

English for maritime purposes: Communication apprehension and communicative competence among maritime students in the Philippines

Mildred A. Rojo-Laurilla
De La Salle University–Manila

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on communication apprehension or speech anxiety in relation to oral communication activities conducted in a maritime ESP class in Manila, Philippines. The study attempted to determine levels of communication anxiety and perceived communication competence among the students, and possible correlations with particular speech tasks. Speech performance scores were obtained through teacher and peer grading. The results indicate that students' performances varied in relation to the type of speech task, and that their perceptions about their communicative abilities were almost independent of the teacher or peer grades given to them. Since the study is exploratory, it is recommended that it be replicated in other ESP classes that require extensive application or use of the students' oral communication skills.

Introduction

[On board I speak] mostly Tagalog and English. But I prefer English, they speak English much more often and you can get your English more fluent to communicate with the nationalities. (from Sampson's fieldnotes, in Sampson & Zhao, 2003, p. 40)

A Filipino seafarer's quote above about his thoughts on using English in a multilingual crew ship illustrates the type of communication situation that a number of Filipino maritime practitioners experience. These are Filipinos who have decided that life on sea is the better option to earn a living than staying in their home country. The type and quality of English spoken on board these ships are a concern because these highlight job-related social interaction and communication in a specialized industry. The current study draws, however, on a maritime-related context of communication—that of oral communication while the maritime students are still in their training and education. A study of such kind is deemed important in order to gain more understanding of English within ESP and to address future needs of these maritime students especially in relation to their oral proficiency.

Oral communication continues to be a part of the curriculum among would-be professionals in the Philippines because of the need to train workers who are not only technically knowledgeable in their respective fields, but are also competent to participate in the social or interpersonal aspects of their

jobs. Teaching oral communication may involve a focus on its interpersonal or intercultural aspects, but is often associated with public speaking. One of the issues often raised in public speaking is communication apprehension or CA which is essentially defined as "an anxiety syndrome associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey, 1977, pp. 27-28).

On communication apprehension

Communication apprehension has attracted a lot of research in the fields of psychology and education, especially in the area of student behavior in the classroom. Powers & Smythe (1980, p. 146) have noted, for example, that because "the role of communication apprehension in shaping educational outcomes has emerged as a major concern of instructional communication researchers...an ever-increasing body of research has accumulated indicating that there is a pervasive relationship between this communication variable and various aspects of the academic experience". Indeed, Holbrook (1987) would later add that people's levels of CA do have a profound impact on their oral communication, social skills, and self-esteem (see also Witt & Behnke, 2006; Opt & Loffredo, 2000).

Earlier studies have focused on correlations between CA and academic achievement. McCroskey & Andersen (1976), for example, have attempted to find out the relationship between communication apprehension and academic achievement among college students. The focus of the study was to look into whether students' GPA, SAT scores, performances in examinations and enrolment in a mass lecture versus traditional classroom setting (one teacher with a certain number of students belonging to a class), correlated with the students' possession of low, moderate and high CA. Indeed, CA had a significant correlation with SAT scores; GPAs of high CA students were significantly lower than those students of low CA; and those with high CA tended to favor the mass lecture method over small classes. Similarly, Powers & Smythe (1980) have found that CA levels had a significant effect on final course grades.

Indeed, these studies show that there is a clear correlation between CA levels and academic achievement; and thus, especially the more recent cognitive-based investigations of CA levels in classroom contexts, they affirm the continuing relevance of work on CA among our students.

Internal factors affecting CA

Some studies attempt to provide evidence for associations between CA and different aspects of communication. For instance, there may be factors related to some physiological or other internally driven considerations. One study focuses on apprehension and self-perceived communication competence among students who stutter and those who do not (Blood, Blood, Tellis, & Gabel, 2001). This study has found that students who stuttered had higher levels of CA and poorer scores on their self-perceived communication competence compared to those who did not stutter. Opt & Loffredo (2000), on the other hand, have established a

possible link between CA and personality traits. It was found that those who were more likely to be introverts experienced higher levels of CA than extroverts.

External factors affecting CA

Levels of communication apprehension could also be triggered by external factors, such as the type of classroom assignment or speech task. For example, Witt & Behnk (2006) have statistically tested anticipatory trait anxiety across speech assignments and found that trait anxiety was highest for impromptu speaking, lower for extemporaneous speaking and lowest for manuscript reading (p. 173): “not only do students associate general, trait-like expectations of anxiety by speech type, but they also experience actual state anxiety indicators of differing intensity when faced with differing speech delivery types” (p. 174). Another potential external source of CA is the field of study or intended major. For example, Simons, Higgins, & Lowe (1995) have noted observations by practitioners and academics who claim that oral and written communication skills among accounting majors need much attention. Their study has found that accounting majors have higher apprehension toward speaking and writing compared to other business majors. On the other hand, Hassall et al.’s (2000) study of Spanish, North American and UK business and accounting students has also found high communication apprehension levels among these students because practitioners expect them to be efficient in speaking and writing.

