

# Students' Attitudes on Communication Apprehension and Self-Perceived Public Speaking Competency

---

Šovagović, Ana

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2023

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:142:411901>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-07-17**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[FFOS-repository - Repository of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Osijek](#)



J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Study Programme: Double Major MA Study Programme in English Language  
and Literature and German Language and Literature –  
Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Ana Šovagović

**Students' Attitudes on Communication Apprehension and Self-  
Perceived Public Speaking Competency**

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Dr. Alma Vančura, Assistant Professor

Osijek, 2023

J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department of English language and literature

Study Programme: Double Major MA Study Programme in English Language  
and Literature and German Language and Literature –

Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Ana Šovagović

**Students' Attitudes on Communication Apprehension and Self-  
Perceived Public Speaking Competency**

Master's Thesis

Scientific area: humanities

Scientific field: philology

Scientific branch: English studies

Supervisor: Dr. Alma Vančura, Assistant Professor

Osijek, 2023

Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet Osijek

Studij: Dvopredmetni sveučilišni diplomski studij engleskoga jezika i

književnosti i njemačkog jezika i književnosti –

Nastavnički smjer

Ana Šovagović

**Stavovi i samoprocjena studenata o strahu od govorenja i  
govorničkim sposobnostima**

Diplomski rad

Mentor: doc. dr. sc. Alma Vančura

Osijek, 2023

Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet Osijek

Odsjek za engleski jezik i književnost

Studij: Dvopredmetni sveučilišni diplomski studij engleskoga jezika i

književnosti i njemačkog jezika i književnosti –

Nastavnički smjer

Ana Šovagović

**Stavovi i samoprocjena studenata o strahu od govorenja i  
govorničkim sposobnostima**

Diplomski rad

Znanstveno područje: humanističke znanosti

Znanstveno polje: filologija

Znanstvena grana: anglistika

Mentor: doc. dr. sc. Alma Vančura

Osijek, 2023

## IZJAVA

Izjavljujem s punom materijalnom i moralnom odgovornošću da sam ovaj rad samostalno napisao/napisala te da u njemu nema kopiranih ili prepisanih dijelova teksta tuđih radova, a da nisu označeni kao citati s navođenjem izvora odakle su preneseni.

Svojim vlastoručnim potpisom potvrđujem da sam suglasan/suglasna da Filozofski fakultet u Osijeku trajno pohrani i javno objavi ovaj moj rad u internetskoj bazi završnih i diplomskih radova knjižnice Filozofskog fakulteta u Osijeku, knjižnice Sveučilišta Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku i Nacionalne i sveučilišne knjižnice u Zagrebu.

U Osijeku, 30.6.2023.

Ana Šaragović, 0122226980

Ime i prezime studenta, JMBAG

## Abstract

This study aims to research the students' attitudes toward their communication apprehension and their self-perceived public speaking competency while speaking in a foreign language. The author used a questionnaire to gather data from 145 students of all years studying at the department of English language and literature at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek to test their communication apprehension, public speaking anxiety, and public speaking competency. The results show that the students show the average level of communication apprehension, moderate anxiety when it comes to speaking anxiety, and a negative correlation has been found between the self-perceived public speaking competency and their public speaking anxiety.

Key words: communication apprehension, public speaking anxiety, public speaking competency, students of English language and literature, EFL

## Sažetak

Ovaj rad će prikazati stavove studenata prema strahu od govorenja i njihovu samoprocjenu vlastitih govorničkih sposobnosti na stranome jeziku. Autorica je koristila upitnik kako bi prikupila i analizirala podatke 145 studenata Filozofskog fakulteta s Odsjeka za engleski jezik i književnost u Osijeku, a koji se tiču straha od komunikacije, anksioznosti od javnog govora i govorničkih kompetencija. Rezultati pokazuju da studenti osjećaju prosječnu razinu straha od komunikacije, da pokazuju umjerenu anksioznost kada je u pitanju govorna anksioznost te je potvrđena negativna korelacija između samopercipirane govorničke kompetencije i govorničke anksioznosti.

Ključne riječi: strah od komunikacije, anksioznost od javnog govora, govornička kompetencija, studenti engleskog jezika i književnosti, engleski kao strani jezik



## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	1
2. Theoretical Background .....	2
2.1 Ethos, logos and pathos .....	2
2.2 Parts of a Speech.....	4
2.3 Research on public speaking apprehension and self-perceived competency .....	5
2.3.1. Language anxiety, public speaking anxiety and foreign language anxiety.....	5
2.3.2. Methods for reduction of public speaking anxiety .....	6
2.3.3. Teacher Immediacy.....	7
3. The Research Study.....	8
3.1 Hypothesis, Aim, and Research Questions.....	8
3.2 Sample .....	9
3.3 Instrument.....	9
3.3.1 Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24).....	10
3.3.2 Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRSPA).....	11
3.3.3 Self-Perceived Public Speaking Competency (SPPSC) .....	12
3.4 Procedure .....	12
4. Results and Discussion.....	12
4.1 Communication Apprehension .....	12
4.2 Public Speaking Anxiety .....	15
4.3 Public Speaking Competency .....	20
4.3.1 Public Speaking Anxiety and Public Speaking Competency Correlation .....	20
4.4 Students' Perceptions of preparedness for Speaking.....	22
4.5 Usefulness of Courses that Require More Speaking .....	24
4.6 Difference in Fear of Speaking in L1 and L2 .....	25
4.7 Improvement of Speaking skill.....	27

5. Conclusion.....	28
References: .....	31
Appendix .....	33

## 1. Introduction

Every person on this planet uses language to communicate with other people on a daily basis. Cambridge dictionary defines language as “a system of communication consisting of sounds, words, and grammar”. With that said, we may define language as means of conveying a message to another person. And when we say the word communication, it implies that there are at least two persons involved in a conversation who are exchanging some types of messages. When one person addresses a crowd, we call it public speaking. Cambridge dictionary gives the definition of public speaking as “the activity of speaking on a subject to a group of people”. Baccarani and Bonfanti (2015) give their definition of public speaking as:

an interactive communication activity carried out by one person (possibly in collaboration with others) who wants (or is called upon) to present ideas or thoughts by means of a speech made in front of a group of a few or many people gathered in a certain place to listen to the speaker(s). (p. 378)

Jaffe (2014) says that “public speaking occurs when one person prepares and delivers a talk for a group that listens, generally without interrupting the speaker’s flow of ideas” (p. 2). Baccarani and Bonfanti (2015) also claim that “public speaking can be a very frequent and necessary activity in the workplace” (p. 375). They say that we express our opinions, try to persuade others to think in a particular way or simply deliver ideas in our everyday life.

Today, there are various means that can contribute to our speech performance, for instance, we may use pictures to help us deliver our message, we may use PowerPoint presentations that contain notes on what we are supposed to say next, we may use cue-cards to help us with the order of our speech, etc. Before we deliver our speech, we have to decide what we are going to talk about, in what way we are going to deliver our message, put our speech in a logical order and then memorize it in order not to read it when it comes to the delivery of it. This can be applied not only to formal delivery of speech, but also to everyday life, especially to students of English language who, one day, hopefully, will work as teachers of English language or interpreters. As mentioned before, there are several steps we need to think of before delivering a speech. Each part will be explained in the theoretical background of this paper. To fully understand the various aspects involved in delivering a speech, and why delivering such a task can be very stressful, one must first comprehend the process of developing the speech itself.

Taking into account that one has a lot on their mind when delivering a speech, it is only normal to assume that it may cause fear or anxiety before, during, and after delivering the speech. This is stressful for native speakers of English language, let alone for L2 speakers of English. English as Foreign Language (EFL) students are faced with speaking and delivering speeches in English every day. Since English is not their mother tongue (L1), they also have to think about grammar structures and vocabulary that they are going to use while speaking in a foreign language. After all, even though they study English, they may not feel ready to use it on a daily basis.

## 2. Theoretical Background

When we want to convey a message to someone or give a speech to a group of people, we should first think about what we want to say and put the message in a logical order. Baccarani and Bonfanti (2015) say that: “speakers have to produce and disseminate knowledge, capture and keep alive the attention of their audience by arousing interest and curiosity, and leave a trace in the memory of their listeners” (p. 378). They say that one has to deliver their speech in an exciting manner while also paying attention to the phases of public speaking process. We can do that through three dimensions that were set by Aristotle (2007) and those dimensions are ethos, logos, and pathos. Dlugan (2010) calls them persuasive appeals and says that “these are the three essential qualities that your speech or presentation must have before your audience will accept your message” (p. 1).

