

## **Communication Apprehension (CA): A Case of Accounting Students**

**Azleen Ilias**

**Mohd Zulkeflee Abd Razak**  
*College of Business and Administration*  
*University Tenaga Nasional, Malaysia*  
*Email: azleens@uniten.edu.my*

**Nek Kamal Yeop Yunus**

*Faculty of Management and Economics*  
*Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia*

### **Abstract**

The objective of this study is to identify the level of Communication Apprehension (CA) among final year accounting students particularly in Universiti Tenaga Nasional. This study also aims to test the Personal Report Communication Apprehension (PRCA). This study indicated more than 50% of the highest level of CA for the generalized context pertaining to four contexts in group discussions, meetings, interpersonal and public speaking. However, the study only shows significant difference in overall PRCA among gender. In addition, the main implication for educators is to develop and implement several strategies in teaching styles in reducing fear and anxiety among students.

**Keywords:** Communication apprehension; accounting students; accounting report.

### **1. Introduction**

#### *1.1 Background of the study*

Nowadays, communication skill is considered to be one of the important skills needed to be developed by undergraduate students especially to find an opportunity in government and commercial industry. Most of employers are very concerned about the ability of communication skill in group discussions, conducting meetings, and interpersonal and public speaking. Lack of communication skill is one of reasons why employers are reluctant to hire job applicants. It can be supported by on a report in Malaysia Today (2005) due to lack of certain skills such as communication skill, poor command of English and lack of work experience. Lack of communication skill is due to fear, anxiety feelings and having less confidence that exists in some situations when communicate with other people. Based on McCroskey (1986) this feeling is called communication apprehension. He developed this concept of communication apprehension. The experience of fear and anxiety is considered a normal experience to everyone but in some circumstances it can be a major problem in order to communicate with other people. According to McCroskey (1977) communication apprehension is one of primary elements associated with poor communication skills development. Communication apprehension (CA) is an "individual level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey, 1977).

#### *1.2 Problem statement*

This study is looking into communication apprehension for students that can affect communication skills needed for employability in the future. Communication apprehension can be a problem for several conditions whenever anxiety and fear will affect a person's ability to communicate well such as in meetings, public speaking, and interpersonal and group discussions. These feelings will engage their

intention and attitude to get into some communication situations whether encouraging or discouraging them to communicate.

A previous study by Albrecht and Sack (2000) indicated that accounting practitioners have stated that the accounting educational model is obsolete because this model is more about content knowledge and is less focused into skill development needed in order to be a more successful professional. Accounting practitioners and educators believe that the top five important skills are analytical/critical thinking, written communication, oral communication, computing technology and decision making.

According to previous evidence in newspaper online (Chen, April 15, 2012) that the Deputy Higher Education Minister Datuk Saifuddin Abdullah stated most students meet the criteria and qualification needed by employers but they are still lacking in communication skills. The Malaysian Employers Federation Executive Director Shamsuddin Bardan also mentioned that even in a good economic time there have been many unemployed graduates due to reluctance to interact and engage well in communication (Hariati Azizan, July 5, 2009). In addition, according to Kelly Services as a recruitment company explained that communication skill, problem solving, ability to participate in decision making, people management and strategic thinking are the top five skills in employability demand (Sidhu, February 12, 2001). Even though graduates have fulfilled their qualifications and are equipped with theoretical knowledge they also need to overcome their lack of soft skills. In a report from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the employers have voiced out to the Ministry of Higher Learning Education (Malaysia) that universities have produced a bunch of graduates with less of good quality supply to the market. According to Graduate Employability in Asia (2012) the good quality criteria refers to the adequacy of self-confidence and soft-skills particularly competence in communicating in the English language, focus and commitment.

### *1.3 Research objectives*

The educators can provide better teaching, learning and facilitating students and enhance soft skills in course syllabi and programs in order to reduce fear and anxiety in developing communication skills such as in meetings, group discussions, and interpersonal and public speaking. Therefore this study has developed some objectives aligned with the contention above:

1. To describe the level of overall and sub-score of CA among final year accounting students in Universiti Tenaga Nasional.
2. To test the Personal Report Communication Apprehension (PRCA) theory relating with overall CA and sub-score CA among final year accounting students particularly in Univesiti Tenaga Nasional.
3. To identify the difference of CA among gender, race, academic performance, expected salary for fulltime accounting position and expected accounting position for final year accounting students in Univesiti Tenaga Nasional.

