

**Author's Name:** Ibrahim Fathi Mohammad Huwari & Dr. Noor Hashima Abd. Aziz

**Affiliation:** Universiti Utara Malaysia

**Address:** UUM-May Bank Collage- Block V Room 102.

**Telephone:** 0174273179

**E-mail:** [Ibrahimhuwari@hotmail.com](mailto:Ibrahimhuwari@hotmail.com)

**Fax:**

**Biographical note:** Ibrahim Huwari is a PhD candidate in the Applied Linguistics programme at UUM. He has a master degree in the Applied Linguistics from UUM and a bachelor degree in English language and literature from Al-albays University in Jordan.

Dr. Noor Hashima Abd. Aziz is a Senior Lecturer/Graduate Programme Chair (Languages & General Studies), UUM CAS.

# **Oral Communication Apprehension in English among Jordanian Postgraduate Students in Universiti Utara Malaysia**

## **ABSTRACT**

This research investigated oral communication apprehension among the Jordanian postgraduate students studying in Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM). It was directed by two main objectives: (1) to investigate the levels of Communication Apprehension among the Jordanian postgraduate students when communicating in English in UUM and (2) to investigate the relationship between programme, age and socioeconomic status and Communication Apprehension. The sampling of this study consisted of seventy Jordanian postgraduate students in UUM. The researcher used McCroskey's (1981) questionnaire, Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24) to measure communication apprehension levels in four different situations (groups, meetings, dyads and public speaking). The results of this study showed that the Jordanian postgraduate students had high levels of communication apprehension and there was a positive relationship between communication apprehension and age, programme, and socio-economic status.

Keywords (*Communication Apprehension, quantitative research*)

## **Introduction**

Communication comes from the Latin word *communicare* which means "to make common or to share, and it is related to both etymological terms *communion* and *community*" (Weekley, 1967: 338). Various definitions of communication have been introduced by scholars such as De

Vito (1986), McCroskey (1977) and others. De Vito (1986: 61) defines the term communication as ‘the process or act of transmitting a message from a sender to a receiver, through a channel and with the interference of noise’. A process is a series of actions or purposes, something that may be better thought of as a continuum, rather than a point. Berko, Wolvin & Wolvin (1992) claim that communication plays an important role in our lives. There are many ways that people communicate with each other such as smiling, socializing, talking or teaching in different settings. A study done by Berko, Wolvin, & Wolvin (1992) discovered that adults spent 42 percent of their total verbal communication as listeners. On the other hand, 40 percent of their overall communication time was spent as speakers. Only 15 percent of their communication time was spent on reading, and 11 percent on writing.

Burgoon and Ruffner (1974) say that children or infants begin to learn the process of communication in the first week of life. Then, the children or infants try to communicate with adults through some activities such as laughing, crying, smiling, scratching their heads or waving their hands. Some of them may face difficulties to share themselves with others and to communicate while others do not. Two case studies done by Philips & Butt (1966) and Wheelless (1971) support the idea that communication apprehension begins early in the childhood years and later it develops step by step.

### **Communication Apprehension**

Communication apprehension can be found almost everywhere such as classrooms, schools, universities, organizations, meetings, or even in group discussions. The term Communication Apprehension (CA) was introduced by McCroskey (1977: 78) who defined it as ‘the fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons is considered as having different levels of communication apprehension’.

McCroskey (1977) says that the noticeable effects of CA in the classrooms involved at least one form of CA out of the many forms such as in public speaking, English composition, and vocal music. The communication apprehensive students' behaviors in avoiding communication are visible in many ways. For example, the students will try to avoid certain classes. If they cannot avoid the class, the anxiety experienced by them may impede them from completing their assignments.

McCroskey (1970) & Philips (1968) claim that people who have a high level of CA are those who have anxiety or fear of communicating with others. Thus, they are more likely to avoid communicating with people whenever possible. Even those who have a high level of proficiency in a language can experience CA. Some people may be good in writing, but some may have problems in speaking. Some may even be good at interpersonal communication, but some may not feel comfortable through formal situations such as making presentations.