### 2.1 Ethos, logos and pathos

Baccarani and Bonfanti (2015) say that ethos is “persuading the audience through the speaker’s credibility” (p. 379). Demirdöğen (2010) also says that “ethos, was the first element in his theory of persuasion, which referred to the character the speaker wished to present. It could be defined as the charisma and the credibility of the speaker” (p. 191). Roberts (1954, as cited in Demirdöğen, 2010, p. 191) thinks that “persuasion is achieved by the speaker’s personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible.... his character may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion he possesses”. This leads us to the conclusion that *ethos* is the dimension which defines in which measure the speaker is

trustworthy and reliable. Words and character are not the only thing that makes a person trustworthy. Aristotle (as cited in Demirdöğen, 2010, p. 192) says that nonverbal messages, reputation and the manner in which we deliver a speech, all contribute to our personal ethos.

A person cannot convince another person to believe in something if they do not have strong arguments. The dimension or rhetoric that deals with arguments is called *logos*. Roos (2013) says that “through logos, the speaker persuades the audience through logical arguments based on facts, deductive or inductive reasoning and irrefutable conclusions” (p. 551). Baccarani and Bonfanti (2015) say that while preparing their speech, the speaker has to clearly define the purpose of it which may be to inform, entertain, persuade, etc. Demirdöğen (2010) again refers to Aristotle and says that he “advised persuaders to use syllogistic arguments (enthymemes) in which the major premise was already believed by the audience” (p. 192).

When we want to persuade someone to believe in something, we will involve emotions. If we do that, we used the dimension of speech called *pathos*. Baccarani and Bonfanti (2015) put it in this way:

[It] includes the speaker’s ability to stimulate favourable emotional impulses in the audience. Saying something very interesting and credible is not sufficient in itself because the information must be delivered in a manner that attracts the attention of the audience and leaves an imprint in the memory of the listeners. (p. 379)

Demirdöğen (2010) defines pathos as mood or tone of the speech that addresses the passion of listeners and Roos (2013) says that pathos is moving the audience to their shared values by using emotions. Baccarani and Bonfanti (2015) say: “persuading the audience by means of effective emotional appeals allows speakers to develop pathos” (p. 380).

These three dimensions are important in making a good speaker and speech. For it to be successful, we need to take all of them into account. On the one hand, it may cause stress and anxiety for students, seeing how much work is necessary to make a good speech. On the other hand, not all students are aware of all these dimensions they need to include in their speech and thus do not feel the stress.

## 2.2 Parts of a Speech

Roos (2013) says:

Delivering a speech does not only mean to stand in front of the listeners and talking – it requires preparation, research, planning, remembering, and only then delivering the speech. A classical speech is constructed and delivered according to the five canons of rhetoric – invention (choosing the topoi, or topics), arrangement (organizing it), style (the phrasing and choices of linguistic elements), memory and delivery. (p. 551)

Jaffe (2014) explains the steps one needs to take in order to prepare a successful speech: select topic and the purpose, analyze one’s audience, do the research to support what one is saying with facts, organize main points, think of what one wants to say in the introduction and conclusion, and outline the speech accordingly. Of course, you have to use the appropriate language while delivering your speech as well. While analyzing your audience, you will see if any additional supporting material is needed, for instance a presentation with notes and photographs, graphs or tables, and prepare that as well. When we take all of this into consideration, we can notice that there are really a lot of things that a person has to think about when composing a speech. Delivering a speech is stressful by itself and thinking about all the things we have to include in our speech can only add additional anxiety to it.

Writing an outline is a quite an important step for preparing your speech and “experienced speakers know there’s no single way to outline a speech correctly, and there’s no set length for an outline. Many factors go into shaping your final product, including the type of speech, the circumstances, and the time limitations” (Jaffe, 2014, p. 137-138). Jaffe (2014) also says that “A content outline accomplishes two major purposes: (1) it shows the speech’s structural elements—the introduction, body, and conclusion, and (2) it shows the speech’s logical elements—the major ideas, the supporting materials, and their relationship to one another” (p. 138). Jaffe (2014) supports the idea that delivering a speech is not only talking in front of a group of people willing to listen to us.

## 2.3 Research on public speaking apprehension and self-perceived competency

### 2.3.1. Language anxiety, public speaking anxiety and foreign language anxiety

MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) define language anxiety as “the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language contexts, including speaking, listening, and learning” (p. 284). Pull (2012) defines public speaking anxiety as “fear of speaking in public, fear of public speaking, or fear of speaking in front of others” (p. 32). Ulupinar (2017) says that one of the biggest challenges that the students who speak English as a second language face is anxiety. Horwitz et al. (1986, as cited in Ulupinar, 2017, p. 1) divided foreign language anxiety into three types: “communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation” (p. 1).

MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) were interested in researching the effects of anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language learning. They state that previous research (Gardner, 1985, Gardner & MacIntyre, 1992 and 1993, Skehan, 1989 and 1991, Spolsky, 1989, as cited in MacIntyre and Gardner (1994)) has shown how various affective variables affect language achievement among which anxiety shows the strongest correlation.

In a previous study, MacIntyre and Gardner (1989, as cited in MacIntyre and Gardner 1994), discovered that anxious students took longer to learn a vocabulary list than those who were less anxious. This study “offers a more complete analysis of the types of language learning processes that might be affected by language anxiety” (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1994, p. 288). They found that “anxiety was correlated with longer latencies to categorize the words but was not associated with the number of errors. Thus, anxious students appeared to be more cautious in making their judgments” (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1994, p. 300).

Ellis (1995) has researched anxiety and communication apprehension when it comes to L1. She (ibid.) has shown that the speaker’s perception of their own competence to deliver a public speech, as well as their own level of apprehension can be an influencing factor when it comes to public speaking. Ellis (1995) examined trends and relationships among public speaking anxiety, self-perceived public speaking competency, and teacher immediacy for students with high, moderate, and low communication apprehension. She mentions that “perceptions of communicative ability may be central to apprehension” (Ellis, 1995, p. 65) and references the research on self-perceived communication competency and variety of personality orientations by McCroskey and Richmond (1989, as cited in Ellis, 1995) which generated

negative correlations between students' apprehension and communication competence, which means that their communication competence was worse when they were feeling more apprehensive about their speech delivery. A research by Richmond et al. (1989, as cited in Ellis, 1995) showed negative correlation between public speaking anxiety and self-perceived public speaking competence. In her study, Ellis (1995) showed that public speaking anxiety is negatively related to self-perceived public speaking competency, namely the more competent one feels, the less anxious about public speaking will they be. In her results, Ellis (1995) states that she found that teacher immediacy plays a role in anxiety decrease. Ellis (1995) concludes that the study "reinforces previous research that indicates that students' self-perceived public speaking competency is indeed an important predictor of their public speaking anxiety" (p. 73).

Woodrow (2006) says that "anxiety experienced in communication in English can be debilitating and can influence students' adaptation to the target environment and ultimately the achievement of their educational goals" (p. 309). Woodrow (2006) wanted to examine "the construct of language learning anxiety of a sample of students studying English for academic purposes" (p. 309). She found that anxiety presents a problem in language learning which has an exhausting effect on some students. She also says that teachers should address this problem so as to provide help to reduce second language anxiety.

Ulupinar (2017) came to the conclusion that understanding foreign language anxiety remains an unsolved question which represents an obstacle to more specific problems and efforts to help students overcome their anxiety.

### 2.3.2. Methods for reduction of public speaking anxiety

Pull (2012) examined the data that concerns psychological and physiological reaction to public speaking with individuals who are afraid of speaking in front of others. Pull (ibid.) found several studies concerning physiological and psychological reactivity which led him to the conclusion that public speaking anxiety is a disabling disorder present in people who suffer from social anxiety disorder. He ends his research by saying that "public-speaking anxiety is amenable to cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) programs that include novel ways of exposure to the feared situations" (p. 35).



Allen et al. (1989) criticize other research papers (Foss (1982), Friedrich and Goss (1984), Kelley (1984), Fremouw (1984)) on methods about reducing public speaking anxiety because they list numerous methods one can use to do so but lack the comparison on the effectiveness of the methods. Allen et al. (ibid.) do not say that the methods are not effective, but if we do not compare them, then they may all seem equally effective. Allen et. al. (ibid.) found that there were seven methods of reducing anxiety while speaking publicly:

(1) systematic desensitization (SD), (2) cognitive modification (CM), (3) skills training through education (SK), (4) cognitive modification and skills training combined, (5) systematic desensitization and skills training combined, (6) systematic desensitization and cognitive modification combined, (7) cognitive modification, systematic desensitization, and skills training combined. (p. 58)

At the end of their research, they (ibid.) came to the conclusion that every method is effective in reducing public speaking anxiety, some less than others and that the “type of self-report scale did not effect the observed effect size” (p. 62).