### *1.4 Research questions*

Aligned with the research objectives the research questions are presented below

1. What is the level of overall CA among accounting students?
2. What is the level of CA in group discussions, meetings, interpersonal and public speaking among accounting students?
3. Is there any difference of CA among gender, race, academic performance, expected salary for fulltime accounting position and expected accounting position?
4. How strong is the level of CA in group discussions, meetings, interpersonal and public speaking related to overall CA among accounting students?

## **2. Literature Review**

### *2.1 Communication apprehension (CA)*

CA is 'an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or imagined communication with another person or persons' (McCroskey, 1977). Within this context, it is important to distinguish CA from

other constructs similar in definition identified in the literature that include reticence, shyness, unwillingness to communicate, introversion, and social anxiety. (Berger et al., 1983; Henjum, 1982; Leonard and Johnson, 1998).

### *2.2 Communication apprehension contexts*

McCroskey (1970) advanced the construct of CA, he made no explicit mention of whether it is a trait of an individual or a response to the situational elements of a specific communication transaction (a state). The distinction is important because of its implications for possible intervention strategies to modify levels of CA. McCroskey (1982) believes the trait/state distinction is a false dichotomy. To view all human behaviour as emanating from either a trait-like, personality orientation of the individual or from the state-like constraints of a situation ignores the interaction of these two sources.

### *2.3 Trait-like CA*

A true trait is an invariant characteristic of an individual, such as eye colour and height. Traits-like personality variables, although highly resistant to change, can be and often are changed during adulthood. There is substantial research on treatment of people identified as having high CA that suggests CA can be changed (Condit, 2000; Beatty et al., 1998). Opt and Loffredo (2000) said for recent views that CA may be a fairly stable personality trait that is not easily subject to change). Trait-like CA is viewed as a relatively enduring, personality-type orientation toward a given mode of communication across a wide variety of contexts (McCroskey, 1978).

### *2.4 Generalised-context CA*

Generalised-Context CA viewed from this perspective represents orientations toward communication within generalisable contexts. Fear of public speaking (stage fright), the oldest of the CA conceptualisations, is an example. This view recognises that people can be highly apprehensive about communication in one type of context while having less or no apprehension in another context. CA is viewed as a relatively enduring, personality-type orientation in a given type of context. McCroskey (1986) 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).

### *2.5 Causes of generalised-context CA*

The causes of situational CA appear much clearer than those offered for trait-like CA. Buss (1980) suggests that the major elements in the situation that can result in increased CA are novelty (increased uncertainty about behaviour); formality (narrower confines for acceptable behaviour); subordinate status (appropriate behaviour is in the hands of the superior); conspicuousness (new social settings or standing up to speak in a class or meetings); unfamiliarity (more comfortable when communicating with whom they are familiar); dissimilarity (with audience); and degree of attention from others (moderate attention is the most comfortable, but being stared at intently or ignored is uncomfortable).

Two other elements are suggested by work from Daly and Hailey (1983). These are the degree of evaluation (more anxious if evaluation is occurring) and prior history (success breeds success but, conversely, prior failure will result in fear of failure and increased apprehension).

### *2.6 Communication apprehension in accounting*

There have been a small number of studies investigating CA in accounting students (Stanga and Ladd, 1990; Warnock and Curtis, 1997; Hassall et al., 2000). Findings from several of these studies support Daly and Stafford's (1984) observation that highly anxious individuals select majors having significantly fewer perceived communication demands than those selected by people with low levels of anxiety. Occupations perceived as low in communication demands included accountant (among others), and several studies have sought to investigate levels of CA in accounting majors relative to their peers in other (business) majors, and in relation to McCroskey's (1986) national norms. Typically the results indicate that accounting students have higher average levels of CA than do other business majors and, for entry-level students, above national norms (Stanga and Ladd, 1990).

Hassall et al. (2000) study also indicates that prior educational background (science-based, arts-based, or a mix) is significantly associated with average levels of written CA for accounting and business majors, with those from a science background being highest and those from an arts background being lowest. Students'

self-ratings of their own academic ability are also found to be significantly associated with average levels of CA for both writing and oral communicating, with those students reporting higher than average ability having lower than average levels of CA.