CA in ESL contexts

Another significant body of research on CA is concerned with how it is influenced by the nature of the language learning classroom itself. That is, it explores CA levels in contexts where the medium of instruction is not the learners’ first language or mother tongue, or simply classrooms where learners learn English as their second or foreign language. For example, McCroskey, Fayer, & Richmond (1983) have found, not surprisingly, that Puerto Rican learners of English as a second language were less apprehensive when communicating in their L1 (Spanish) but far more apprehensive when communicating in English (L2). They have also noted a significant correlation between self-perceived competence in a second language and their CA levels in the same language. Young’s (1989) study among high school students learning Spanish also supports the claim that language anxiety is much pronounced when we communicate in a language that is not our first language. Another related and interesting study is that of Keaten, Kelly, & Pribyl (1997) which has found that communication apprehension levels of Japanese elementary and secondary school students learning English as a second language have increased from primary to secondary school.

A wholistic look at CA

Most recently, however, studies on CA have tried to paint a much more complex picture of social and cognitive influences affecting CA levels among

different kinds of learners and students. Zhang (2005), for example, has found that communication apprehension is affected by both individual (e.g., cognitive, personality-induced) and cultural (e.g., orientation towards the use of humour in the classroom, power relations) factors, indicating that student-teacher relations, and not simply teachers or students per se, correlate with CA levels in various ways. Meanwhile, delivery formats may also have an impact on the cognitive and affective learning outcomes of students. Messman & Jones-Corley (2001) have found that class size (whether big sized lectures, mid- to small class sizes) does affect the quality of learning. For example, lecture formats have tended to improve the students' cognitive development, while mixed-size formats have resulted in students' significantly improved affective learning mechanisms. Thus, since "the more communicatively apprehensive students are generally less motivated to participate and have lower affective learning relative to the less communicatively apprehensive students" (p. 197), certain kinds of classes could bring about different levels of CA.

Our brief discussion of the relevant literature on CA shows that communication apprehension is, indeed, a phenomenon that is worth investigating. We are therefore justified to investigate CA in the context of English as a Second Language (ESL) and, even more specifically, in an ESL English for Specific Purposes context, because it is in situations like this where various cognitive and cultural elements work together (or against each other) to generate communication apprehension that is both complex and real. Besides, zeroing in now on English for maritime purposes, there has been little research done on experiences of students enrolling in maritime studies, especially those concerning communication apprehension. It is thus of much interest to study maritime communication because, as Sampson & Zhao (2003, p. 31) note, the "introduction of multilingual crews and the loss of universal forms of communication" have made English as the lingua franca of the sea even more desirable and, perhaps, inevitable.

On Maritime Education and Maritime English

According to Ramirez (2003), there are around 118 maritime institutions all over the Philippines, producing thousands of seafarers over the years, thus helping make the country "the labor capital of the world" (p. 279). Students in the maritime field enroll in courses such as BS Marine Engineering and BS Marine Transportation. The maritime field is heavily reliant on constant and exact communication as well as understanding of mathematical formulas and their application on the field (c.f. Sampson & Zhao, 2003). Students are also expected to be proficient in English since the technical jargon is mainly in English, and because of the high probability of working in a multicultural environment. Cwilewicz & Pudlowski's (1998) work on didactic programs for a maritime academy in Poland state exactly this same view: to ensure safety of their passengers and colleagues, maritime students must also learn effective communication skills.

An accompanying issue, however, concerns the quality of English in the maritime field. Winbow (2002) points out that in most countries, maritime professionals generally lack English communication skills. This generalization

is attributed to the status of English in the countries where these professionals come from—as either ESL (English as a Second Language) or EFL (English as a Foreign Language). More often, miscommunication due to cultural differences and the perceived lack of proficiency in the English language of these maritime students are identified as sources of concern in the language classroom. With the involvement of technical terms/jargon and the high use of written and spoken communication, it is therefore even more imperative for maritime professionals to undergo extensive English communication skills training. Of course, cross-cultural and/or communication skills training must be contextualized to achieve maximum effectiveness. After finding out that most available materials in ESL maritime English teaching are designed for more traditional teaching of English, Benton (2003) suggests that maritime instructors use materials that suit the specific needs of their maritime students.

Background of the study

A group of Filipino maritime stakeholders communicated with De La Salle University (DLSU)—Manila expressing their interest to fund a Maritime Academic Ramp Program in English, Math and Science. This was to satisfy the goal of meeting the needs of the global maritime industry and make the Filipino students competitive applicants to foreign shipping companies alongside other nationalities such as the Chinese and Indians.

The students selected for enrollment in the maritime institution would be required to undergo the Ramp Program. The Ramp Program was designed to review concepts and skills learned in high school and use some of these concepts and skills to prepare the students for their maritime studies. These students were to complete their maritime education with the Maritime Academy of Asia and the Pacific (MAAP)—Kamaya Point located in the province of Bataan. Since students were pre-selected by the stakeholders in coordination with MAAP, DLSU—Manila simply provided assistance through the summer instruction. The author of the paper served as their instructor for speech or oral communication in the summer of 2004.