### 2.3.3. Teacher Immediacy

Mehrabian (1971, as cited in Ellis (1995)) defines immediacy as “communication behavior that reduces physical and/or psychological distance between people. Immediacy behavior can be verbal or nonverbal” (p. 67). Ellis (1995) then defines nonverbal teacher immediacy variables as “smiling, eye contact, vocal expressiveness, movement about the classroom, gesturing, and a relaxed posture” (p. 67) and verbal ones as:

(a) using humor in class, (b) praising students' work, actions, or comments, (c) frequently initiating and/or demonstrating willingness to become engaged in conversations with students before, after, or outside of class, (d) self-disclosing, (e) asking questions that solicit viewpoints or opinions, (f) following up on student-initiated topics, (g) providing feedback on students' work, and (h) inviting students to telephone or meet outside of class if they have questions or want to discuss a matter. (p. 67-68)

Mehrabian (1971, as cited in Ellis, 1995) says that immediacy behavior can reflect a positive attitude between the sender and receiver.

### 3. The Research Study

#### 3.1 Aim, Research Questions and Hypotheses

The aim of the study was to try and determine the attitudes on communication apprehension and self-perceived public speaking competency of the students of English language and literature at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek. There were multiple research questions and hypotheses that this study wanted to answer.

RQ1: Is there a difference in the level of communication apprehension for students of different years studying English language and literature at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek?

H1: There will be a significant difference in the level of communication apprehension for students of different years studying English language and literature at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek

RQ2: Is there a difference in the level of public speaking anxiety for students from the first year of undergraduate studies when compared to the students of other years of studies, studying English language and literature at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek?

H2: There will be a significant difference in the level of public speaking anxiety for students from the first year of undergraduate studies when compared to the students of other years of studies, studying English language and literature at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek

RQ3: Are there any changes in level of self-perceived public speaking competency for students from the first-year undergraduates when compared to the students of other years of studies?

H3: There will be significant changes in the level of self-perceived public speaking competency for students from the first-year undergraduates when compared to the students of other years of studies

RQ4: Is there a correlation between self-perceived public speaking competency and public speaking anxiety?

H4: Public speaking anxiety is negatively related to self-perceived public speaking competence.

RQ5: What is students' perception on their readiness to hold lectures (to speak in front of students) when they leave university?

RQ6: Do the courses that require more speaking make students more prepared for speaking in front of students?

RQ7: Do students feel the difference when they have to speak in Croatian as opposed to speaking in English language?

### 3.2 Sample

The participants that participated in the research were 145 students of English language and literature from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek. Given that the study wanted to investigate the possible changes in the levels of public speaking anxiety as well as their own communication apprehension, students of all years, namely from the first year of undergraduate studies to the second year of graduate studies, were surveyed. The survey was completed by 145 students, 42 of which were first-year undergraduate students, 30 were second-year undergraduate students, 21 were third-year undergraduate students, 11 were first-year graduate students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language, 14 students were majoring in translation studies, and 27 were second-year graduate students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language. Even though the students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language and those majoring in translation studies are both students of English language, the author thinks that their education and approach to language could be quite different at the graduate level of studies and that is why the author decided to analyze them separately. Regarding gender, out of 145 students, 68,3% (N=99) participants are female, 29,7% (N=43) participants are male, and 2% (N=3) were non-binary students. With the minimum of 9 and maximum of 21, the average amount of years that the participants have studied English is 14,82 years.

### 3.3 Instrument

The participants took a 7-page survey consisting of a) bio-data, b) four questionnaires (see **Appendix**) based on McCroskey (1982), McCroskey (1970), and Ellis (1995), c) five open-end and d) three yes/no questions. Parts c) and d) of the questionnaire were designed by the author and the advisor. The four questionnaires consisted of Personal Report of Communication

Apprehension (to which the students answered on a Likert scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree), Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (five-point Likert scale), Self-Perceived Public Speaking Competency (five-point Likert scale), and Teacher Immediacy (students answered on a Likert scale that read 0 = never and 4 = always). There were 123 items in total in the survey. The items of all surveys were taken in their original form. The only thing that was changed in agreement between the author and the supervisor was the Likert scale measurement in the first survey, so that instead of 1 meaning strongly agree, it was changed to mean strongly disagree. The reason for this is the students' habit and cultural acceptance that 1 is of a lower value than 5 when it comes to grades, and therefore it is more likely that the participants will associate the number 1 with something more negative, that is, poorer results, or in this case, disagreement. When the results were entered into the IBM SPSS program, the author used the 'Recode Into Same' order to change the values into what they originally should have been in order to be able to calculate the score.

In the open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire, the students were able to express in words how they feel about talking in front of the pupils and/or listeners in English when they finish their studies, to tell whether they are introverts or extroverts, and to list different things that helped them in their skill when speaking in English.

### 3.3.1 Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24)

PRCA-24 is a self-report measure on oral communication apprehension developed by James McCroskey. McCroskey (1978) defines oral communication apprehension as: "an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated (oral) communication with another person or persons" (p. 192). There are four subgroups in PRCA-24 instrument: Group Discussion (e.g., items 1. *I dislike participating in group discussions* and 2. *Generally, I am comfortable while participating in group discussions*), Meetings (e.g., items 8. *Usually, I am calm and relaxed while participating in a meeting* and 10. *I am afraid to express myself at meetings*), Interpersonal (e.g., items 15. *Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations* and 16. *Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations*), and Public Speaking (e.g., items 21. *I feel relaxed while giving a speech* and 24. *While giving a speech, I get so nervous I forget facts I really know*). The calculation for the Group Discussion sub-score was adding up 18 with items 2, 4, and 6, then adding up items 1, 3, and 5, and at the end, subtracting the second score from the first one. Meetings sub-score followed the same

procedure, but with different items. For this sub-score, the author added up 18 with items 8, 9, and 12, then she added up the items 7, 10, and 11, and at the end subtracted the second score from the first one. The same thing goes for the Interpersonal sub-score, where 18 was added up with items 14, 16, and 17 for the first score, then the for the second one items 13, 15, and 18 were added up, and finally second score was subtracted from the first one. Lastly, the last sub-score, the Public Speaking one, was again computed the same way: adding up 18 with items 19, 21, and 23 for the first score, items 20, 22, and 24 for the second one, and at the end, subtracting the second score from the first one. To calculate the overall score, one is supposed to add up all four sub-scores. The author then added them up in IBM SPSS program and was then able to extract the results for the communication apprehension.

McCroskey (1982) defined that any result above 18 indicates some degree of apprehension. Results that are lower than 51 indicate low level of communication apprehension, above 80 is high level of apprehension, and everything in between is considered average level of communication apprehension. For calculation of PRCA-24 levels descriptive statistics, that is, frequencies test, One-Way ANOVA test, and Bonferroni test were applied.

### 3.3.2 Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRSPA)

Everyone has some type of fear or anxiety when we have to speak in front of other people. This is tested with PRPSA questionnaire which was taken from McCroskey (1970) who used Emery and Krumboltz's (1967) instrument. "The PRPSA was developed by substituting public speaking situations for test situations (...) to measure test anxiety. The test anxiety instrument has been used in a number of studies and found to be reliable" (McCroskey, 1970, p. 276). There are no subgroups in this instrument as in PRCA-24 that have to be separately calculated. The PRPSA instrument was calculated in three steps. The first step was to add up items 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34. Second step was to add up items 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, and 26. Finally, the third step was to complete the following formula:  $72 - \text{total from step 2} + \text{total from step 1}$ . In this way, the author got the overall result of the PRPSA instrument. With the PRPSA instrument the scale went from 1 which had the lowest value ('Strongly disagree') to 5 which had the biggest value ('Strongly agree').

### 3.3.3 Self-Perceived Public Speaking Competency (SPPSC)

The questionnaire which tests the participants' own views of their public speaking competency was developed by Ellis (1995): "The SPPSC is a 5-step, Likert-type self-report measure developed by the researcher. The instrument is based on the eight public speaking competencies identified on the 'The Competent Speaker Speech Performance Evaluation Form'" (p. 69). Upon collecting the data, the author had to recode several items for the items to match because some items are in a negative form, and all should be positive. The items that were recoded are 3, 6, 11, 14, 16, and 18.

Teacher immediacy was tested with a 34-item, 5-step Likert-type scale.