Based on Warnock and Curtis (1997) using a small sample of Irish accounting students, they found that the overall average levels of oral CA was 72.6 – much higher than found in other studies, but there was no association between overall academic performance and levels of CA. However, they did find significant association between levels of CA and participation in tutorials and, importantly, they found that levels of CA were associated with the apparent success of students to get job offer from the (then) Big Six accounting firms.

### **3. Research Methodology**

#### *3.1 Respondents*

Based on the focus of the current study, only final year accounting students from Universiti Tenaga Nasional were included in the final respondent sample (N= 179). The method of sampling was purposive sampling due to specific type of people and conforms to some criteria set by the researcher. The selection is due to the objective of the study which is looking into the final year students that have been well prepared with knowledge and skills in accounting for internship final year program. The sample of respondents is as much as necessary based on Roscoe (1975) and Sekaran (2000) who stated that sample sizes larger than 30 and less than 500 are appropriate for most research.

#### *3.2 Instrumentation*

All respondents received a set of questionnaire consisting of a demographic questionnaire and Personal Report Communication Apprehension (PRCA). The questionnaire has been adopted from McCroskey's PRCA-24 that is widely used to measure communication apprehension. This instrument all items use five-scale Likert type response formats and the reliability is very high at above  $\alpha = 0.90$  in most cases. The most recently developed 24-item version of the instrument includes six items for each of four contexts: public speaking, speaking in formal meetings, speaking in small group discussions, and interpersonal interaction. This version also permits the generation of four sub-scores as well as an overall score. The independent variables are the four sub-scores and the dependent variable is overall score. Respondents respond to the 24 items by choosing the number on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (strongly agree), 2 (agree), 3 (neither agree nor disagree), 4 (disagree) and 5 (strongly disagree).

#### *3.4 Statistical analysis*

To analyze the data SPSS for windows was used. Descriptive statistics, reliability score and Pearson correlation was used to examine the research questions. The study ignores the normality assumption since it does not seem to have a severe effect on results since the size of a sample (N=179) is more than 100 (Vaus, 2002).

### **4. Findings and Discussion**

#### *4.1 Reliability analysis for overall communication apprehension*

The reliability of the PRCA-24 items Questionnaire for the current study was determined and it was finally found that Cronbach's alpha measure of internal consistency reliability is .948. Table 1 shows a comparison of the Cronbach alpha coefficients for each of the varied populations. Most of the Cronbach alpha shows more than .70 which indicates that this instrument items and scales produce reliable and robust results due to the rule of thumb developed by Hair et al. (2010) and Sekaran (2000). They stated if Cronbach alpha of more than .07 can be considered acceptable. The closer the Cronbach Alpha coefficient gets to 1.0, the better the results of reliability will be. Reliabilities that are less than 0.6 are considered to be poor, those in the 0.7 ranges, acceptable, and those 0.8 are good (Sekaran, 2000). In the analysis from previous study, the internal consistency reliability of the measures used can be considered to be good for the PRCA-24 items except Sarriff and Gillani (2011) can be considered to be acceptable.

#### *4.2 Reliability statistics for sub-score communication apprehension*

Mostly, previous results produced only reliability analysis based on overall score of communication apprehension. Table 2 shows a comparison of the Cronbach alpha coefficients for each of the sub-score

from the PRCA-24 items. The results show that every item from four contexts is considered to be good except .736 from the current study which can be considered acceptable. In order to understand further, refer to Table 3.

#### *4.3 Respondents' profile*

A total of one hundred and seventy nine (179) questionnaires were distributed among the respondents. Out of this figure, 124 (69.3%) were female and 55 (30.7%) were male. The study respondents constituted Chinese (9.5%), Malay (77.1%), Indian (12.8%), and other races (0.6%), respectively. The average age range was 18 to 22 years. In term of academic results, the current CGPA performance showed that 47% (about 84 students) achieved not less than 3.00. In using language, most of them only knew English as their second language. In future, about 132 of the students expect to earn a salary more than RM2000-RM3000 and less than 50% expect to pursue their career in public accounting (46.4%).

#### *4.4 Descriptive statistics*

Table 5 represents the descriptive presentation of the study. The minimum number of students indicated that most students agreed with the statement and the maximum indicated they disagree with the statement of communication apprehension for each context. The statements provided in each context reflect three positive feelings and three negative feelings through communication situation (refer to Table 3 for further understanding).