### **Oral Communication Apprehension**

There are two types of oral Communication Apprehension: a state CA and a trait CA. A state CA refers to a specific oral communication situation, such as giving a speech to a group of strangers or interviewing with a prospective employer for a desired position. On the other hand, a trait CA refers to individuals who experience fear or anxiety of virtually in all oral communication encounters (McCroskey, 1970). Understanding the difference between the two is important because of the possible intervention strategies that can be used to modify the levels of CA. Some researchers such as Spielberger, 1966 & Lamb, 1973 have drawn a distinction between the state and trait apprehension. However, McCroskey (1984) believes that trait/state feature is a fake dichotomy to view all human behaviors as originating from either a trait-like,

personality orientation of the individual, or from the state-like limitations of a situation. His advice is to view the sources of CA as four points on a continuum from trait to situational.

- Trait-like CA. It is viewed as a relatively enduring and personality-type orientation toward a given situation.
- Generalised-Context CA. It is viewed from this perspective as representing orientations toward communication within general contexts. McCroskey (1984) identifies four classic types of CA context: public speaking, speaking in formal meetings, speaking in small group discussions and speaking in dyadic interactions (i.e. conversations).
- Person-Group CA and Situational CA. These two types of CA are the reactions of an individual to communicating with a given individual or group of individuals in the course of time, and the reactions of an individual communicating with a given individual or group of individuals at a given time.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The researcher interviewed some of the Jordanian postgraduate students in UUM about the problems that they faced when communicating in English. They claimed that they were unable to communicate effectively in their daily conversations and in carrying out tasks in English particularly during classes and daily life. The researcher has the following assumptions about the Jordanian postgraduate students in UUM in relation to the problems in communicating in English. Firstly, it is related to the methods of teaching English employed in Jordan which focused on grammar and ignored the communicative aspects of language teaching and learning. Secondly, it is related to the diverse cultural differences between the Jordanian students and other nationalities such as the Malays, Chinese, and Nigerians who are studying at UUM. Thirdly, the medium of instruction at the bachelor degree programmes in most Arab countries is

mainly in Arabic language. Zughoul and Taminian (1984) assert that Arabs have a strong feeling that English constitutes a threat to the Arab identity. Therefore, the Arab league imposed upon the Arab people to use the Arabic language as the language of administration and education. Arab learners of English encounter problems in both speaking and writing. This fact has been clearly stated by many researchers such as Abbad (1988), Abdul Haq (1982), Harrison, Prator and Tucker (1975), Rabab'ah (2005) and Wahba (1998).

The students in Jordan, for example, learn English in their home country where the native language is mainly in the Arabic language. Zughoul and Taminian (1984) state that Jordanian EFL students commit serious lexical errors while communicating in English. In addition, Rabab'ah (2005) states that formal instruction by language teachers who are native speakers of Arabic contribute to the problem of acquiring English. Another reason given by Rabab'ah (2005) is limited opportunities to practice English because Arab learners only encounter native speakers of English who come to the Arab world as tourists. A study done by Abbad (1988) on Yemeni learners of English found that in spite of the low proficiency level in English of most of the applicants, they were still accepted into the English department. In most of the Arab universities, high school graduates are still accepted to pursue a programme such as English studies in spite of their low proficiency in that language. Based on the reasons given, the researcher thinks that there is a need for a study on CA among Jordanian postgraduate students who study abroad where English language is the medium of instruction.

## **Objectives of the Study**

This study aims to investigate the levels of CA among Jordanian postgraduate students when communicating in English in UUM. In addition, it intends to investigate the relationship between CA and programme, age, and socioeconomic status.

## **Significance of the Study**

It is hoped that by identifying such levels of CA would help parents as well as teachers to be aware of student's communication apprehension. Factors such as programme, age and socio-economical will shed some light on the relationship of these factors with CA.

## **Literature Review**

McCroskey (1977) claims that many studies have suggested that Communication Apprehension (CA) is pervasive throughout the populace; it impacts on personality, social, and occupational behavior. Communication Apprehension, also known as stage fright, communication anxiety, or performance anxiety can easily be classified as the hidden communication disorder because it is not frequently recognized, acknowledged, or discussed. Communication Apprehension theory assumes that high-apprehensive individuals are less likely to engage in communication than low-apprehensive individuals (Scott and Timmerman, 2005). Furthermore, communication apprehension is believed to be a personality trait, it remains relatively consistent across different communication scenarios. Situational characteristics play a role in determining how much a person might communicate (McCroskey and Richmond, 1990).