## 3.4 Procedure

Before they were given a study, the participants had been informed by the author how the survey was going to look like. They were given a questionnaire and instructed not to overthink the items but to record their first impression. The students needed approximately ten to fifteen minutes to fill in the questionnaire. The survey was completely anonymous and voluntary.

The results of the study were analyzed through the program IBM SPSS Statistics Data Editor. The quantitative data analysis included standard descriptive statistics.

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 4.1 Communication Apprehension

As mentioned in 3.3.1., McCroskey (1982) calculated the results of the PRCA-24 test and reported that results that are lower than 51 indicate low level of communication apprehension, above 80 is considered to be a high level of apprehension, and everything in between is considered average level of communication apprehension.

#### *4.1.1. PRCA overall score for all years*

Out of 145 students, 134 students completed the PRCA-24 questionnaire. The results show that by having the mean value of 69,73 and standard deviation of 20,89, the students of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek have the average level of communication apprehension. But even though the students have the average level of communication apprehension, one can tell that there are large variations between the individual students. Although when calculated together the results show the average level of apprehension, on the one hand the value of one individual is 25 and on the other, the maximum value is 115 which signifies very low and very high level of apprehension. Even though Ellis (1995) did not calculate an overall score for all students, but for each student separately, we can see that most of the students from her research had an average level of communication apprehension. With the overall score gravitating more towards the high level of communication apprehension, we can conclude that PRCA-24 instrument also confirms the initial hypothesis that public speaking anxiety negatively affects students' public speaking competence.


One-Way ANOVA test showed us that there is no significant difference in the results between the students of the five years (1<sup>st</sup> undergraduate to 2<sup>nd</sup> graduate) who took the survey, as Sig. is ,259. It signifies that there is no statistical significance in the score between the groups (years of study). The hypothesis that there will be a significant difference in the level of communication apprehension for students of different years studying English language and literature at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek has not been confirmed.

The author also conducted the Post Hoc Multiple Comparison Bonferroni Test which showed that there are no significant differences between the means of different study groups. However, there are small differences detected between some of the groups. Among groups of first year of undergraduate studies and the students of the second year, there is difference of 2,99 in mean score. One might say that there is almost no difference between these two groups. The mean difference between the students of the first year of undergraduate studies and the students of the third year is small as well, it amounts to only 5,06. When it comes to difference in means between the students of the first year of undergraduate studies and first-year graduate students majoring in translation studies it is 5,56, but it goes up with the group of students that represent teaching English as a foreign language. The mean difference between these groups jumps at 11,19. It is a bigger difference between the two years, but it still is not significant to take it into

account or to categorize the different years of studying as different. The same is with the second-year graduate students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language where the mean difference is 12,47892 and the Sig. is ,329. Still not enough to be considered significant.

Graph 1

– PRCA overall score - Review of All Years



Graph 1 shows the overview of the results of the PRCA instruments according to individual years. There are big differences in minimum and maximum score within the years. The first year of undergraduate studies has the mean sum of 74,91 which sorts the group into the average level of apprehension. Nevertheless, if we look at the scale that McCroskey (1982) set, we can see that they are not far from being sorted into high level of communication apprehension (high



=>80). Their minimum mean is 40 and maximum mean is 108, which again shows a wide range among the students within the same year.

The second-year undergraduate students are not far behind the first-year students, with the mean value of 71,92 and belonging to the same group of communication apprehension, i.e., the average level of apprehension. The range between the minimum and the maximum value is even wider with the second group, for they are 26 and 115, respectively. This is the biggest range between the minimum and the maximum value in all of the years. The third year of undergraduate studies reported average level of apprehension as well, with the mean of 69,85, the lowest score of 29,00 and the highest of 102,00. The range between the minimum and the maximum score is wide, but not as wide as the one of the second year. The first-year graduate students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language reported a little bit lower score on their PRCA score, with the mean value of 63,72, still within the limit to be placed into the average level of communication apprehension. Their minimum score amounts to 25,00 and maximum to 100,00, still showing how wide a range can be among the students of the same year. Their parallel year but majoring in translation studies reported the mean of 69,35, thus showing a little higher result than the students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language. The minimum score of students majoring in translation studies is 46,00 showing that there are more students with higher communication apprehension score than in the parallel group. The maximum of the group amounts to 97,00. The second-year graduate students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language achieved a group mean score of 62,44 which sorts them into the average level of communication apprehension. The results show that their mean value is lower than the one from the first-year graduate students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language probably because they are older, and they learned everything they could so far. Nonetheless, they were still categorized as average, and their results were a bit lower on the communication apprehension test when compared to the first year.

## 4.2 Public Speaking Anxiety

The speaking anxiety was tested with Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) instrument developed by James McCroskey in 1970. There was no need for alterations of this instrument.

To be able to understand the results, McCroskey defined them as following: “Likert-type scale which, when scored in the usual 1-5 manner, yields scores with a potential range of

34 to 170” (McCroskey, 1970, p. 276). If the score is lower or higher than that, it means that the calculation is wrong and has to be done again. Scores below 98 are considered low, scores over 131 are considered high, and everything in between is considered moderate.

#### *4.2.1 PRPSA overall score*

A total of 139 students filled out the questionnaire after which the author ran the descriptive statistics frequencies test to see the statistics of the whole group. With the mean of 105,76 and standard deviation 31,38, the students of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek are categorized as having moderate speaking anxiety. The results are similar to those that McCroskey got in 1970: “The mean score for the 945 subjects who have completed this instrument is 114.62. The standard deviation is 17.21” (p. 277). Even though McCroskey’s results show a mean value that is a little bit higher and standard deviation lower than the one the author got, both groups of students are categorized the same, that is, belong in the moderate category when it comes to public speaking anxiety. It tells us that some sort of anxiety is always present with the students of English language and literature no matter the year they are at. Even though the students show the moderate level of public speaking anxiety, their minimum and maximum values almost reach the lower and upper limit of the instrument. The minimum value that some students got is 36,00 (with 34 being the minimum value in the instrument and the score below 98 being considered low anxiety) and the maximum value 166,00 (with 170 being the highest value in the instrument and scores over 131 being considered high). This tells us that there are both students who have no anxiety at all when speaking publicly as well as students who experience huge anxiety when facing a prospect of delivering a public speech. Even though the students of the Faculty can be sorted into the moderate category when it comes to public speaking anxiety, this still tells us that they are anxious when delivering a public speech and therefore can perceive themselves as not being competent enough to give a speech and thus it confirms the initial hypothesis of the paper.


One-Way ANOVA test was also conducted with the PRPSA instrument. The test showed that there are no significant differences between the groups as the Sig. is ,239. It signifies that there is no statistical significance in the score between the groups (different years of study).

Like with the PRCA overall result, the author conducted the Post Hoc Multiple Comparison Bonferroni Test with the PRPSA overall score. The results show that the differences between the mean values of groups representing different years of studying English are not significant. The hypothesis that there will be a difference in the level of public speaking anxiety for students from the first year of undergraduate studies when compared to the students of other years of studies, studying English language and literature at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek was not confirmed.

Nonetheless, there are some small differences between the value means of individual groups. These differences are higher than when comparing them with the PRCA results, but that can be attributed to the possibility of the PRPSA overall score being significantly higher than the PRCA overall score. The difference in the mean score between the first year and the second year of undergraduate studies is 10,19. This is also the lowest mean difference among the years. The mean difference between the first and the third year of undergraduate studies is higher, and it amounts to 13,73. The difference is not big when compared to the students of second year, but it still shows us a raise in the mean value. The biggest mean difference is between the groups of the first-year undergraduate students and the first-year graduate students majoring in teaching. The difference in score between these two groups is 20,13 and this is the only mean difference where the significance does not amount to 1,0 but to ,912. Even so, this still does not show statistically significant difference between the two groups. There is a decrease in the mean difference between the students of the first year of undergraduate studies and the students of the first year of graduate studies majoring in translation studies. The difference between mean values of these two groups is 17,87. This also shows that there is a small difference in the mean values of the two groups of the same year (5<sup>th</sup>) with different majors. The last mean difference is between the students of the first year of undergraduate studies and the second-year graduate students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language. The difference between their mean scores is 14,35. This shows us not only another decrease of mean differences, but it also shows us that there is almost no difference in mean values between the students of the third year of undergraduate studies and this group, which is quite interesting if we take into account that the difference between the first and the second year of graduate students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language is 5,77.