For a period of two weeks (half of the instruction was conducted at DLSU, the other half was done at the MAAP campus), the students were exposed to the impromptu, extemporaneous and informal debate types of speeches. These speeches were deemed useful for both interpersonal/group and more formal or public-type oral communication situations that the students might encounter in the future. For the extemporaneous speech, the students prepared a speech of description (for the diagnostic task) and a persuasive speech. The persuasive, impromptu and informal debate speeches were the ones included in the study. The students were given enough time in the classroom for input and practice, as each class was around three hours per day. Peer and teacher assessments were also conducted.

Prior to instruction, the students were given a questionnaire to determine their level of communication apprehension using the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (labeled in this paper as PRCA) adapted from

McCroskey (1982) and the Self-Perceived Communication Competence Scale (labeled in this paper as SLFPER) also adapted from McCroskey & McCroskey (1988). Both instruments have been used in previous studies and were proven to be reliable (for communication competence, c.f. Horwitz, 1986; McCroskey, Fayer, & Richmond, 1985; for PRCA, c.f. McCroskey, Beatty, Kearney, & Plax, 1985; Pribyl, Keaten, Sakamoto, & Koshikawa, 1998; Beatty, 1985; Keaten, Kelly, & Pribyl, 1997; and Blood, Blood, Tellis, & Gable, 2001).

After the summer instruction, the students were asked to complete the same forms. Throughout this paper, PRCA and SLFPER1 refer to data obtained prior to instruction while SLFPER2 refers to data obtained after instruction. SLFPER1 and SLFPER2 were administered to determine if students' perception of their own competence has changed through the speech sessions.

Objectives of the study

The study is generally exploratory. It attempts to find out if communication apprehension exists among maritime students, whether or not the students view themselves as communicatively competent in English, and more specifically now, whether or not the speech tasks have helped them improve as speakers thus reducing their level of speech anxiety and improving their perceptions of their communicative competence. Did their speech performances correlate with particular levels of communication anxiety and perceived communication competence?

This study specifically intends to answer the following questions:

- a. What correlations exist between the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA) and Self-Perceived Communication Competence 1 (SLFPER1)?
- b. What correlations exist between the results of the SLFPER before and after undergoing the presentations?
- c. What correlations exist between PRCA and the presentations (based on teacher and peer grades)?
- d. What correlations exist between SLFPER1 and the presentations, and SLFPER2 and the presentations before and after undergoing the Academic Ramp Program (based on teacher and peer grades)?

The following are the hypotheses of the study:

- a. There is a significant relationship between the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA) and the Self-Perceived Communication Competence Scale 1 (SLFPER1).
- b. There is a significant relationship between the PRCA scale and the students' scores (based on teacher and peer grades).
- c. There is a significant relationship between students' scores (based on teacher grades) and the SLFPER1.
- d. There is a significant relationship between students' scores (based on teacher grades) and the SLFPER2.
- e. There is a significant relationship between students' scores (based on peer grades) and the Self-Perceived Communication Competence Scale 1 (SLFPER1).

- f. There is a significant relationship between students' scores (based on peer grade) and the Self-Perceived Communication Competence Scale 2 (SLFPER2).

Methodology

This section presents the profile of participants in the study, the instruments used, the procedures in data gathering, and the statistical treatment/s used.

Participant profile

The participants of the study, all male, were initially 50 incoming first year students of the Maritime Academy of Asia and the Pacific or MAAP (in Kamaya Point, Bataan, Philippines). They were housed initially in a dormitory near De La Salle University in Manila, and later in the program inside the MAAP campus. They were given an entry-level examination and an English subject post-course evaluation. They were recruited from various provinces all over the country based on the standards of MAAP. However, some students dropped out of the program due to a variety of reasons (e.g., did not meet the health requirements, change of mind about pursuing the program) which resulted in the final number of 24 participants.

Instruments/materials/procedures

As mentioned earlier, a checklist for the individual's report on Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SLFPER 1 and 2) adapted from McCroskey & McCroskey (1988) was distributed to the participants before and after instruction (see Appendix A). This instrument consists of 12 statements representing various contexts of communication (public speaking, dyad, meeting, group, friend, etc.). The participants completed the questionnaire by indicating their level of competence in each given context, with 0 as the lowest score and 100 as the highest. Each communication context indicates a possible range of level of competence. For example, for Public, a score > 86 means High SPCC, while a score < 51 indicates Low SPCC. In Meetings, a score > 85 indicates High SPCC while a score < 51 indicates Low SPCC.

The second instrument used in the study was McCroskey's (1982) Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA) (see Appendix B). It has 24 statements concerning feelings of people when they communicate with others. The respondents were asked to rate each statement by using this scale: strongly agree (1-SA), agree (2-A), undecided (3-U), disagree (4-D), or strongly disagree (5-SD). This instrument was given to the students prior to instruction. According to this instrument, scores can range from 24 to 120. Scores below 51 represent people who have very low CA. Scores that fall within 51-80 represent people with average CA. Scores above 80 represent people who have high levels of trait-like CA.