McCroskey & Richmond (1977) claim that people with high communication apprehension attempt to remove from any kind of communication including self-disclosive communication. Therefore, if people have a high negative communication apprehension toward themselves, they

try to avoid other people. McCroskey (1976) says that the behaviors of people who have high level of communication apprehension are totally different from those who have a lower level of communication apprehension. Furthermore, other people are likely to view highly communication apprehensive people in negative ways.

## **Methodology**

A survey design was employed by this study because it collects quantitative, numbered data using a questionnaire and statistically analyse the data to describe trends about responses to questions (Creswell, 2008). This method is suitable to fulfil the objectives of this study. The Personal Report of CA-24 (PRCA-24) instrument was administered to collect the data for this study.

## **Respondents**

The number of Jordanian postgraduate students at the College of Arts and Sciences, UUM for academic year 2010-2011 was 86 students. The sample size adopted for this study was seventy Jordanian postgraduate students at UUM College of Arts and Science (CAS) based on Sekaran's (2003) formula. The students were selected using simple random sampling. According to Creswell (2008), this type of sampling enables the individuals in the selected population to obtain equal chance to participate in a study.

## **Instrument**

In order to achieve the objectives and goals of this quantitative research, the researcher used one instrument, that is, the Personal Report of CA-24 (PRCA-24) for Part B and some demographic information for Part A such as age, programme and socio-economic status. PRCA-24 consists of 24 questions which can be classified into four different communication situations:



group, meeting, dyad and public speaking. The 24 items in PRCA-24 test are clear statements developed to reflect easily recognizable self-assessment reactions (McCroskey, 1981).

The Personal Report of CA-24 (24 items) is a Likert-type self-report scale with five possible answers for each item from (1) strongly agree to (5) strongly disagree. Examples of the items are like: “I dislike participating in group discussions”, “I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions”, “I am afraid to express myself at meetings”, “I feel relaxed while giving a speech”, and “generally, I am comfortable while participating in group discussions”. To investigate the levels of CA in different communication situations, PRCA-24 is structured in four groups of statements each: Statements 1 to 6 are related to oral communication in groups; Statements 7 to 12 are related to oral communication in meetings (or classes); Statements 13 to 18 are related to oral communication in dyads (couples); and Statements 19 to 24 are related to oral communication in public speaking.

According to McCroskey (1981), the average overall score on the PRCA-24 is 65.6. For respondents whose score is close to 65.6, it is about average, and is considered as not having a high level of CA. However, respondents whose score falls below 65.6 are considered to have a lower level of overall communication. If the respondents receive a score above 65.6, then they can be considered to have a higher level of CA.

Before we can conclude that the respondents have a high level of CA, we must look at how much higher the respondents' score is. McCroskey (1981) uses one standard deviation above the mean as a cut-off point. To conclude that respondents have a higher level of CA, their score must be 80.9 or higher. On the other hand, respondents whose score are 50.3 or lower can be concluded to have a lower level of CA.

## **Data Analysis**

The quantitative data collected from PRCA-24 was analyzed using the SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). Descriptive statistics were used to achieve the objectives of this study. A pilot test was done with 30 Jordanian postgraduate students in UUM. Table 1 shows the reliability of the pilot test.

**(PLEASE INSERT TABLE 1 HERE)**

Table 1 shows that all factors or variables used in this study were tested. The Cronbach Alpha for the Groups was 0.807, Meetings was 0.665, Dyads was 0.757 and Public Speaking was 0.724. This means that these factors are valid and reliable.

## **Validity**

Published studies support the construct and criterion-related validity of the PRCA-24. For example, McCroskey and Beatty (1984) found that all four contexts-based scores predicted self-reported state anxiety experienced in a related context (e.g. public speaking). This finding has been replicated by the following studies for the public speaking component of the PRCA-24 (Beatty, 1987, 1988; Beatty, Balfantz, & Kuwabara, 1989; Beatty and Friedland, 1990).