Graph 2

PRPSA overall score. Review of All Years



Graph 2 gives us an overview of the results that each tested group achieved. The overall score of the PRPSA instrument was such that the students of all years were placed into the category which signals moderate public speaking anxiety. As we already saw, the general results of the groups are within the limits of the instrument (when it comes to minimum and maximum, i.e., between 34 and 170). The first year of undergraduate studies had the mean value result of 115,94 which places the group into the moderate category. This group is approximately right in the middle of the moderate category and it has the highest mean score of all groups. Their minimum score is 49,00 and maximum is 160,00. There is a small decrease in mean value

towards low anxiety with the students of the second year of undergraduate studies. Their result is 105,75 with at least one student having the minimum score of 39,00 and at least one student the maximum score of 161,00. They are still categorized as having moderate public speaking anxiety. The decrease can easily be explained with more students reporting low on the PRPSA instrument with the minimum being quite lower than with the first year (1<sup>st</sup> year – 49, 2<sup>nd</sup> year -39). Following the pattern, the students of the third year of undergraduate studies scored the mean of 102,21. Again, slight decrease from first and second year, but again, not enough to be sorted into the low category when it comes to public speaking anxiety. This groups has the most varied results in the minimum and the maximum values. The minimum score is 36,00 and the maximum score of some student is 166,00, which are at the same time the minimum and maximum score of all the participants in this research, which shows that the person with the lowest and highest anxiety are at their third year of studies. A small, but important decrease happens with the next group as well. The students of the first year of graduate studies majoring in teaching English as a foreign language have the lowest mean value of 95,81 which places them into the low category when it comes to public speaking anxiety and making them the group that is the most confident. Their minimum of this group, which amounts to 52,00, is the highest minimum of all the participants in the research and the maximum in this group is quite high as well, amounting to 154,00. Their parallel year, the first year of graduate studies majoring in translation studies, is not far behind them with the mean of 98,07. This puts them right on the border of the low and moderate category, but since the score is over 98, they are sorted into the moderate category. Their minimum amounts to 51,00 and maximum 151,00 showing that they too vary a lot within the group. The second year of graduate studies majoring in teaching English as a foreign language follow in the footsteps of the first year of graduate studies majoring in translation studies and show an increase in the mean value. Their mean is 101,59 which puts them into the moderate group when it comes to public speaking anxiety. With the minimum of 42,00 and maximum of 155,00 this group has neither the lowest minimum nor the highest maximum, but again shows big variations among students within the group. From this table, it is clearly visible that there are big differences among the students even within individual groups because their minimums and maximums differ a lot and therefore leads to the conclusion that there are both very confident and very anxious students within each year.

### 4.3 Public Speaking Competency

Ellis (1995) developed the Self-Perceived Public Speaking Competency instrument designed to test how students perceive their own competence to give a public speech. It consists of 19 items to which the participants answer using a Likert scale ('1-strongly disagree' to '5-strongly agree'). There is no specific way of calculating the overall score for SPPSC and therefore there are no categories into which we can classify students.

One hypothesis of this paper was that public speaking anxiety is negatively related to self-perceived public speaking competence. The research was able to confirm that through the Pearson Correlation test ran with PRPSA overall score and SPPSC items. These results show significant negative correlation.

#### 4.3.1 Public Speaking Anxiety and Public Speaking Competency Correlation

Table 1.

*Pearson Correlation Test – SPPSC items and PRPSA overall score*

	r
1. I choose a topic that is appropriate for the audience.	-,057
2. I have excellent posture when giving a speech.	-,495**
3. I have difficulty using appropriate gestures.	-,510**
4. Generally, I move smoothly from idea to idea within my speech.	-,542**
5. I choose a topic that is appropriate for the occasion.	-,244**
6. Generally, giving an effective introduction is a problem for me.	-,430**
7. I use appropriate facial expressions.	-,425**
8. Generally, the body of my speech is logically organized.	-,255*
9. I use a variety of supporting material (e.g., examples, expert opinions, statistics, research findings, illustrations) to enhance my speech.	-,228**
10. I use variety in pitch to enhance my message.	-,296**
11. Maintaining eye contact is a problem for me.	-,495**
12. Generally, my conclusion clearly reflects the content of my speech.	-,227*
13. I use language that is extremely clear.	-,369**
14. Some audience members have difficulty hearing me.	-,390**
15. I use variety in my rate of speech.	-,317**

16. I have trouble articulating my words clearly.	-,521**
17. I dress to enhance my credibility.	-,061
18. Using high quality supporting material is often problematic for me.	-,398**
19. I make very few, if any, pronunciation errors.	-,165

r = Pearson correlation coefficient

Table 1 represents the results of the Pearson Correlation test which the author ran with the PRPSA overall score and 19 items of the SPPSC instrument. Even though the results showed no significant differences so far, the correlation test demonstrated very significant results. There were no significant differences between the years, but there are significant results with the Pearson correlation test. The only items that do not show significant difference are “1. I choose a topic that is appropriate for the audience”, “17. I dress to enhance my credibility”, and “19. I make very few, if any, pronunciation errors”. Those correlations are negative, but not significant. The first item is not related with speaking anxiety probably because even though the students are nervous and anxious when faced with giving a speech, they do not choose a topic themselves as they are quite often given a topic by their professors. The second item *I dress to enhance my credibility* is not related because possibly every educational institution has their own dress code which requires students to dress appropriately. The last item *I make very few, if any, pronunciation errors* can be explained by many courses at the faculty where students practice their pronunciation. The rest 16 items show all quite significant correlations at 0.01. They are also negative which means that the more anxious the students are, the less confident they are in their public speaking competence and vice versa. Let us take item number three for example: “3. I have difficulty using appropriate gestures”. The Pearson correlation is -,510\*\* at 0.01 level of significance. It means that the more anxious the student is, their gestures will not be as appropriate as they should be. The same goes with the rest of the items, the more anxious they are, their posture will be worse (item 2), they will not move smoothly from idea to idea (item 4), they will have more trouble giving an effective introduction (item 6), using appropriate facial expressions (item 7), or having audience members hear them well (item 14), etc.

#### 4.4 Students' Perceptions of preparedness for Speaking

Table 2.

*Students' own perceptions of preparedness for speaking*

	Do you think you are ready/will be ready to talk in front of students if you become a teacher/in front of listeners if you become an interpreter?	
	YES	NO
first-year undergraduate students	31	10
second-year undergraduate students	22	7
third-year undergraduate students	17	4
first-year graduate students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language	8	3
first-year graduate students majoring in translation studies	11	3
second-year graduate students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language	22	5
Total	111	32

One of the questions in the survey was whether students perceive themselves as ready to speak in front of students if they become a teacher or in front of the listeners if they become interpreters. In the Table 2, one can see how each year responded to that question and the result



in total. All years perceive themselves more as ready (N=111, i.e., 77,6%) than not ready (N=32, i.e., 22,4%). Individual years lean more towards the positive answer as well.

Students were also asked to give reasons for why they do feel ready or why they do not feel ready to speak. The author went through all of the answers and found that some of the general reasons that the students gave for why they do feel ready to speak are: they do not have a problem with expressing themselves and communicating with others, they think they will be experienced enough by the time they finish college, they improve their speaking skills every time they present, they feel that their emotions are not important when it comes to giving a speech, they can deal with stress to achieve better results, they feel it is in their job description and that they have to learn how to deal with it, some already have experience in speaking in front of others, because they are certain in what they are talking about, etc. The answers were: „because I don't have a problem to express myself and to communicate with others”, “I tend to present well even when I'm nervous”, “I will be experienced enough by the time I have to speak in front of others”, “by frequently presenting in front of others, I'm getting used to it and improving each time”, “feelings are not important when it comes to doing the job”, my course will prepare me for it”, “I'll have to be”, “I'll become more confident with myself”, “because I'll work on my abilities and perfect them”, “because of prior experience and preparing materials designed to include students in further discussion”, “I'm confident in my abilities to talk in front of others”, “I'm not afraid of speaking publicly”, “the fear goes away when working with children”, “because I'm practicing it on college in different seminars and presentations even though I'll need to practice a lot more while on praxis and afterwards”, “I can bear with stress and therefore get better results”, “I can connect with the listeners and intrigue them and familiarize with the material without many complications”, “it's different to teach those who are a lot younger than you are and without someone evaluating you”, “I know how to prepare myself for presenting and I stick to that preparation, even though I have no problems with improvising”, “I've learned to control my anxiety”, “public speaking is natural to me and I get positive feedback after presentations and speaking in class”, “I gained that ability by volunteering at the Red Cross”, “I have enough knowledge to be confident”, “Students don't present authority for me”, “my competences have sufficiently developed”, “I'm a good speaker”, “because I know what I'm going to talk about, I love to talk and listen to other people's opinions”, “I don't have a fear of making mistakes, if I do make them, it is not the end of the world”, “I feel comfortable teaching”, etc.