In the course of the public speaking program, the participants performed speech presentations—the impromptu speech, debate, and persuasive speech—

all of which were graded by the researcher and the participants' classmates. The rubric used by the researcher in grading the impromptu speech tasks was based on the rubric used at DLSU–Manila where 70% percent of 100 is the passing grade. However, after these tasks, the students requested a change to an easier rubric because it was the first time they used such an instrument. This decision to use a different rubric for both teacher and peer evaluation was adapted for the rest of the speech assignments. For this set of descriptors, the highest possible grade was 8 (see Appendix C for the rubric), and the passing mark was 5.6 (equivalent to 70%).

Data analysis and statistical treatment

What will be reported in this paper are scores for all the 24 students regardless of their section assignments. The numerical aspects of the study included the means, percentages and standard deviations. The statistical analysis included Pearson R correlation.

Results

General performance of the students in the speech tasks

Table 1 displays the mean and the standard deviation of the students' scores in all three speech activities conducted—impromptu speech, persuasive speech, and debate—during the summer Ramp Program.

Based on the teacher's grade, the results indicate that on the average, the students met the passing score of 70% for the impromptu speech. However, their mean scores for the persuasive and debate speeches were a little under the passing score of 5.6 (out of 8). Peer grades, on the other hand, show that the students were slightly more generous in giving marks to their peers in all the speech tasks. The standard deviation obtained for both peer and teacher grades, especially in the persuasive and debate speeches, appears to indicate that the scores given were not too disparate from each other, except for the impromptu grade given by the teacher.

Table 1

Mean scores obtained in impromptu, persuasive and debate speeches

Scoring: 0–100 points			Scoring: Scale of 0–8	
Type of speech activity	Mean Scores (Teacher Grade)	SD	Mean Scores (Peer Grade)	SD
Impromptu	70.36*	11.1	5.73**	.93
Persuasive	5.37**	.90	6.02**	.73
Debate	5.47**	.75	6.13**	.57
N = 24				

* computed based on the original DLSU rubric

** computed based on the revised rubric

Table 2

General mean and standard deviation values of the students' reports for PRCA and SLFPER 1 and 2

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. PRCA scale	66.62	13.16
2. SLFPER 1 scale (administered before the Ramp Program)	64.15	17.82
3. SLFPER 2 scale (administered after the Ramp Program)	79.46	11.84
N = 24		

Meanwhile, Table 2 shows the mean scores and standard deviation values of the students' PRCA and their SLFPER.

In terms of the PRCA score, the students' perception of their own level of communication anxiety is moderate (the score is within the 51-80 average range). The value obtained for SLFPER 1 (64.15) indicates that students might not have viewed themselves as highly flexible, assertive and competent communicators. The value obtained for SLFPER 2 (79.46) shows an increase in their perceptions about themselves as communicators after undergoing the oral communication course. Students' perceptions of their own language skills could have improved. The standard deviations obtained indicate that the students varied in terms of their perception on levels of communication apprehension and competence.

Correlations between Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA) and Self-Perceived Communication Competence 1 (SLFPER1)

For this part of the study, it was hypothesized that there is a significant relationship between the Personal PRCA and SLFPER1—that the students' own report of their communication apprehension correlates significantly with their perception of their own communication competence. The Pearson R value obtained for PRCA and SLFPER1 was $-.541$, a value indicating moderate strength of association and, at the same time, indicating that the two variables (PRCA and SLFPER1) are inversely related. This may mean that generally, there were instances when students considered themselves competent in certain speaking contexts and non-competent in other contexts. In addition, the inverse relationship may mean that the higher their perception is of their communication competence, there is a possibility of a lower score for communication anxiety. The data also indicate that the Pearson R value is higher than the critical value ($.402$) set at $.05$ confidence level. Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

Correlations between Perceptions of Communication Competence before and after undergoing the presentations

The correlation between perceptions of communication competence before and after undergoing the presentations was also sought. Indeed, the correlation value of $.654$ obtained for SLFPER1 and SLFPER2 indicates a strong association. The positive correlation may indicate that if the SLFPER 1 value is high, it is likely

Table 3

Correlations between Personal Report of Communication Apprehension and the Three-Speech Tasks (based on teacher's grades)

Variables	R (based on teacher's grade)	R (based on peer grade)
PRCA—Impromptu	-.178	.223
PRCA—Persuasive	-.171	-.051
PRCA—Debate	-.343	.121

Note: $r > .402$, $df = .22$, $p < .05$

that SLFPER2 value is also high. This means that the students' ratings have been reliable as they showed consistency of perceptions of their own competence before and after the presentations. Because the computed value is greater than the critical value of .402 at .05 confidence level, the hypothesis for this question is accepted.

Correlations between Personal Report of Communication Apprehension and the speech tasks based on teacher and peer grades

It was also hypothesized that there is a significant relationship between the Personal Report on Communication Apprehension scale and the students' scores (based on teacher and peer grade). Table 3 displays the correlations between the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension and each of the three activities as graded by the teacher and the peers.