## **Reliability**

In order to find the reliability of PRCA-24 test, questions 1,3,5,7,10,11,13,15,18,20,22 and 24 have to be recoded to prevent invalidity of the reliability. The reliability coefficient measures the consistency that will be created in order to measure the internal consistency of the research instrument and convert data collected from the respondents. The PRCA-24 has been found to be internally consistent. According to McCroskey, Beatty, Kearney (1985), the alpha reliability estimates for all the 2 items ranges from .93 to .95. Reliability estimates that the individual

composites are only slightly lower in stability across time. Test-retest reliability which is coefficient greater than .80 has been reported (Rubin, Graham, & Mignerey, 1990). To measure the reliability of PRCA-24 for this study, 30 respondents were selected for the pilot test. The Cronbach Alpha found are as follows: Groups 0.807, Meeting 0.665, Dyads 0.757 and Public Speaking 0.724.

## **Results**

Table 2 shows that most of the respondents in this study were at the age of 21 to 30 years old, that is 43 people (61%), 27% at the age of 31 - 40 years old and 11% of them were at the age of 41 to 50 years old that is 8 people.

**(PLEASE INSERT TABLE 2 HERE)**

Table 3 shows the respondents of this study in terms of Socio-Economic Status. Majority of the respondents in this study were from the Middle income group that is 40 respondents (57%) followed by the Low income group, that is 17 (24%) respondents. On the other hand, a small number of respondents were from the high income group that is 13 (19%) respondents.

**(PLEASE INSERT TABLE 3 HERE)**

Table 4 shows that majority of the respondents in this study came from the IT programme that is 48 (69%) respondents. Applied linguistics and Managerial communication programmes consisted of 6 (9%) respondents whereas the rest of the respondents were following the ICT and Tourism programmes with a total of 5 (7%) respondents.

**(PLEASE INSERT TABLE 4 HERE)**

Table 5 shows the percentage, mean and standard deviation for oral communication in groups. In general, the results of this study for oral communication in groups shows that most of

the respondents stated undecided with an overall mean of 3.24 and standard deviation of 0.44. The analysis shows that 52 (74 %) respondents stated undecided while the rest of them 11 (16 %) respondents stated agree and 7 (10 %) respondents stated disagree. The results show that in 3 out of the 6 items, the respondents stated undecided for oral communication in groups with the following items: *Generally, I am comfortable while participating in group discussions* (mean 2.63, SD 1.46), *I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions* (mean 2.70, SD 1.41), *I like to get involved in group discussions* (mean 2.76, SD 1.39). On the other hand, in three items in the oral communication in groups, the respondents stated disagree. The items are: *I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions* (mean 2.59, SD 1.36), *participating in group discussions with new people makes me tense and nervous* ( mean 3.67, SD 1.22), and *I dislike participating in group discussions* (mean 4.07, SD 1.32).

**(PLEASE INSERT TABLE 5 HERE)**

Overall, the result of this study for meetings shows that most of the respondents stated undecided with an overall mean of 3.41 and standard deviation of 0.54. The analysis shows that 51 (73 %) respondents stated undecided. The rest 19 (27 %) respondents stated agree and most of them stated disagree with the factor.

Table 6 shows the items that appeared in the meetings. The result shows the three items in which the respondents were undecided. Among the items are: *Usually I am calm and relaxed while participating in a meeting* (mean 2.76, SD 1.41), *I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion at a meeting* (mean 2.99, SD 1.31) and *I am very relaxed when answering questions in a meeting* (mean 3.07, SD 1.58).

There are three items where the respondents agreed with the statement. These are: *Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting* (mean 3.86 and standard deviation 1.13),

*communicating at a meeting usually makes me uncomfortable* (mean 3.82 and standard deviation 1.37) and *I am afraid to express myself at meetings* (mean 3.94, SD 1.19).

**(PLEASE INSERT TABLE 6 HERE)**

The result of this study shows that the respondents were undecided with the dyads factor with an overall mean of 3.46 and standard deviation of 0.71. In terms of the percentage factor for the overall of the dyads, 47 respondents (67%) stated undecided with factor and the rest stated neither agree that is 20 (29 %) respondents and 3 (4 %) respondents stated disagree.