The students who do not feel ready gave these answers: “currently not because I have problems with it”, “because I need to get a lot more experience, and sometimes it can be problematic to find the will and step in front of people”, “I don’t know enough”, “because it makes me nervous and I think I’ll ruin everything”, “I need practice, experience, and, more than anything, courage”, “because of frequent anxiety, I think I’ll need some time to get used to being in front of students, but that it will come with experience”, “I need to practice more to become more relaxed”, “because of stage fright”, “I need a lot more practice and a lot of preparation. When I’m under stress, my vocabulary is bad and I don’t speak fluently”, “Stress”, “the experience is too stressful, too many things happen at the same time”, “it requires to be a good listener too”, etc.

#### 4.5 Usefulness of Courses that Require More Speaking

Table 3.

*Courses that require more speaking*

	Do you think that the courses which require more speaking make you readier to speak in front of students/listeners?	
	YES	NO
first-year undergraduate students	39	3
second-year undergraduate students	23	6
third-year undergraduate students	17	4
first-year graduate students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language	8	3
first-year graduate students majoring in translation studies	12	2
second-year graduate students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language	22	5
Total	121	23

Students were then asked to express their opinion on courses at university which require from them to speak and whether they find them useful. The Table 3 shows the overall result of that test, as well as the results according to the years of studying. If you take a look at the table, you can see that overall result of each year is that the students do believe that those courses help them and therefore the overall result of this question is yes with 84% of answers (N=121). Only a handful of students disagree (N=23, i.e., 16%).

#### 4.6 Difference in Fear of Speaking in L1 and L2

Table 4

*Difference in fear when speaking in mother tongue (Croatian) and their second language (English)*

	Do you feel a difference in fear when you speak in Croatian as opposed to when you speak in English?	
	YES	NO
first-year undergraduate students	24	18
second-year undergraduate students	18	12
third-year undergraduate students	9	12
first-year graduate students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language	7	4
first-year graduate students majoring in translation studies	9	5
second-year graduate students majoring in teaching English as a foreign language	11	16
Total	78	67

Participants of the study were also asked to express if they feel a difference in fear when speaking in their mother tongue as opposed to speaking their second language, namely English. The results were tested with the Descriptives Crosstabs. Almost half of the students answered

yes (N=78), more precisely 53,79% meaning that they do feel a difference in fear when speaking in Croatian as opposed to when they speak in English. They are more confident when speaking Croatian, their mother tongue, than when they speak their second language. The rest of them 46,21% (N=67) answered that they do not feel any difference in fear when speaking English. As for the individual years of studying, the results are different and some groups are more on the side of feeling a difference in fear while speaking English, while others are not. The first and the second year of undergraduate studies, as well as both first year of graduate studies majoring in teaching English as a foreign language and majoring in translation studies, have more students who do feel a difference in fear when speaking compared to those who do not feel a difference in fear. As for the students of the third year of undergraduate studies and second year of graduate studies majoring in teaching English as a foreign language, there are more of them who express themselves as not feeling a difference in fear when speaking Croatian as opposed to when speaking English.

Those students who answered yes were asked to give their reasons why they feel the difference when speaking in English and Croatian. The author examined them all and found that some of the general reasons are that they think about making grammatical errors or failing to remember certain words in English, because they make coherent sentences easier in Croatian, because they make more mistakes in English, they have more confidence speaking in Croatian, they feel more pressure talking in English, they feel that they will manage easier in Croatian if they forget something because it is their mother tongue, etc. Some of the answers would be the following: *“I stutter more often in English”*, *“I find it more difficult to manage in English, it’s harder to remember the words”*, *“Croatian is my mother tongue and it’s harder to make a mistake”*, *“Croatian is my first language and it’s easier to get by if I forget something or make a mistake”*, *“it’s a lot more pressure speaking in English since it is not our first language”*, *“I make more mistakes when speaking in English”*, *“even though I consider myself being a good speaker of English, I am nervous that others will think I’m bad at it”*, *“I might make a mistake”*, *“there is a fear of making mistakes in pronunciation”*, *“I forget vocabulary in English”*, *“I’m worried about people understanding my English”*, *“pronunciation”*, *“because it is easier for me to explain the main point in a different way in Croatian if I get confused or forget how I wanted to explain it”*, *“practicing holding a public speech, especially the way to hold it”*, *“it is possible to say something that is grammatically incorrect”*, *“Croatian is my mother tongue so it is only natural that I need more preparation to give a speech in English”*, *“I make sentences in Croatian faster and better”*, *“I’m better in Croatian”*, *“I have more confidence when speaking*

*Croatian”, “I think I can express myself easier and faster and express my opinion and give more different examples”, “Croatian is my mother tongue and I don’t have to put in a lot of effort to express even the most complex ideas”, “because I’m an extrovert and confident in my speaking skills”, “my vocabulary is better in Croatian”, “I don’t want to make a mistake when speaking English so as not to leave an impression that I don’t understand it”, “I think I’ll pronounce words incorrectly because of stress”, “there weren’t enough activities throughout my education where I could have developed my speaking skills in English”, etc.*

There were also students who feel the difference in fear in favor of English and their reasons are the following: *“it’s easier to talk in English”, “I feel more comfortable speaking in English”, “English sounds better so I’m less afraid”, “it’s sometimes easier for me to express myself in English and I have a feeling that I will make mistakes more easily in Croatian”, “I feel more relaxed speaking in English as opposed to Croatian”, “English has some words that Croatian does not”, “Croatian is my mother tongue so I am afraid to make a mistake because I think I should know everything”, “English is more natural to me than English”, etc.*

#### 4.7 Improvement of Speaking skill

To improve our speaking, we often resort to different aids and strategies. Students are known to help themselves in various ways to achieve the goal. That is why, at the end of the survey, they were asked to write down what helped them improve their speaking skills. Some of the things that they named are: speaking in a relaxed atmosphere and not having the feeling of being graded, more presentations at college because that way they are exposed to talking, some of the courses at college (Contemporary English Language, Public Speaking, Teaching English as a Foreign Language with Young Learners, etc.), watching and listening to certain professors and their behavior, watching movies, interaction with other people, experience and confidence, competitions, practicing their speech at home before delivering it, group work, online speaking with native speakers of English, student discussions about certain topics, talking to oneself. Some of the answers were: *“general interaction with people”, “I talk to myself when I’m bored”, “discussions about certain topics, but only among students”, “online talking with people who speak English”, “seminars”, “working on getting self-confidence”, professors from grammar school in Osijek who demanded regular public speech exercises”, “oral presentations, group works”, “knowing that most people don’t listen to me”,*

*“Contemporary English Language – participating in classes, and American/British Culture and Civilization - presentations”, “presentations at different courses”, “the internet, series, and Erasmus projects”, “Phonetics and Phonology, Contemporary English Language [all courses]”, “I sometimes talk with my friends in English, I think that that helped me a lot”, “talking outside the classroom”, “online games”, “presentations and seminars held in front of other students”, “films”, “meeting new people”, “talking with people”, “Helen Doron school”, “advice and videos that help with stress management and anxiety but also more preparation before the speech itself”, “oral exams”, “pecha kucha presentations”, “talking in front of the mirror”, “talking to a larger group of people and with strangers”, “language exercises of the German language”, “experience and self-confidence”, “competitions in high school and debates”, “Survey of American/British Literature because it requires from us to speak”, “dealing with the material that I’m interested in as opposed to the very specific topics which mostly don’t interest me”, “writing essays”, “music and media”, “public speaking course, writers club”, “Speech Exercises course”, “debate team in primary school”, “student jobs which consist of talking with people, different courses, professors that encourage us to debate, ...”, “reading in church, giving interviews for local newspaper and television shows, volunteering”, “Teaching English as a Foreign Language with Young Learners”, “Public Speaking course – we learn the parts of the speech, how to form a speech, what to avoid, etc.”, “Ted talks”, “relaxed atmosphere and when I don’t feel like I’m being graded”, etc.*

## 5. Conclusion

This study aimed at researching the students’ attitudes towards their own communication apprehension and their self-perceived public speaking competency. The Pearson correlation showed negative correlation between public speaking anxiety and public speaking competency and therefore confirmed the hypothesis that students’ anxiety while speaking is negatively connected with their self-perceived public speaking competency.