The results generally indicate weak correlations between PRCA and the different speech tasks. In addition, all speech tasks were inversely correlated to PRCA. The results imply that there is no correlation between the students' perceptions of their communication apprehension and the teacher's grades. In addition, the students' and teacher's perceptions do not necessarily match. With computed values all less than the critical value of .402, the hypothesis is rejected in consideration of the teacher's grades.

On peer grading, the correlation values obtained indicate weak correlations between the PRCA and each of the three activities, as graded by the students' peers. PRCA is found to be negatively correlated with the persuasive speech, unlike the two other speech tasks. Similar to the results of the correlations in relation to the teacher's grades, these results mean that the peers' perceptions of their performances in the different speech tasks do not necessarily match their own perceptions of their communication anxiety levels, leading to the possibility that communication apprehension may not be a predictor of success in performance. Since the computed values are less than the critical value of .402, the hypothesis is rejected concerning peer grades.

Correlations between Self-Perceived Communication Competence (before and after undergoing the Academic Ramp Program) and the speech tasks based on teacher's grades

The hypotheses for this section are the following: first, that there is a significant relationship between students' scores (based on teacher's grades) and SLFPER1, and second, there is a significant relationship between students' scores (based on teacher's grades) and SLFPER2 (see Table 4 for the correlations).

The results reveal that neither the persuasive nor the debate grades given by the teacher show a strong correlation to SLFPER1, although the debate speech task is negatively correlated to SLFPER1. It appears that perceptions of general communication competence are independent of perceptions of the students' abilities in fulfilling these particular speech tasks. That is, their success in performing the speech tasks does not depend on how they viewed themselves as communicators. A student may have viewed himself as a poor communicator, but may still get a good grade as evaluated by the teacher.

In contrast, there is moderate correlation between the impromptu activity and SLFPER1. The students also met the minimum cut-off score for the impromptu. This correlation might signal that behaviors such as anxiety, reticence, and fear of making language mistakes were inherent in the students because the impromptu activity was done during the first few sessions of the course. Based on the results, the hypothesis is rejected for both the persuasive and debating activities, while the hypothesis is accepted for the impromptu activity. That is, the students' perception of their competence did not correlate with the teacher's grades in persuasive and debating activities, while there was some positive relation between their perception of their competence during the impromptu speech and the grades that they eventually received from the teacher.

Meanwhile, the correlation between SLFPER2, done upon completion of the English speech course, and each of the three speech activities as evaluated by the teacher, reveals that neither the persuasive and debating activities highly correlated with SLFPER2, similar to the results of SLFPER1. In contrast, there is also a moderate correlation between the impromptu activity and the SLFPER2. Similar to SLFPER1, the hypothesis is rejected for both the persuasive and debate activities, while the hypothesis is accepted for the impromptu activity.

Table 4

Correlation matrix of Self-Perceived Communication Competence 1 and 2 (SLFPER 1 and 2) and the three speech tasks based on teacher's grades

Before Instruction	R	After Instruction	R
SLFPER1—Impromptu	-.178	SLFPER2—Impromptu	.223
SLFPER1—Persuasive	-.171	SLFPER2—Persuasive	-.051
SLFPER1—Debate	-.343	SLFPER2—Debate	.121

Note: $r = > .402$, $df = .22$, $p = < .05$

Correlations between the Self-Perceived Communication Competence (before and after undergoing the Academic Ramp Program) and the speech tasks based on peer grade

Finally, two additional hypotheses were posed in relation to the possible change in perceived communication competence before and after instruction, namely—there is a significant relationship between students' scores (based on peer grades) and SLFPER1; and, there is a significant relationship between students' scores (based on peer grades) and SLFPER2. Table 5 displays the correlations between self-perception and peer grades before and after instruction.

The Pearson R values obtained for the impromptu and persuasive speeches in relation to SLFPER1 and SLFPER 2 show weak positive correlations in contrast to values obtained for SLFPER1 and 2 in relation to debate, which indicate weak but negative correlations. This means that regardless of the peer grade, students would generally perform beyond their and their peers' expectations during their speech activities. Second, students could have improved regardless of the extent of their peers' quantitative feedback on their speech performances in class. The third possibility could be the inconsistency in terms of peer score and SLFPER2 score. For instance, a student could have reported his communicative competence to be low despite a good performance in class. Thus, in relation to peer grade, the hypothesis regarding the significant relationship is rejected.

Discussion

First, the results of the PRCA and the two SLFPER scales indicate that the students' communication apprehension and perceived competence were generally average. These could be because of the students' growing positive attitudes towards learning English throughout the duration of the course. An increase in the two SLFPER scales indicates that the three speech presentations could have had a major role in the students' improvement in their self-perception of communication skills. Interactive in nature, these activities could have motivated the students to improve their English language skills through the presentations.

