefit in the future. Furthermore, students conveyed that the specific topic they had to speak about was more significant in determining the difficulty of impromptu presenting, than the type of talk they had to do. In addition, learners indicated that the most difficult elements were quickly organizing and structuring their thoughts, and as a result, concluding the presentation. Despite the difficulties and challenges they faced delivering impromptu presentations, Japanese learners overwhelmingly gave positive feedback regarding their usefulness and benefit.

REFERENCES

- Brigance, L. Z. (2004). Tag team public speaking. *Communication Teacher*, 18 (3), pp. 98-101.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing Grounded Theory*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ivic, R. K. & Green, R. J. (2012). Developing charismatic delivery through transformational presentations: Modeling the persona of Steve Jobs. *Communication Teacher*, 26 (2), pp. 65-68.
- Miles, R. (2013). Impromptu presentations. *Between the Keys*, 21 (2), pp. 23-26.
- Nehls, P. N. (2013). Student feedback on the value of impromptu speeches. *The 2013 PanSig Conference Proceedings*, pp. 280-284.
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Sevian, H. & Gonsalves, L. (2008). Analysing how scientists explain their research: A rubric for measuring the effectiveness of scientific explanations. *International Journal of Science Education*, 30 (11), pp. 1441-1467.
- Thompson, K. J., Switky, B. & Gilinski, A. (2012). Impromptu presentations: Boosting student learning and engagement through spontaneous collaboration. *Journal of Education for Business*, 87, pp. 14-21.

Appendix 1. Responses to questions 1-6 (G1).

Presenter	1	2	3	4	5	6
G1Ai	3-3-3.5-3	3-3.5-4-4	2.5-2-2.5-2	4-4-3.5-3.5	3-3-3-2.5	3-3-3.5-3
G1Ao	4-x-4.5-2	2-x-4.5-3	2-x-4-4	4-x-4-2	4-x-4-3	4-x-4-3
G1Co	3-3-2-5	5-5-4-5	4-2-2-3	5-5-4-5	5-4-3-5	5-5-4-5
G1Di	2-2-x-2	5-4-x-5	2-3.5-x-4	5-3-x-4	5-1.5-x-4	4-2.5-x-4
G1Ea	2-2-1-1	2.5-3-3-5	1.5-3-3-4	3.5-3-4-5	2-1-5-5	4-2-3-5
G1Ke	2-1-3-1	3-2-5-3	1-1-3-2	4-2-5-2	2-3-2-4	5-3-5-3
G1Ka	4-4-x-4	3-3-x-4	3-5-x-5	4-4-x-4	4-4-x-4	5-3-x-4
G1Ki	5-4-3.5-3	5-5-4-4	3-3-2.5-3	5-5-4-4	5-4-4-3	5-5-3.5-4
G1Mo1	4-4-3-2	4-2-1-4	1-1-1-1	5-4-3-3	3-4.5-4-2	5-4-2.5-3
G1Ma	4-5-2-2	5-5-3-4	2-3-2-2	3-5-1-3.5	2.5-5-2-4	4-5-2-3.5
G1Mi	2-2-5-1	5-5-5-4	3-4-4-2	4-2-4-3	2-4-3-2	4-4-5-2
G1Mo2	3-4-3-2.5	2.5-4-4-3	1-3-2.5-2	4-4-4-2.5	4-4-4-3	3-3-3.5-3
G1Mo3	3-3-5-3	4-4-4-4.5	3-2-3-2	4.5-3.5-4-4	3-3-2-3	4-3.5-4-3.5
G1Mo4	3.5-2-x-2	5-5-x-3	1-1-x-1	5-5-x-4	4-3-x-4	4-5-x-4
G1Ni	3.5-2.5-4-2	4-3.5-3.5-4.5	2-2-2-2	4-3-3.5-4	3.5-3.5-3.5-5	3.5-3.5-3-4
G1Ra	4-4-5-3	4-3-5-4	4-3-4-4	5-3-5-4	5-4-5-4	3-4-4-3
G1Si	3-4-4-3	4-3-4-3	2-1-2-4	4-3-4-3	3.5-3-4-3	3.5-4-4-4
G1Ta	4-2.5-3.2.5	5-4-5-3	1-2-2.5-2.5	3-3-4-4	2-3-3-3.5	4-3.5-3.5-2.5
G1To	4-5-2.5-3	4-5-3-3	3-4-3-3	3.5-5-2.5-2	4-4-2.5-4	4-5-3-4
G1Yo	1-3-4-4	4-4-5-4	3-4-4-4	2-5-5-3	2-5-5-3	4-4-5-4

- “x” indicates the participant was absent for this particular impromptu presentation

Appendix 2. Responses to questions 1-6 (G2).

Presenter	1	2	3	4	5	6
G2Ai	2-4-x-3	2-3-x-4	3-3-x-4	4-3-x-3	3-2-x-3	2-3-x-4
G2Ha	4-5-2-3	5-4-3-4	3-3-3-3	3-4-5-4	2-3-5-3	4-4-4-4
G2Mi1	3-3-4-4	2-2-3-2	3-2-4-3	4-3-3-2	3-3-3-2	3-3-4-3
G2Ra	4-4-4-4.5	3-3.5-3-4	2-3-3-3	3-3-4-5	3-3.5-2.5-4	4-4-4-5
G2Mi2	3-x-x-4	5-x-x-5	2-x-x-2	4-x-x-5	3-x-x-4	5-x-x-3
G2Mi3	4-x-3-2	3-x-4-4	2-x-2-2	4-x-4-3	2-x-2-4	5-x-3-5
G2Ye	4-2-2-2	5-4-4-5	4-3-3-3	5-4-4-4	3-4-3-5	4-3-5-4
G2Io	4-2-2-2	4-3-3-5	2-3-2-1	2-4-4-3	2-2-3-4	4-4-4-4
G2Mi4	2-4-3-2	4-5-3-2	3-3-2-2	3-4-4-3	2-3-3-2	3-4-4-2
G2Ke	4-5-3-3	4-4-5-2	3-2-2-2	4-3-4-4	3-3-3-3	4-4-4-4
G2Sol	5-4-3-4	4-5-3-5	4-4-4-4	3-4-5-5	3-3-4-5	3-4-4-4
G2Aa	2-2-1.5-2	3-2-2-2	2-1-1.5-2	3-3-3-3	2-2-2-3	2-2-2-2
G2Mi5	3-1-1-1	5-4.5-2-2	4-3-1-1	2-2-4-2	2-3-3-3	3-3-3-3
G2Ko	5-4-3.5-4	4-4.5-5-5	3-3-3.5-3.5	4-5-4.5-4.5	4-4.5-4.5-4	4-4-4.5-4.5
G2Mu	5-x-x-4	4-x-x-5	3-x-x-1	5-x-x-5	5-x-x-4	5-x-x-4
G2Mo	3-3-2-3	4-5-3-5	3-3-3-3	4-5-4-4	4-4-4-5	5-4-5-4
G2Ma	4-x-3-4	4-x-5-4	2-x-3-2	4-x-4-4	3-x-3-3	4-x-4-3
G2Di	2-2-5-1	4-5-5-2	1-1-3-1	5-5-5-2	5-3-3-2	3-3-4-2
G2So2	4-3-2-3	4-4-4-4	2-2-3-2	5-2-3-3	3-3.5-4-2	4-4-5-4
G2Hu	x-x-2-4	x-x-2-2	x-x-1-1	x-x-4-4	x-x-2-2	x-x-2-1