#### *4.5 Level of communication apprehension*

The overall communication apprehension score varied from 24 to 120. The levels of overall CA is categorized into low (scores below 51); average (scores 51 to 80); and high (scores more than 80). The level of CA in the four contexts is categorized into low (score below 18) and high (score more than 18). In Table 5, the results have been sub classified into the level of CA. The high CA in overall communication apprehension means their levels of anxiety and fear is highest in communicating with others. From this result, researchers can indicate that most of the students in this case face anxiety and fear feelings whenever they need to talk during meetings, public speaking, group discussions and interpersonal communication.

#### *4.6 Relationship for communication apprehension*

Theoretically, the correlation could range between -1.0 and +1.0, whether it has a positive or a negative relationship. From the results, the overall score, as would be expected, significantly ( $p < 0.01$ ) at 2-tailed is positively correlated to communication apprehension in group discussions (.546), meetings (.483), interpersonal (.533) and public speaking (.568). This suggests that the overall score for communication apprehension is less depending on any of the specific contexts included in PRCA measurement. The highest relationship is public speaking and the overall CA indicates that public speaking explains the variance to the extent of 32.2%. However, McCroskey, (1985) shows more dependence in indicating the overall communication apprehension.

Table 8 tested for significant different for overall communication apprehension and sub-score towards race, academic performance, expected salary and expected accounting position at  $p < 0.005$ . Firstly, there is no significant different among races towards group discussion ( $F = .649$ ,  $p = .585$ ), meeting ( $F = 1.043$ ,  $p = .375$ ), interpersonal ( $F = 2.447$ ,  $p = .065$ ), public speaking ( $F = .393$ ,  $p = .758$ ) and overall communication apprehension ( $F = .181$ ,  $p = .909$ ). This results suggesting that every student from all races were considered facing similar anxiety and feel fear in every situation of communication. However, in research done by Sarriff and Gillani (2011) have shown that there is significant different among races which suggesting Malay students are more apprehensive compared to Chinese student.

Secondly, the study suggests that similar communication apprehension facing by several level of academic performance. The results show no significant different for group discussion ( $F = 1.413$ ,  $p = .231$ ), meeting ( $F = .621$ ,  $p = .648$ ), interpersonal ( $F = 1.564$ ,  $p = .186$ ), public speaking ( $F = .941$ ,  $p = .442$ ) and overall communication apprehension ( $F = .315$ ,  $p = .867$ ). In research done by Gardner et al. (2005) researchers looking into the association between communication apprehension and academic performance. They failed to find any strong associations between levels of communication apprehension and students' abilities to advance in their studies or average levels of academic performance.

Thirdly, there is no significant different of communication apprehension for most of students which were expecting to gain more than RM2000 for fulltime accounting position for group discussion ( $F=1.087$ ,  $p=.356$ ), meeting ( $F=1.420$ ,  $p=.239$ ), interpersonal ( $F=.293$ ,  $p=.831$ ), public speaking ( $F=1.649$ ,  $p=.180$ ) and overall communication apprehension ( $F=2.049$ ,  $p=.109$ ).

Finally, expected accounting positions also have been tested thus results show group discussion ( $F=1.502$ ,  $p=.225$ ), meeting ( $F=.008$ ,  $p=.992$ ), interpersonal ( $F=.510$ ,  $p=.602$ ), public speaking ( $F=2.866$ ,  $p=.06$ ) and overall communication apprehension ( $F=1.396$ ,  $p=.250$ ). As general, can be seen that there is no significant different of communication apprehension. In previous research examine the relation between job preference, job requirement and communication apprehension such as Ayers et al. (1993), Ayers and Crosby (1995) and Scott et al. (1976). Scott et al. (1976) reported that an adult sample of high apprehensive had a significant preference for occupations with lower communication requirements than the low apprehensive, whereas for the low apprehensive the pattern was the reverse. Stark et al. (1987) reported that low apprehensive deliberately sought out and occupied positions with significant communication requirements. Previous result from Harville (1994) also stated that a negative relationship exists between CA and communication requirements of the jobs.