Table 7 shows the items that the respondents stated disagree. They are: *I have no fear of speaking up in conversations* (mean 3.11, SD 1.56), *Usually, I am very calm and relaxed in conversations* (mean 3.21, SD 1.51) and *While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed* (mean 3.27, SD 1.39). Only three items the respondents stated agree that is *I'm afraid to speak up in conversations* (mean 3.66, SD 1.28), *Usually, I am very tense and nervous in conversations* (mean 3.77 SD 1.33) and *While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous* (mean 3.71, SD 1.26).

**(PLEASE INSERT TABLE 7 HERE)**

This research shows that the respondents stated undecided with the public speaking with a mean of 3.50 and standard deviation of 0.61. 42 respondents (60%) stated agree with the factor. 21 respondents (30%) stated agree with the factor, and only 7 respondents (10 %) stated disagree with the factor.

Table 8 shows the items that the respondents stated undecided. They are: *My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I general giving a speech* (mean 3.54, SD 1.14), *I have no fear of giving a speech* (mean 3.10, SD 1.37), *While giving a speech I gate so nervous, I forget facts I really know* (mean 3.60, SD 1.27) and *Certain parts of my body feel very tense and*

*nervous while giving a speech* (mean 3.84, SD 1.25). The rest of the items show the respondents disagreed and agreed with the factor on public speaking.

**(PLEASE INSERT TABLE 8 HERE)**

Table 9 shows the age, socio-economic status and programme have a positive relationship with communication apprehension. It is found that the relationship between programme and communication apprehension is a low positive relationship that is ( $r = 0.331$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). On the other hand, there is a low positive relationship between age and socio-economic status and communication apprehension with programme ( $r = 0.047$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and age ( $r = 0.072$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

**(PLEASE INSERT TABLE 9 HERE)**

## **Discussion**

The first objective of this study was to investigate the levels of Communication Apprehension among the Jordanian postgraduate students when communicating in English in UUM. The questions in the PRCA were grouped into four different situations communication apprehension: groups, meetings, dyads and public speaking. Jordanian postgraduate students stated that they had high level of communication apprehension for the four different situations of CA. It appears that the overall mean of CA in groups is 3.24, meetings 3.41, dyads 3.46 and public speaking is 3.50. The Jordanian postgraduate students also had high apprehension on public speaking followed by dyads, meetings and groups. A study done by Shung (1998) arrived at similar result whereby the undergraduate students in UUM were particularly apprehensive in meeting and public speaking. In the present study, statements which scored the highest mean in public speaking are: *I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence* (mean 3.90), *Certain parts of my body feel very tense and nervous while giving a speech* (mean 3.84) and *While giving*

*a speech I get so nervous, I forget facts I really know* (mean 3.60). On the other hand, the statements which scored the highest mean in the meetings are: *I am afraid to express myself at meetings* (mean 3.94), *Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting* (mean 3.86), and *Communicating at a meeting usually makes me uncomfortable* (mean 3.82). Next, the statements which scored the highest mean in the dyads are: *Usually, I am very tense and nervous in conversations* (mean 3.77), *While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous* (mean 3.71), and *I'm afraid to speak up in conversations* (mean 3.66). The last statements which scored the highest mean in the groups are: *I dislike participating in group discussions* (mean 4.07), *participating in group discussion with new people makes me tense and nervous* (mean 3.67) and *I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions* (mean 2.59).

The result of this study seems to corroborate with the study conducted by Shung (1998) who studied CA among undergraduate students at Universiti Utara Malaysia Using PRCA-24, Shung found that CA also existed among the undergraduate students with the average overall score slightly below than the studies conducted in the western countries.

The second research objective of this study was to investigate the relationship between programme, age and socioeconomic status and Communication Apprehension. For the first variable (age), the highest frequency is 43 (age between 21 to 30 years old) or 61%, followed by 19 (27%) respondents were at the age of 31- 40 years old and the lowest frequency is 8 (11%) respondents were at the age of 41- 50 years old. It appears that those who were at the age between 21 to 30 years old were the most apprehensive students, while those at the age 41- 50 were the least apprehensive students. It is found that the younger adults were more apprehensive than the older adults. There is a possibility that those at the age of 41 years old and above are

more likely to be experienced teachers or instructors and have used English more frequently than the younger adults who had less exposure to English in the academic field.