The results of the PRCA-24 instrument gave insight into the level of communication apprehension of all participants as well as individual groups (years of study). As a whole, the students at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek have the average level of communication apprehension even though the results of individual students go as high as 115 and as low as 25. The hypothesis that there will be significant difference between different years of study was not confirmed. Even though the students have the average level of

communication apprehension, their overall score gravitates more towards the high level of communication apprehension and in that way supports the initial hypothesis. All groups can be sorted into the average category of communication apprehension as well, and it is visible from the results that there are no significant differences among the students of different years at the Faculty, just a small decrease in the mean.

The PRPSA instrument showed that the students of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek can be categorized as having moderate speaking anxiety. Just as with the PRCA-24, the PRPSA instrument showed that there are no significant differences among the individual years. Therefore, hypothesis about a significant difference in anxiety between years was not confirmed. Despite that, not all of the groups can be sorted into the moderate category when it comes to public speaking anxiety. The first year of graduate studies majoring in teaching English as a foreign language can be categorized as having low speaking anxiety showing that the students of this group feel less anxious when giving a public speech than other groups.

The third part of the survey was the SPPSC instrument. Even though there were no significant results between the groups (years of study), the results of Pearson correlation test between SPPSC items and PRPSA overall score both confirmed the hypothesis of this research and showed us that public speaking anxiety negatively affects one's self-perceived public speaking competency in a way that the more anxious the students are, the less confident they are in their public speaking competence.

Students were also able to express their own sense of preparedness for speaking upon graduating college. The results were positive, having more students answering *yes* to the question *Do you think you are ready/will be ready to talk in front of students if you become a teacher/in front of listeners if you become an interpreter?* Students listed different reasons for why they consider themselves ready to speak publicly upon graduating at university, some of which are that they do not have a problem with expressing themselves and communicating with others, they think they will be experienced enough by the time they finish college, they improve their speaking skills every time they present, they feel that their emotions are not important when it comes to giving a speech, they can deal with stress to achieve better results, etc.

When asked if they think that the courses which require more speaking make them readier for speaking, the students' overall result was that they do believe that it helps them, especially those where they are exposed to speaking in front of others.

When it comes to difference in fear when speaking in their L1 (Croatian) and L2 (English), the students are divided almost in half with those who do feel the difference while speaking in English and Croatian (53,79%) and those who do not (46,21%). Those who feel the difference give reasons such as fear of making grammatical and pronunciation errors, they have more confidence speaking in Croatian, they feel more pressure talking in English etc.

Lastly, when asked '*What do you think helped you improve your speaking skills?*', students listed various things which may be of help for improving one's speaking skills. Some of those things are various courses at college, speaking with native speakers, practicing the speech before delivering it, speaking to themselves in front of a mirror, different online activities, for instance playing video games, watching YouTube videos, listening to music, different activities in primary and high school, etc.

Everything leads to the conclusion that even though the students belong to the average level of communication apprehension and can be sorted into the moderate category when it comes to public speaking anxiety, they still feel anxious when they have to deliver a speech in front of a certain group of people which negatively affects their view of themselves and their speaking abilities. This requires students to practice delivering public speeches more while in college as well as more courses that require speaking, such as Public Speaking, which were mentioned most often by students as a helping tool for improving their speaking skills. These courses should also be included into the curriculum as mandatory courses.



## References:

- Allen, M., Hunter, J. E., & Donohue, W. A. (1989). Meta-analysis of self-report data on the effectiveness of public speaking anxiety treatment techniques. *Communication Education*, 38(1), 54-76. Retrieved on May 31, 2023.
- Aristotle (2007). *On rhetoric. A theory of civic discourse*. Translated with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices by George A. Kennedy. 2nd edition. Oxford University Press
- Baccarani, C and Bonfanti, A. (2015). "Effective public speaking: a conceptual framework in the corporate-communication field", *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 20(3), 375 – 390. Retrieved on May 25, 2023, from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-04-2014-0025>
- Cambridge Dictionary | *English Dictionary, Translations & Thesaurus*. (n.d.). Public Speaking. Cambridge Dictionary. Retrieved May 25, 2023, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/public-speaking>
- Cambridge Dictionary | *English Dictionary, Translations & Thesaurus*. (n.d.). Language. Cambridge Dictionary. Retrieved July 4, 2023, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/language>
- Demirdöğen, Ü. D. (2010). The roots of research in (political) persuasion: Ethos, pathos, logos and the Yale studies of persuasive communications. *International Journal of Social Inquiry*, 3(1), 189-201. Retrieved on May 26, 2023.
- Dlugan, A. (2010). Ethos, pathos, logos: 3 pillars of public speaking. Six minutes speaking and presentation skills, 24. Retrieved on May 27, 2023, from [https://c3f7fd3c-a-e4a39a70-s-sites.googlegroups.com/a/gilmour.org/potterspeechclass/homework-assignments\\_summer\\_13/unit2structure/ethos%20pathos%20and%20logos%20short.pdf?attachauth=ANoY7cod3K02YlQZkakCbQBedqNY9ViUv12EVzVa-8DWSvIRfW5kTH\\_OzIqZ-4YnaAf9P02Y7H03eXmadCcEjOg5Ssyjpr-kG0JeMGxfzUYVVeBlafSqz7PNPg9mdZC8s4AxrO-CAyxYdNk2hOm\\_yoDqN58iP51e5dsR\\_FoARNCH3WZaSe4PS-lqwU2hOyosZeUSZ3ImSupokN2M4KXQEuUItZqJb8-KIMjOb8\\_DIGNNiBOuRbJJCeqk0CyhA5BqmgISFNqg23QE2jQG-](https://c3f7fd3c-a-e4a39a70-s-sites.googlegroups.com/a/gilmour.org/potterspeechclass/homework-assignments_summer_13/unit2structure/ethos%20pathos%20and%20logos%20short.pdf?attachauth=ANoY7cod3K02YlQZkakCbQBedqNY9ViUv12EVzVa-8DWSvIRfW5kTH_OzIqZ-4YnaAf9P02Y7H03eXmadCcEjOg5Ssyjpr-kG0JeMGxfzUYVVeBlafSqz7PNPg9mdZC8s4AxrO-CAyxYdNk2hOm_yoDqN58iP51e5dsR_FoARNCH3WZaSe4PS-lqwU2hOyosZeUSZ3ImSupokN2M4KXQEuUItZqJb8-KIMjOb8_DIGNNiBOuRbJJCeqk0CyhA5BqmgISFNqg23QE2jQG-)

[qL2gZEDt\\_Enb85KY59GllmrbIdik4\\_72LBQ3MTFZKkagY4d\\_NRMjqWrbvYHu&at\\_tredirects=0](#)

Ellis, K. (1995). Apprehension, self-perceived competency, and teacher immediacy in the laboratory-supported public speaking course: Trends and relationships.

*Communication Education*, 44(1), 64-78. Retrieved on May 28, 2023.

Jaffe, C. (2014). *Public speaking: Concepts and skills for a diverse society*. Cengage Learning.

MacIntyre, P. D. and Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language learning*, 44(2), 283-305.

McCroskey, J. C. (1978). Validity of the PRCA as an index of oral communication apprehension. *Communications Monographs*, 45(3), 192-203. Retrieved on May 28, 2023.

McCroskey, J. C. (1970). Measures of communication-bound anxiety. *Speech Monographs*, 37(4), 269-277. Retrieved on May 29, 2023.

McCroskey, J. C. (1982). *An introduction to rhetorical communication* (4th Ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Pull, C. B. (2012). Current status of knowledge on public-speaking anxiety. *Current opinion in psychiatry*, 25(1), 32-38. Retrieved on May 31, 2023.

Roos, J. (2013). The benefits and limitations of leadership speeches in change initiatives. *Journal of Management Development*, 32(5), 548 – 559. Retrieved on May 27, 2023.

Ulupinar, D. (2017). Foreign language anxiety among counseling students speaking English as a second language: A rationale for future research. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 40(2), 162-172.

Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and speaking English as a second language. *RELC journal*, 37(3), 308-328.

## Appendix

### Questionnaire:

Anketa pred Vama se provodi u sklopu istraživanja za potrebe izrade diplomskog rada čiji je naslov Students' Attitudes on Communication Apprehension and Self-Perceived Public Speaking Competency.

Ova anketa je namijenjena za studente od 1. do 5. godine studija engleskoga jezika na Filozofskom fakultetu Osijek te je u potpunosti anonimna i dobrovoljna. Sva pitanja u ovoj anketi se odnose na to kada govorite engleskim jezikom.