However, there were also a generally weak to no correlations between the three activities and the peer grades and the three different scales (PRCA, SLFPER1, and SLFPER2), as well as between persuasive and debating activities and teacher's grades. Despite this, correlations observed were between: (a) PRCA and SLFPER1,

Table 5

Correlation matrix of Self-Perceived Communication Competence 1 and 2 (SLFPER 1 and 2) and the three speech tasks based on peer grades

Before Instruction	R	After Instruction	R
SLFPER1—Impromptu	.006	SLFPER2—Impromptu	.115
SLFPER1—Persuasive	.040	SLFPER2—Persuasive	.007
SLFPER1—Debate	-.048	SLFPER2—Debate	-.042

Note: $r > .402$, $df = .22$, $p < .05$

(b) SLFPER1 and SLFPER2, (c) SLFPER1 and Impromptu (teacher's grades), and (d) SLFPER2 and Impromptu (teacher's grades).

Therefore, the study points to three general findings. The first concerns how a positive attitude towards a speech task, coupled with a sufficient level of motivation, correlates positively with marked improvement in one's own performance. This could mean that one of the Summer Ramp Program's goals was met: to make the students anticipate the kind of speech activities they would encounter in the maritime school. The opportunity to be exposed to these "real-world" activities could have led to their deeper appreciation of the classroom work. A second main finding relates to how students who are aware of their strengths and weaknesses in communication tend to improve in subsequent communication-based activities. In the course of the oral communication program, the students might have appreciated the value of seeing first-hand each other's performance, being able to provide feedback through the peer grading, as well as receiving feedback from the teacher. In addition, through their active participation in the speech preparation stage, they were likely to have developed a sense of solidarity with their interlocutors, making them more relaxed and less apprehensive in the classroom. This classroom phenomenon can be explained through recourse to the socio-affective dimensions of communicative language learning. In this sense, language learning is also facilitated by feedback coming from "real" audience members, and not just feedback coming from the teacher. Lastly, the study shows how communicative competence and apprehension vary from context to context. This is evidenced by the correlation values obtained from the different speech tasks and their scores. These findings prove the applicability of using standardized measures such as the PRCA and the communication competence scale. Results are comparable to those of previous research particularly those of McCroskey's cross-cultural studies.

There are, of course, limitations and weaknesses in the present study. It is recommended that future studies replicate this in other maritime institutions not only in Metro Manila but also in other major cities of the Philippines to verify its findings and possibly for comparison purposes. Since this study is limited only to one maritime institution, a general conclusion on maritime students' English speech performance could not be made. Second, it would be optimal to increase the sample size so that the statistical analyses would be more reliable. Third, other types of speech activities may be included. This could help determine the consistency of students' reports of communication anxiety and self-perception with their performances in other speech activities and contexts. Other researchers might wish to extend or replicate this study to students of other degree programs (e.g., within ESP contexts such as English for nurses, medical transcription and other health-allied areas, English for the call center and the hotel and restaurant service industry), in order to determine similarities and differences in the levels of communication anxiety and speech performance among the students. This would encourage school administrators, curriculum planners, and ESP teachers to develop real-life, context-based, and interactive activities for students to minimize their communication apprehension.