Table 9 show Independent Sample T-test where looking into the different of communication apprehension between female and male. The result is analyzed 4 sub-scores and overall communication apprehension (PRCA). Female and male is considered similar in facing each communication apprehension sub-score; group discussion ( $F=.508$ ,  $p=.477$ ), meeting ( $F=.714$ ,  $p=.399$ ), interpersonal ( $F=.045$ ,  $p=.833$ ) and public speaking ( $F=.087$ ,  $p=.769$ ). On the other hand, overall PRCA shows there is significant different among gender. This result can be supported by most research which indicated there was a significant different between the level of total PRCA scores and gender in research done by Sarriff and Gillani (2011) particularly for oral communication.

### **Conclusion**

As a conclusion this PRCA items can be considered reliable to be adopted in the Malaysia scenario since the Cronbach Alpha (.948) in this current study is considered good and acceptable when compared with previous studies Next, this study has identified the highest level of Communication Apprehension for the Generalized Context pertaining to four contexts in group discussions, meetings, interpersonal communication and public speaking. The results indicate that the level of fear and anxiety still exists even though the students were in final year. From the results, almost 93.3% (Highest CA) are facing feelings towards overall communication apprehension followed by High CA in Group Discussions = 93.3%, High CA in Meetings = 71.1%, High CA in Interpersonal communication = 67.6% and High CA in Public Speaking = 77.7%. This result has answered RQ1 and RQ2 in order to identify the level of communication apprehension among final year accounting students.

Then, the relationship between the overall CA with the other four contexts in CA (group discussions, meetings, interpersonal communication and public speaking) showed significant with positive relationships. The results showed correlation coefficient in group discussions (.546), meetings (.483), interpersonal communication (.533) and public speaking (.568). Thus, it has answered RQ3 in testing the Personal Report Communication Apprehension (PRCA) theory by McCroskey (1977) by relating overall communication apprehension to the sub-scores of communication apprehension (group discussions, meetings, interpersonal communication and public speaking) among final year accounting students particularly in Univesiti Tenaga Nasional

Then, the differences of communication apprehension among gender, race, academic performance, expected salary for fulltime accounting position and expected accounting position. However, only overall PRCA shows significant different among gender.

### **References**

- Albrecht, W. S., & Sack, R. J. (2000). Accounting education: Charting the course through a perilous future, *Accounting Education Series, 16*. Retrieved from <http://aaahq.org/pubs/AESv16/toc.htm>
- Aly, I. M., & Islam, M. (2003). Audit of accounting program on oral communications apprehension: A comparative study among accounting students. *Managerial Auditing Journal, 18*(9). 751-760.