The second variable is Socio-economic status. The highest frequency of this factor was from the middle income group that is 40 respondents (57%). On the other hand, the lowest frequency was these from high Socio-Economic statuses that is 13 (19%) respondents. Respondents were from low income group that is 17 (24%) respondents.

The third variable is programme. Majority of the respondents in this study were from IT programme, that is 48 (69%), respondents followed by Applied linguistics and Managerial Communication programmes that is 6 (9%) respondents. The rest of the respondents were following ICT and Tourism programmes with a total of 5 (7%) respondents.

Overall, it appears that Jordanian students have high levels of communication apprehension regardless of their programme. High levels of communication apprehension as represented in the results can be attributed to many reasons which are related to their educational background in Jordan. First, English in Jordan is taught as EFL where students are only required to pass the sit-in examination and there is not much emphasis on communication either at classrooms or in daily life situations. Second, the method of teaching English is usually grammar translation method or the teachers just use any structural syllabi which don't enhance the use of language or communicative abilities. Third, English teaching in Jordan is teacher-centered in which the teacher controls the class while the students are merely recipient of knowledge. Moreover, they are not encouraged to communicate or use the knowledge they get in the classroom (Al-Khateeb, 2004).

Using correlation, it is found that there is a significant positive relationship between age, socio-economic status and programme. It is found that there is a low relationship between



programme and communication apprehension, that is ( $r = 0.018, p < 0.05$ ). On the other hand, there is a low positive relationship between age and socio-economic status and communication apprehension, that is ( $r = 0.040, p < 0.05$ ), and programme ( $r = 0.018, p < 0.05$ ).

## **Conclusion**

The two objectives in this study were: (1) to investigate the levels of Communication Apprehension among the Jordanian postgraduate students when communicating in English in UUM and (2) to investigate the relationship between programme, age and socioeconomic status and Communication Apprehension. The results indicate that the Jordanian postgraduate students experience high level of communication apprehension in general, and this level of communication apprehension increases in speech, and fear of the class. Although the students are considered to have high communication apprehension, they still have a strong concern to learn English and keep going to these classes.

To conclude based on the different environment between UUM and the Jordanian students' background, communication apprehension appears to be an affective factor that is believed to reduce the learning experience which can affect the general academic achievement levels, a matter that needs special considerations and recommendations.

## **Future Research**

Researchers can conduct a similar research to this study by involving other international students studying in UUM. UUM has many international students who come from different countries such as Libya, Indonesia, Thailand, China, Iraq, and Pakistan. Researchers can also conduct a similar research to this study by using a mix method research design such as conducting interviews besides conducting a survey.

## References

- Abbad, A. (1988). *'An Analysis of Communicative Competence Features in English Language Texts in Yemen Arab Republic'*, unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Abdul Haq, F. (1982). *An Analysis of Syntactic Errors in the Composition of Jordanian Secondary Students*. Jordan: Yarmouk University.
- Beatty, M. J. (1987). 'Communication apprehension as a determinate of avoidance withdrawal and performance anxiety', *Communication Quarterly*, 35: 202-217.
- Beatty, M. J. (1988). 'Situational predispositional correlates of public speaking anxiety', *Communication Education*, 38: 277-289.
- Beatty, M. J., Balfantz, G. L., & Kuwabara, A. Y. (1989). 'Trait-like qualities of selected variables assumed to be transient causes of performance state anxiety', *Communication Education*, 38: 277-289.
- Beatty, M. J., & Friedland, M.H. (1990). 'Public speaking state anxiety as a function of selected situational and predispositional variables', *Communication Education*, 39: 142-147.
- Berko, R.M., Wolvin, A.D., & Wolvin, D.R. (1992). *Communicating: A social and career focus* (5\* ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Burgoon, M., & Ruffner, M. (1978). *Human communication: A revision of approaching speech/communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Harrison, W., Prator, C. & Tucker, G. (1975). *English Language Policy Survey of Jordan*, Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