References

- Blood, G., Blood, I., Tellis, G., & Gabel, R. (2001). Communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence in adolescents who stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 26, 161-178.
- Beatty, M. (1985). Communication apprehension and general anxiety in the prediction of public speaking anxiety. *Communication Quarterly*, 33(3), 174-84.
- Benton, G. (2003). Maritime English, critical thinking and American ESL programs. *Proceedings of the 4th General Assembly of International Association of Maritime Universities*. Retrieved on November 10, 2007, from <http://www.iamu-edu.org/generalassembly/aga4/benton.pdf>.
- Cole, J., & McCroskey, J.C. (2003). The association of perceived communication apprehension, shyness, and verbal aggression with perceptions of source credibility and affect in organizational and interpersonal contexts. *Communication Quarterly*, 51(1), 101-110.
- Cwilewicz, R., & Pudlowski, Z. (1998). New didactic methods in the education of engine room officers. *Global Journal of Engineering Education*, 2, 223-230.
- Hassall, T., Joyce, J., Ottewill, R., Arquero, J., & Donoso, J. (2000). Communication apprehension in UK and Spanish business and accounting students. *Education & Training*, 42(2/3), 93-101.
- Holbrook, H. (1987). Communication apprehension: The quiet student in your classroom. *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved on November 22, 2007, from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/32/2c/9e.pdf.
- Horwitz, E.K. (1986). Preliminary evidence for the reliability and validity of a foreign language anxiety scale. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 559-562.
- Keaten, J., Kelly, L., & Pribyl, C. (1997). Communication apprehension in Japan: Grade school through secondary school. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 21, 319-343.
- McCroskey, J.C. (1982). *An introduction to rhetorical communication* (4th Ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- McCroskey, J.C., & Andersen, J. (1976). The relationship between communication apprehension and academic achievement among college students. *Human Communication Research*, 3(1), 73-81.
- McCroskey, J.C. (1977). Classroom consequences of communication apprehension. *Communication Education*, 26, 27-33.
- McCroskey, J.C. Beatty, M., Kearney, P., & Plax, P. (1985). The content validity of the PRCA-24 as a measure of communication apprehension across context. *Communication Quarterly*, 2, 165-173.
- McCroskey, J., Fayer, J., & Richmond, V. (1983). Don't speak to me in English: Communication apprehension in Puerto Rico. *Communication Quarterly*, 33(3), 185-192.
- McCroskey, J.C., & McCroskey, L.L. (1988). Self-report as an approach to measuring communication competence. *Communication Research Reports*, 5, 108-113.
- Messman, S., & Jones-Corley, J. (2001). Effects of communication environment, immediacy, and communication apprehension on cognitive and affective learning. *Communication Monographs*, 68(2), 184-200.
- Opt, S., & Loffredo, D. (2000). Re-thinking communication apprehension: A Myers-Briggs perspective. *The Journal of Psychology*, 134(5), 556-570.
- Powers, W., & Smythe, M. (1980). Communication apprehension and achievement in a performance-oriented basic communication course. *Human Communication Research*, 6(2), 146-152.
- Pribyl, C., Keaten, J., Sakamoto, M., & Koshikawa, F. (1998). Assessing the cross-cultural content validity of the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension scale (PRCA-24). *Japanese Psychological Research*, 40(1), 47-53.
- Ramirez, V. (2003). Philippine maritime and nursing education benchmarking with APEC best practices. In Tullao, T. (ed.), *Education and globalization* (pp. 273-333). Philippines: Philippine APEC Study Center Network (PASCN) and Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS).
- Sampson, H., & Zhao, M. (2003). Multilingual crews: Communication and the operation of ships. *World Englishes*, 22(1), 31-43.
- Simons, K., Higgins, M., & Lowe, D. (1995). A profile of communication apprehension in accounting majors: Implications for teaching and curriculum revision. *Journal of Accounting Education*, 13, 159-176.

- Winbow, A. (2002). The importance of effective communication. *International Seminar on Maritime English*. Retrieved on November 20, 2007, from http://www.imo.org/includes/blastDataOnly.asp/data_id=18000/InternationalSeminar.pdf.
- Witt, P.L., & Behnke, R.R. (2006). Anticipatory speech anxiety as a function of public speaking assignment type. *Communication Education*, 55(2), 167-177.
- Young, D.J. (1990). An investigation of students' perspectives on anxiety and speaking. *Foreign Language Annals*, 23, 539-553.
- Zhang, Q. (2005) Immediacy, humor, power distance, and classroom communication apprehension in Chinese college classrooms. *Communication Quarterly*, 53(1), 109-124.

APPENDIX A: Self-Perceived Communication Competence Scale (SPCC)

The SPCC was developed to find out about people's perception of their own competence in different communication contexts and given different types of receivers. Early self-report measures of competence were structured to represent what the creators of the measures felt were the components of communication competence. The scale is intended to let the respondents define communication competence. Since people make decisions with regard to communication (for example, whether they will even engage in it), it is their own perception that is important, and not that of an outside observer. It is important that users of this measure recognize that this is not a measure of actual communication competence; it is a measure of perceived competence. While these two different types of measures may be substantially correlated, they are not the same thing. The SPCC has generated good alpha reliability estimates (above .85) and has strong face validity. It also has been found to have substantial predictive validity.

Directions: Below are twelve situations in which you might need to communicate. People's abilities to communicate effectively vary a lot, and sometimes the same person is more competent to communicate in one situation than in another. Please indicate how competent you believe you are to communicate in each of the situations described below. Indicate in the space provided at the left of each item your estimate of your competence.

Presume 0 = completely incompetent and 100 = competent.

- _____ 1. Present a talk to a group of strangers.
- _____ 2. Talk with an acquaintance.
- _____ 3. Talk in a large meeting of friends.
- _____ 4. Talk in a small group of strangers.
- _____ 5. Talk with a friend.
- _____ 6. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.
- _____ 7. Talk with a stranger.
- _____ 8. Present a talk to a group of friends.
- _____ 9. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.
- _____ 10. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.
- _____ 11. Talk in a small group of friends.
- _____ 12. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.

Scoring: To compute the sub-scores, add the percentages for the items indicated and divide the total by the number indicated below.

Public	1 + 8 + 12; divide by 3.
Meeting	3 + 6 + 10; divide by 3.
Group	4 + 9 + 11; divide by 3.
Dyad	2 + 5 + 7; divide by 3.
Stranger	1 + 4 + 7 + 10; divide by 4.
Acquaintance	2 + 6 + 9 + 12; divide by 4.
Friend	3 + 5 + 8 + 11; divide by 4.

To compute the total SPCC score, add the subscores for Stranger, Acquaintance, and Friend. Then, divide that total by 3.