- Ayers, J., & Crosby, S. (1995). Two studies concerning the predictive validity of the personal report of communication apprehension in employment interviews. *Communication Research Reports*, 12, 145-151.
- Ayers, J., Ayers, D. M., & Sharp, D. (1993). A progress report on the development of an instrument to measure communication apprehension in employment interviews. *Communication Research Reports*, 10, 87-94.
- Beatty, M. J., McCroskey, J. C., Heisel, A. D. (1998). Communication apprehension as temperamental expression: a communibiological paradigm, *Communication Monographs*, 65,197–219.
- Berger, B. A., Baldwin, H. J., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1983). Communication apprehension in pharmacy students: A National Study. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 47, 95-102.
- Borzi, M., & Mills, T. (2001). Communication apprehension in upper level accounting students: An assessment of skill development, *Journal of Education for Business*, 76(4), 193-198.
- Chen, K. S. (April 15, 2012). *Look beyond your major*, The Star, Retrieved from: <http://thestar.com.my/education/story.asp?file=/2012/4/15/education/11064125&sec=education>
- Condit, C. M. (2000). Culture and biology in human communication: toward a multi-causal model. *Communication Education*, 49, 7-24.
- Daly J. A., & Hailey, J. L. (1983). Putting the situation into writing research: Situational parameters of writing apprehension as disposition and state. In R. E. Beach & L. Bidwell (Eds), *New directions in composition research*, New York: Guilford.
- De Vaus, D. (2002). *Analyzing social science data*, 1st Edition. London: Sage Publication Ltd.
- Graduate Employability in Asia. (2012). UNESCO Bangkok, Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002157/215706e.pdf>
- 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), pp. 93–100.
- Hariati Azizan, (July 5, 2009), *The jobs are out there*. Retrieved from <http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2009/7/5/focus/4258655&sec=focus>
- Harville, D. L. (1994). Person/job fit model of communication apprehension in organizations. Interim Technical Paper for Period February 1991 - November 1992. Air Force Materiel Command Brooks Air Force Base, Texas. Available at: <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a280319.pdf>
- Henjum A. (1982). Introversion: A misunderstood “individual difference” among students. *Education*, 103(1), 39-43.
- Hair, J. F. Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B.J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective*, 7th edition. Saddle River, NJ. Prentice-Hall International.
- Leonard T. C., & Johnson J. Y. (1998). The reticent student: Implications for nurse educators. *Research Briefs*, 37(5), 213-215.
- Malaysia Today. (2005). *Malaysia has 60 000 graduates' unemployed*, November 3, 2005. Retrieve from <http://www.malaysiatoday.net/Blog-e/2005/11/malaysiahas-60000-undergraduates.htm>. Accessed on June 2012
- McCroskey, J. C. (1970). Measures of communication-bound anxiety. *Speech Monographs*, 27, 269-277.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Classroom consequences of communication apprehension. *Communication Education*, 26, 27-33.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1978). Validity of the PRCA as an index of oral communication apprehension. *Communication Monographs*, 45, 192-203.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1982). *An introduction to rhetorical communication*, 4th edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1986). *An introduction to rhetorical communication*, 5th edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Opt, S. K., & Loffredo, D. A. (2000). Rethinking communication apprehension: a Myers–Briggs perspective. *The Journal of Psychology*, 134(5), 556-570.
- Roscoe, J. T. (1975). *Fundamental research statistics for the behavioral sciences*, 2nd edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Sarriff, A., & Gillani, W. S. (2011). Communication apprehension among Malaysian pharmacy students: A pilot study. *Indian Journal of Pharmaceutical Education and Research*, 45(1), 8-14.
- Scott, M. D., McCroskey, J. C., & Sheahan, M. E. (1976). The development of a self-report measure of communication apprehension in organizational settings. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association*, Portland, OR.
- Sekaran, U. (2000). *Research methods for business,,: A skill building approach*, 4th edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Shanahan, D. (2011). *Communication apprehension among business and accounting students*, Dissertation for Master of Business Studies, Dublin City University.
- Sidhu, J. S. (February 12, 2001). *The scramble for skills*, Retrieved from <http://biz.thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?sec=business&file=/2011/2/12/business/8051679>
- Stark, P. S., Morley, D. D., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (1987). Communication professionals: If they're not afraid why don't they talk? *Communication Research Reports*, 4(2), 11-16.
- Stanga, K. G., & Ladd, R. T. (1990). Oral communication apprehension in beginning accounting ajors: An exploratory study. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 5(2), 180–194.
- Warnock, K., & Curtis, E. (1997). Oral communication apprehension: a preliminary study of accounting students. Paper presented at the *Irish Accounting and Finance Association Conference*, Dublin City University, 8-9 May.

Table 1: Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for PRCA-24 items questionnaire for previous studies and current study

Study	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	Area of study
McCroskey (1982)	.97	24	CA in undergraduates enrolled in Introductory Communication courses
Current study	.948	24	CA in Accounting Final Year Students
McCroskey (1977)	.90	24	Investigated over 50 studies that consistently reported reliabilities over .90.
Aly and Islam, (2003)	.94	24	CA between two groups of accountancy students: those entering the program and those exiting the program after completion.
Sarriff and Gillani (2011)	.76	24	CA in first year of undergraduate pharmacy students
Borzi and Mills (2001)	.88	24	289 students at two AACSB-accredited midwestern universities which were well advanced in their major
Shanahan (2011)	.95	24	CA among business and accounting students

Table 2: Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the sub-score for previous studies and current study

	Levine and McCroskey (1990)	Current study	Dan Shanahan (2011)	Clare T. Gardner et. al (2011)
Group Discussion	.86	.736	.87	.883
Meeting	.88	.851	.87	.88
Interpersonal	.83	.837	.90	.837
Public Speaking	.85	.82	.88	.86

Table 3: Personal report of CA (PRCA-24)