- McCroskey, J. C. (1970). 'Measures of communication-bound anxiety', *Speech Monographs*, 37: 27-33.
- McCroskey, J. (1976). 'The effects of communication apprehension on the perception of Peers', *Western Speech Communication*, 40: 14-21.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1977). 'Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research', *Human Communication Research*, 4: 78-96.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1981). *Oral communication apprehension: Reconceptualization and a new look at measurement*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Central States Speech Association, Chicago, IL.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1984). 'The communication apprehension perspective', in J.A. Daly and J. C. McCroskey (eds.), *Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, pp. 13-39.
- McCroskey, J.C. & Beatty, M. J. (1984). 'Communication apprehension and accumulated communication state anxiety experiences: A research note', *Communication Monographs*, 51: 79-84.
- McCroskey, J.C. & Beatty, M. J. & Kearney, P., & Plax, T.G. (1985). 'The content validity of the PRCA-24 as a measure of communication apprehension across communication contexts', *Communication Journal*, 33: 165-173.
- McCroskey, J., Richmond, V. (1977). 'Communication apprehension as a predictor of self-disclosure', *Communication Quarterly*, 25: 40-43.
- McCroskey, J.C. and Richmond, V.P. (1990). 'Willingness to Communicate: A cognitive view', *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 19-37.

- Rabab'ah, G. (2005). 'Communication problems facing Arab learners of English', *Grazer Linguistische Studien*, 63-75.
- Rubin, R. B., Graham, E. E., & Mignerey, J. T. (1990). 'A longitudinal study of college students' communication competence', *Communication Education*, 39: 1-14.
- Scott, C. R. and Timmerman, E. C. (2005). Relating Computer, Communication and Computer-Mediate Communication Apprehension to New Communication Technology Use in the Workplace', *Communication Research*, 32(6): 683-725.
- Shung, W. W. (1998). 'Communication apprehension among UUM students', unpublished Master thesis. Sintok: Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Spielberger, C.D. (1966). 'Theory and research on anxiety', in C.D. Spielberger (ed.), *Anxiety and behavior*. New York: Academic Press, pp.3-37.
- Wahba, E. (1998). 'Teaching Pronunciation—Why?', *Language Teaching Forum*, 36(3): 32.
- Weekley, E. (1967). *An etymological dictionary of modern English (Vol. 1)*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Wheless, L. R. (1971). 'Communication apprehension in the elementary school', *Speech Teacher*, 10: 297-99.
- Zughoul, M. Taminian, L. (1984). 'The linguistic attitude of Arab university students: factorial structure and intervening variables', *The International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 50.

## APPENDIX

**Table 1: Reliability**

<b>VARIABLE</b>	<b>CRONBACH ALPHA</b>
Groups	0.807
Meeting	0.665
Dyads	0.757
Public Speaking	0.724

**Table 2: Distribution of Respondents According to Age**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
21-30	43	61
31-40	19	27
41-50	8	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 3: Distribution of Respondents According to Socio-Economic Status**

<b>Socio-Economic Status</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Low income group	17	24
Middle income group	40	57
High income group	13	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 4: Distribution of Respondents According to Academic Programme**

Academic Programme	Frequency	Percent
Information technology	48	68
Information communication technology	5	7
Applied linguistics	6	9
Managerial communication	6	9
Tourism	5	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 5: Oral communication in groups**

		Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	I dislike participating in group discussions  <b>Mean= 4.07 SD= 1.32</b>	8	11	2	3	4	6	19	27	37	53
2	Generally, I am comfortable while participating in group discussions  <b>Mean= 2.63 SD= 1.46</b>	20	29	21	30	4	6	15	21	10	14
3	I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions  <b>Mean=2.59 SD= 1.36</b>	6	9	13	19	6	9	22	31	23	33
4	I like to get involved in group discussions  <b>Mean= 2.76 SD= 1.39</b>	16	23	22	31	2	3	23	33	7	10
5	Participating in group discussions with new people makes me tense and nervous  <b>Mean= 3.67 SD= 1.22</b>	6	9	7	10	9	13	29	41	19	27

6	I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions  <b>Mean= 2.70 SD= 1.41</b>	18 26	19 27	8 11	16 23	9 13
	<b>Oral communication in groups</b> <b>Mean= 3.24 SD= 0.44</b>	<b>1.0 – 2.4</b>		<b>2.5 – 3.4</b>		<b>3.5 – 5.0</b>
		7	10	52	74	11 16