	Reliability	Mean	Standard Deviation
Public	.72	68.8	17.8
Meeting	.68	68.8	17.1
Group	.67	76.1	14.6
Dyad	.44	81.1	12.4
Stranger	.87	55.5	23.6
Acquaintance	.84	77.4	15.3
Friend	.78	88.2	11.3
Total	.92	73.7	13.8

Public	> 86 High SPCC	< 51 Low SPCC
Meeting	> 85 High SPCC	< 51 Low SPCC
Group	> 90 High SPCC	< 61 Low SPCC
Dyad	> 93 High SPCC	< 68 Low SPCC
Stranger	> 79 High SPCC	< 31 Low SPCC
Acquaintance	> 92 High SPCC	< 62 Low SPCC
Friend	> 99 High SPCC	< 76 Low SPCC
Total	> 87 High SPCC	< 59 Low SPCC

Higher SPCC scores indicate higher self-perceived communication competence with basic communication contexts (public, meeting, group, dyad) and receivers (strangers, acquaintance, friend).

Source: McCroskey & McCroskey (1988).

Appendix B: Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24)

The PRCA-24 is widely used to measure communication apprehension. It is preferable above all earlier versions of the instrument (PRCA, PRCA10, PRCA-24B, etc.) because it is highly reliable (alpha regularly $>.90$) and has very high predictive validity. It permits one to obtain sub-scores in the contexts of public speaking, dyadic interaction, small groups, and large groups. However, these scores are substantially less reliable than the total PRCA-24 scores—because of the reduced number of items. People interested only in public speaking anxiety should consider using the PRPSA rather than the public speaking sub-score drawn from the PRCA-24. It is much more reliable for this purpose.

This instrument is composed of twenty-four statements concerning feelings about communicating with others. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you: Strongly Disagree = 1; Disagree = 2; are Neutral = 3; Agree = 4; Strongly Agree = 5.

- _____ 1. I dislike participating in group discussions.
- _____ 2. Generally, I am comfortable while participating in group discussions.
- _____ 3. I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions.
- _____ 4. I like to get involved in group discussions.
- _____ 5. Engaging in a group discussion with new people makes me tense and nervous.
- _____ 6. I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions.
- _____ 7. Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting.
- _____ 8. Usually, I am comfortable when I have to participate in a meeting.
- _____ 9. I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion at a meeting.
- _____ 10. I am afraid to express myself at meetings.
- _____ 11. Communicating at meetings usually makes me uncomfortable.
- _____ 12. I am very relaxed when answering questions at a meeting.
- _____ 13. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous.
- _____ 14. I have no fear of speaking up in conversations.
- _____ 15. Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations.
- _____ 16. Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations.
- _____ 17. While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed.
- _____ 18. I'm afraid to speak up in conversations.
- _____ 19. I have no fear of giving a speech.
- _____ 20. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.
- _____ 21. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.
- _____ 22. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.
- _____ 23. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.
- _____ 24. While giving a speech, I get so nervous I forget facts I really know.

Scoring

Group discussion	18 - (scores for items 2, 4, & 6) + (scores for items 1,3, & 5)
Meetings	18 - (scores for items 8, 9, & 12) + (scores for items 7, 10, & 11)
Interpersonal	18 - (scores for items 14, 16, & 17) + (scores for items 13, 15, & 18)
Public Speaking	18 - (scores for items 19, 21, & 23) + (scores for items 20, 22, & 24)

Group Discussion Score _____

Interpersonal Score _____

Meetings Score _____

Public Speaking Score _____

To obtain your total score for the PRCA, simply add your sub-scores together. _____

Scores can range from 24-120. Scores below 51 represent people who have very low CA. Scores between 51-80 represent people with average CA. Scores above 80 represent people who have high levels of trait CA.

Norms for the PRCA-24 (based on over 40,000 college students; data from over 3,000 non-student adults in a national sample provided virtually identical norms, within 0.20 for all scores.)

	Mean	Standard Deviation	High	Low
Total Score	65.6	15.3	> 80	< 51
Group	15.4	4.8	> 20	< 11
Meeting	16.4	4.2	> 20	< 13
Dyad (Interpersonal)	14.2	3.9	> 18	< 11
Public	19.3	5.1	> 24	< 14

Source: McCroskey, J. C. (1982).

Appendix C: Revised rubric used

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Vocal Elements (voice level, pitch, tone, vocal variety, etc.)								
Non-verbal elements (hand and eye movements, other gestures/ movement, facial expression, etc.)								
Content (expression of ideas, development of ideas, etc.)								
Organization (clearly defined and developed intro, body and conclusion, presence of cohesive devices like transition markers, etc.)								
Audience Impact (includes confidence and fluency, rapport with audience, etc.)								

Note: Put a check ✓ on the box which represents your rating for each of the criterion.

Legend:

- 1 – I do not like your performance at all.
- 2 – I did not see you perform this at all.
- 3 – I believe you need a lot of improvement here.
- 4 – I could not comment on your performance.
- 5 – I find your performance satisfactory.
- 6 – I find your performance good.
- 7 – I find our performance very good.
- 8 – I find your performance outstanding.