#### 1. SPOL:

- a) muško
- b) žensko
- c) ne želim se izjasniti

#### 2. UPISANI SMJER NA VISOKOM UČILIŠTU: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 3. GODINA KOJU POHAĐATE:

- a) 1. godina preddiplomskog
- b) 2. godina preddiplomskog
- c) 3. godina preddiplomskog
- d) 1. godina diplomskog – nastavnički smjer
- e) 1. godina diplomskog – prevoditeljski smjer
- f) 2. godina diplomskog – nastavnički smjer
- g) 2. godina diplomskog – prevoditeljski smjer

#### 4. UKUPAN BROJ GODINA UČENJA ENGLESKOG JEZIKA: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 5. Personal Report of Communication Apprehension

This instrument is composed of twenty-four statements concerning feelings about communication with other people. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you:

**(1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) are undecided, (4) agree, or (5) strongly agree.**

Work quickly; record your first impression.

No.						
1.	I dislike participating in group discussions.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Generally, I am comfortable while participating in group discussions.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I like to get involved in group discussions.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Engaging in a group discussion with new people makes me tense and nervous.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I am calm and relaxed while participating in a group discussion.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Usually, I am calm and relaxed while participating in a meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion at a meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	I am afraid to express myself at meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Communicating at meetings usually makes me feel uncomfortable.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	I am very relaxed when answering questions at a meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I have no fear of speaking up in conversations.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	I'm afraid to speak up in conversations.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I have no fear of giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while I am giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5

21.	I feel relaxed while giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	While giving a speech, I get so nervous I forget facts I really know.	1	2	3	4	5

## 6. Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety

This is a scale that focuses strictly on public speaking anxiety. Please indicate whether or not you believe each statement applies to you by marking whether you:

**1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree.**

No.						
1.	While preparing for giving a speech, I feel tense and nervous.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I feel tense when I see the words “speech” and “public speech” on a course outline when studying.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Right after giving a speech, I feel that I have had a pleasant experience.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I get anxious when I think about a speech coming up.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I have no fear of giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Although I am nervous just before starting a speech, I soon settle down after starting and feel calm and comfortable.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	I look forward to giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	When the instructor announces a speaking assignment in class, I can feel myself getting tense.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	My hands tremble when I am giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	I feel relaxed while giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5

12.	I enjoy preparing for a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	I am in constant fear of forgetting what I prepared to say.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I get anxious if someone asks me something about my topic that I don't know.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I feel that I am in complete possession of myself while giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	My mind is clear when giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	I do not dread giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I perspire just before starting a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	My heart beats very fast just as I start a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I experience considerable anxiety while sitting in the room just before my speech starts.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Realizing that only a little time remains in a speech makes me very tense and anxious.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	While giving a speech, I know I can control my feelings of tension and stress.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	I breathe faster just before starting a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	I feel comfortable and relaxed in the hour or so just before giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	I do poorer on speeches because I am anxious.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	I feel anxious when the teacher announces the date of a speaking assignment.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	When I make a mistake while giving a speech, I find it hard to concentrate on the parts that follow.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	During an important speech I experience a feeling of helplessness building up inside me.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	I have trouble falling asleep the night before a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	My heart beats very fast while I present a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	I feel anxious while waiting to give my speech.	1	2	3	4	5

<b>34.</b>	While giving a speech, I get so nervous I forget facts I really know.	1	2	3	4	5
------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

### **7. Self-Perceived Public Speaking Competency**

The instrument is based on the eight public speaking competencies identified on the “The Competent Speaker Speech Performance Evaluation Form”.

Please indicate whether or not you believe each statement applies to you by marking whether you:

**1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree.**

<b>No.</b>						
<b>1.</b>	I choose a topic that is appropriate for the audience.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>2.</b>	I have excellent posture when giving a speech.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>3.</b>	I have difficulty using appropriate gestures.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>4.</b>	Generally, I move smoothly from idea to idea within my speech.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>5.</b>	I choose a topic that is appropriate for the occasion.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>6.</b>	Generally, giving an effective introduction is a problem for me.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>7.</b>	I use appropriate facial expressions.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>8.</b>	Generally, the body of my speech is logically organized.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>9.</b>	I use a variety of supporting material (e.g., examples, expert opinions, statistics, research findings, illustrations) to enhance my speech.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>10.</b>	I use variety in pitch to enhance my message.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>11.</b>	Maintaining eye contact is a problem for me.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>12.</b>	Generally, my conclusion clearly reflects the content of my speech.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>13.</b>	I use language that is extremely clear.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>14.</b>	Some audience members have difficulty hearing me.	1	2	3	4	5
<b>15.</b>	I use variety in my rate of speech.	1	2	3	4	5

16.	I have trouble articulating my words clearly.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	I dress to enhance my credibility.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Using high quality supporting material is often problematic for me.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I make very few, if any, pronunciation errors.	1	2	3	4	5

### 8. Teacher Immediacy

The following variables are connected to teacher immediacy. Immediacy behavior can be verbal or non-verbal.

Please indicate the incidence of the following statements using:

**0 = never; 1 = rarely; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; 4 = always**

No.						
1.	Uses personal examples or talks about experiences she/he has had outside of class.	0	1	2	3	4
2.	Asks questions or encourages students to talk.	0	1	2	3	4
3.	Gets into discussions based on something a student brings up even when this doesn't seem to be part of his/her lecture plan.	0	1	2	3	4
4.	Uses humor in class.	0	1	2	3	4
5.	Addresses students by name.	0	1	2	3	4
6.	Addresses me by name.	0	1	2	3	4
7.	Gets into conversations with individual students before or after class.	0	1	2	3	4
8.	Has initiated conversations with me before, after or outside of class.	0	1	2	3	4
9.	Refers to class as "my" class or what "I" am doing.	0	1	2	3	4
10.	Refers to class as "our" class or what "we" are doing.	0	1	2	3	4
11.	Provides feedback on my individual work through comments on papers, oral discussions, etc.	0	1	2	3	4



12.	Calls on students to answer questions even if they have not indicated that they want to talk.	0	1	2	3	4
13.	Asks how students feel about an assignment, due date or discussion topic.	0	1	2	3	4
14.	Invites students to telephone or meet with him/her outside of class if they have questions or want to discuss something.	0	1	2	3	4
15.	Asks questions that have specific, correct answers.	0	1	2	3	4
16.	Asks questions that solicit viewpoints or opinions.	0	1	2	3	4
17.	Praises students' work, actions or comments.	0	1	2	3	4
18.	Criticizes or points out faults in students' work, actions or comments.	0	1	2	3	4
19.	Will have discussions about things unrelated to class with individual students or with the class as a whole.	0	1	2	3	4
20.	Is addressed by his/her first name by the students.	0	1	2	3	4
21.	Sits behind desk while teaching.	0	1	2	3	4
22.	Gestures while talking to class.	0	1	2	3	4
23.	Uses monotone/dull voice when talking to class.	0	1	2	3	4
24.	Looks at class while talking.	0	1	2	3	4
25.	Smiles at the class as a whole, not just individual students.	0	1	2	3	4
26.	Has a very tense body position while talking to the class.	0	1	2	3	4
27.	Touches students in the class.	0	1	2	3	4
28.	Moves around the classroom while teaching.	0	1	2	3	4
29.	Sits on a desk or in a chair while teaching.	0	1	2	3	4
30.	Looks at the board or notes while talking to the class.	0	1	2	3	4
31.	Stands behind podium or desk while teaching.	0	1	2	3	4
32.	Has a very relaxed body position while talking to the class.	0	1	2	3	4
33.	Smiles at individual students in the class.	0	1	2	3	4
34.	Uses a variety of vocal expressions while talking to the class.	0	1	2	3	4

9. Smatrate li da ste spremni/ćete biti spremni govoriti pred učenicima ukoliko postanete profesor/ica/ pred slušateljima ukoliko postanete usmeni prevoditelj/ica? DA / NE

Ako da, zašto? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Ako ne, zašto? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

10. Smatrate li da vas kolegiji koji zahtijevaju više govora čine spremnijim za govorenje pred učenicima/slušateljima? DA / NE

11. Osjećate li razliku u strahu od govorenja kad govorite na hrvatskom u odnosu na to kada govorite na engleskom? DA / NE

Ako da, zašto? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

12. Biste li se okarakterizirali kao introvert ili ekstrovert? \_\_\_\_\_

13. Smatrate li da Vaša osobnost utječe na Vaš stav prema govorenju? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

14. Što smatrate da Vam je pomoglo u poboljšanju Vašeg govorenja (molim navesti ime kolegija, konkretne vježbe, nešto treće što nema veze s nastavom)? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

15. Jeste li slušali ili trenutno slušate kolegij „Govorništvo“? \_\_\_\_\_

16. Jeste li slušali ili trenutno slušate kolegij „Govorne vježbe“? \_\_\_\_\_