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

PRCA, simply add your sub-scores together

Table 4: Respondents' profiles

<b>Gender</b>	Frequency	Percent
Male	55	30.7
Female	124	69.3
<b>Race</b>	Frequency	Percent
Malay	138	77.1
Chinese	17	9.5
Indian	23	12.8
Others	1	.6
<b>Age</b>	Frequency	Percent
18-21 years old	44	24.6
22-26 years old	133	74.3
More than 26 years old	2	1.1
<b>Current CGPA result</b>	Frequency	Percent
Below 2.00	7	3.9
2.00-2.49	23	12.8
2.50-2.99	65	36.3
3.00-3.49	68	38.0
Above 3.50	16	8.9
<b>Languages use other than Malay</b>	Frequency	Percent
English	154	86.0
Mandarin	16	8.9
Others	9	5.0
<b>Expected salary for fulltime accounting position</b>	Frequency	Percent
RM800-RM1000	15	8.4
RM1000-RM2000	32	17.9
RM2000-RM3000	81	45.3
More than RM3000	51	28.5
<b>Expected accounting position</b>	Frequency	Percent
Public Accounting	83	46.4
Corporate/Industry Position	62	34.6
Non-profit Organization	34	19.0

Table 5: Descriptive statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Group Discussion	179	14.00	38.00	18.3520	2.22451

Meeting	179	15.00	24.00	18.7318	1.64748
Interpersonal	179	14.00	22.00	18.2011	1.47404
Public Speaking	179	14.00	24.00	18.6480	1.71383
PRCA	179	66.00	90.00	73.9330	3.76948

Table 6: Personal report communication apprehension

	Frequency	Percentage
Level of Overall Communication Apprehension (CA)		
High CA	167	93.3
Average CA	12	6.7
Level of Communication Apprehension in Group Discussion		
High CA in Group Discussion	107	93.3
Low CA in Group Discussion	72	6.7
Level of Communication Apprehension in Meeting		
High CA in Meeting	138	77.1
Low CA in Meeting	41	22.9
Level of Communication Apprehension in Interpersonal		
High CA in Interpersonal	121	67.6
Low CA in Interpersonal	58	32.4
Level of Communication Apprehension in Public Speaking		
High CA in Public Speaking	139	77.7
Low CA in Public Speaking	40	22.3

Table 7: Correlations Test

		Group Discussion	Meeting	Interpersonal	Public Speaking
PRCA (current study)	Pearson Correlation	.546**	.483**	.533**	.568**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
PRCA (McCroskey, 1985)	Pearson Correlation	.86**	.88**	.61**	.77**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 8: ANOVA

	Races	Academic Performance (Current CGPA result)	Expected salary for fulltime accounting position	Expected accounting position
--	-------	---	--	------------------------------

Group Discussion	F = .649 Sig. = .585	F = 1.413 Sig. = .231	F = 1.087 Sig. = .356	F = 1.502 Sig. = .225
Meeting	F = 1.043 Sig. = .375	F = .621 Sig. = .648	F = 1.420 Sig. = .239	F = .008 Sig. = .992
Interpersonal	F = 2.447 Sig. = .065	F = 1.564 Sig. = .186	F = .293 Sig. = .831	F = 510 Sig. = .602
Public Speaking	F = .393 Sig. = .758	F = .941 Sig. = .442	F = 1.649 Sig. = .180	F = 2.866 Sig. = .060
PRCA	F = .181 Sig. = .909	F = .315 Sig. = .867	F = 2.049 Sig. = .109	F = 1.396 Sig. = .250

Table 9: Independent sample T-test

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Group Discussion	Male	55	18.0000	1.63299	.22019
	Female	124	18.5081	2.43115	.21832
Meeting	Male	55	18.4727	1.50129	.20243
	Female	124	18.8468	1.70148	.15280
Interpersonal	Male	55	18.1273	1.50376	.20277
	Female	124	18.2339	1.46564	.13162
Public Speaking	Male	55	18.2364	1.76345	.23778
	Female	124	18.8306	1.66612	.14962
PRCA	Male	55	72.8364	2.99854	.40432
	Female	124	74.4194	3.97982	.35740

	Gender
Group Discussion	F = .508 Sig. = .477
Meeting	F = .714 Sig. = .399
Interpersonal	F = .045 Sig. = .833
Public Speaking	F = .087 Sig. = .769
PRCA	F = 4.320 Sig. = .039