**Table 6: Meetings**

		<b>Strongly Disagree</b>		<b>Disagree</b>		<b>Undecided</b>		<b>Agree</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	
		<b>1</b>		<b>2</b>		<b>3</b>		<b>4</b>		<b>5</b>	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting  <b>Mean= 3.86 SD= 1.13</b>	4	6	6	9	11	16	25	36	24	34
2	Usually I am calm and relaxed while participating in a meeting  <b>Mean= 2.76 SD= 1.41</b>	17	24	19	27	7	10	18	25	8	18
3	I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion at a meeting  <b>Mean= 2.99 SD= 1.31</b>	11	16	20	29	8	11	23	33	8	11
4	I am afraid to express myself at meetings  <b>Mean= 3.94 SD= 1.19</b>	4	6	9	13	6	9	23	33	28	40
5	Communicating at a meeting usually makes me uncomfortable  <b>Mean= 3.82 SD= 1.37</b>	5	7	12	17	3	4	17	24	32	46

6	I am very relaxed when answering questions in a meeting  <b>Mean= 3.07    SD= 1.58</b>	16   23	16   23	5   7	12   17	20   29
	<b>Meetings</b> <b>Mean= 3.41    SD= 0.54</b>	<b>1.0 – 2.4</b>		<b>2.5 – 3.4</b>		<b>3.5 – 5.0</b>
		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>19   27</b>

**Table 7: Dyads**

		<b>Strongly Disagree</b>		<b>Disagree</b>		<b>Undecided</b>		<b>Agree</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	
		<b>1</b>		<b>2</b>		<b>3</b>		<b>4</b>		<b>5</b>	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous  <b>Mean= 3.71    SD= 1.26</b>	3	4	15	21	4	6	23	33	24	34
2	I have no fear of speaking up in conversations  <b>Mean= 3.11    SD= 1.56</b>	15	21	16	23	4	6	16	23	18	26
3	Usually, I am very tense and nervous in conversations  <b>Mean= 3.77    SD= 1.33</b>	8	11	6	9	5	7	25	36	24	34
4	Usually, I am very calm and relaxed in conversations  <b>Mean= 3.21    SD= 1.51</b>	14	20	12	17	8	11	17	24	17	24
5	While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed  <b>Mean= 3.27    SD= 1.39</b>	9	13	14	20	15	21	12	17	19	27



6	I'm afraid to speak up in conversations.  <b>Mean= 3.66    SD= 1.28</b>	5    7	11   16	7    10	24   34	22   31
	<b>Dyads</b> <b>Mean= 3.46    SD= 0.71</b>	<b>1.0 – 2.4</b>		<b>2.5 – 3.4</b>		<b>3.5 – 5.0</b>
		3	4	47	67	20   29

**Table 8: Public speaking**

		<b>Strongly Disagree</b>		<b>Disagree</b>		<b>Undecided</b>		<b>Agree</b>		<b>Strongly Agree</b>	
		<b>1</b>		<b>2</b>		<b>3</b>		<b>4</b>		<b>5</b>	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1	I have no fear of giving a speech  <b>Mean=3.10    SD 1.37</b>	10	14	17	24	11	16	17	24	14	20
2	Certain parts of my body feel very tense and nervous while giving a speech  <b>Mean= 3.84    SD 1.25</b>	7	10	8	11	6	9	24	34	25	36
3	I feel relaxed while giving a speech  <b>Mean= 2.94    SD 1.54</b>	19	27	12	17	5	7	19	27	14	20
4	My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech  <b>Mean=3.54    SD 1.14</b>	6	9	8	11	11	16	33	47	12	17
5	I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence  <b>Mean=3.90    SD 1.04</b>	3	4	4	6	11	16	30	43	21	30
6	While giving a speech I get so nervous, I forget facts I really know  <b>Mean=3.60    SD 1.27</b>	7	10	6	9	9	13	28	40	19	27

<b>Public speaking</b> Mean= 3.50 SD 0.61	<b>1.0 – 2.4</b>	<b>2.5 – 3.4</b>	<b>3.5 – 5.0</b>
	7	10	21
		30	42 60

**Table 9: Correlation between age, socio-economic status and programme with communication apprehension**

	<b>Communication Apprehension</b>
<b>Age</b>	.072**
<b>Socio-economic status</b>	.047**
<b>Programme</b>	.331**

\*\*p< 0.01

\*p< 0.05