Common Problems of Oral Presentations Delivery by University Students

Abstract. The problems of poor oral presentations performance by students in the academic environment have remained relevant for many decades despite multiple efforts of researchers to describe the causes and address the challenges of speaking in public. Speakers’ personality characteristics, anxiety, extra linguistic communication skills, peer evaluation practice, critical thinking skills and focus on linguistic performance constitute the features which affect students’ oral presentation performance. In order to define the commonest problems which students face while delivering presentations a survey was conducted in two parts: 1) an observation of 13 Italian students’ oral presentations with the subsequent interviewing the participants about their attitude to delivering presentations and 2) an interview of 47 Italian and Ukrainian students about delivering presentations from the speaker’s and the listener’s points of view. The results of the observation showed that the commonest problems of oral presentation delivery were the following: the lack of speaker-audience contact, emphasis on linguistic features of the presentation delivery rather than communication with the audience, fear to look incompetent in front of the audience. The interviews found out that most students were more concerned about their own image of the speaker rather than the ways to convey information to the audience. The interviews showed their reluctance to ask questions to the speaker and start a discussion, as well as the listeners’ indifference towards the topic. These findings imply the necessity to create an integrated course of the effective communication principles and contribute forming the students’ interactive presentation skills which could foster their successful education and career.
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ЗАГАЛЬНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ УСНИХ ВИСТУПІВ З ПРЕЗЕНТАЦІЯМИ СТУДЕНТІВ ВИЩИХ НАВЧАЛЬНИХ ЗАКЛАДІВ

Анотація. Питання неефективних усних виступів студентів з презентаціями в умовах освітнього процесу залишаються актуальними протягом багатьох десятиліть, незважаючи на численні зусилля дослідників описати причини та шляхи подолання труднощів публічних виступів. Особливостями, які впливають на якість усних презентацій студентів, визначено такі: особистісні характеристики промовців, тривожність, навички екстрапівастичного спілкування, практика оцінювання з боку колег, навички критичного мислення та концентрація головної уваги на мовному аспекті усного виступу. З метою визначення найпоширеніших проблем, які постають перед студентами під час публічних виступів, було проведено дослідження, яке складалось з двох частин: 1) спостереження за 13 виступами італійських студентів з наступними опитуванням щодо їх ставлення до усних презентацій та 2) опитування 47 італійських та українських студентів про особливості виступів з усними презентаціями з точки зору як промовців, так і слухачів. Результати спостереження показали, що найпоширенішими проблемами є відсутність спілкування між промовцем та аудиторією, наголос на лінгвістичних особливостях промови, а не на встановлени спілкування зі слухачами, страх виглядати некомпетентним перед аудиторією. Результати опитування виявили, що більшість студентів хвилювалась власним іміджем більше, ніж способом передачі інформації до аудиторії. Більшість студентів продемонструвала небажання ставити промовцю запитання та розпочинати дискусію, а також незацікавленість слухачів у темі виступу. Ці висновки свідчать про необхідність створення інтегрованого курсу для навчання студентів основам ефективних публічних виступів та сприяти набуттю ними навичок інтерактивного спілкування, що покращить як їх академічну успішність, так і професійне зростання.
The problem setting. Oral presentations as a mode of assessment of students’ ability to research and present information clearly to an audience are widely used in the sphere of education, in the course of English as a foreign language (EFL) in particular. Delivering presentations in public develops students’ language proficiency, critical analysis, communication skills and problem-solving abilities. The supporters of the introduction of public speaking skills education claim that it brings more benefits to students both in the academic setting and the workplace. The competence in assessing and analyzing ideas, as well as planning and organizing information will lead students to success in their studies in college, improve their performance and, consequently, the grades and prepare for the challenges at work. Being a good communicator will significantly increase the chances for a graduate to be selected for a good job. Moreover, critical thinking skills which students acquire at public speaking courses help them to form and defend their standpoint and adjust their presentation delivery level to the level of the audience in order to get the necessary message across. The efficient communication skills contribute to success in all areas of studies and career making as they raise the awareness of human thinking process in general and can be applicable to any subject matter. Addressing speaking anxiety, or ‘stage freight’, as one of the commonest factors impeding the speakers to deliver an effective presentation, will enhance the students’ self-confidence. As most university learners still experience multiple difficulties while speaking in public, the causes need to be defined and addressed accordingly.

Recent research works and publications analysis. The researchers of public speaking mention a variety of factors affecting the presentation speaker’s performance which include personal features, extra linguistic communication skills, anxiety, and the lack of oral presentation skills. Personality characteristics and their combinations affect students’ performance while delivering oral presentations. The studies showed that extraverted students can compensate for their low level of speaking English. The enhanced ability of extraverts to cope with stress makes them more successful and efficient in oral presentation performance [1]. These findings go in line with the suggestion of G. Ockney that more extraverted students being more assertive and stress resistant possessed higher level of second language oral ability and could perform better in terms of fluency and communication skills [2].
Extra linguistic communication can also have a big influence on the listeners and sometimes cause even a greater effect that the words pronounced. So the speakers must be fully aware of how they express their ideas by using nonverbal patterns of communication. On the other hand, in some surveys students reported using non-verbal strategies to cover their nervousness and anxiety [3].

Not only speaking is important in effective communication between people but also effective and critical listening which can defend from manipulative strategies, unethical information and irresponsible messages. The researchers also insist on teaching students to give constructive critical feedback to their peers in responding to their presentations. The comments based on descriptive, interpreting and evaluating strategies show their engagement in the interaction and help the speakers to improve. Knowing the audience’s interests and the level of their awareness of the presentation subject enhances the communication and helps the speaker to adjust, as well as to engage the audience by using relevant rhetorical devices in order to persuade, motivate and influence the listeners. The ultimate reason to study public speaking which the researchers mention is empowering oneself to be a leader [4].

The EFL teachers agree to the fact that oral presentations in class can be beneficial as they are student-centered and need the use of writing, reading, speaking and listening within this interactive activity. The speakers have to be able to respond to the possible questions from the audience while their peers need to be active listeners and check their understanding by asking those questions. Providing students with realistic language tasks such as communicating the ideas in a foreign language rather that practicing language structures as speaking drills makes more sense for language learners. Such real life situations where they have to discuss issues, explain them to their peers, and persuade them contribute to motivation for successful language acquisition and development of their research skills [5].

Findings concerning students’ self-assessment results demonstrated that they mostly paid attention to their linguistic performance rather than the delivery of the presentation, its structure or the content [6]. Making students write their self-reflection reports on their delivering presentations helps them to notice their achievements and focus on the areas for improvement. The students get used to noticing the gaps they need to fill in during their future presentations and develop their functional language skills which contribute to more effective social interaction. Observing their own performance in delivering presentations video-recorded may also foster the students’ awareness of perceived weaknesses, motivate them to improve accuracy in following presentations, and achieve better presentation effects [7; 8].
Peer evaluation is also regarded as an important part of communication in the classroom as it enables students to give feedback, express constructive criticism, anticipate possible questions and commentaries, and prepare to respond to them [9; 6].

On the other hand, exposure to peer evaluation leads to additional stress which some students experience and perceive as threatening to their self-confidence. Students’ speaking anxiety caused by the fear of negative evaluation affects their performance and impedes setting the effective communication environment during a presentations stage. The lack of presenting information practice and the lack of confidence of the speaker leads to creating a weak and incompetent presenter image [10].

Some studies show the difference in perceiving the reasons of low performance during presenting information by students and by teachers. Students think that personal peculiarities usually affect their performance as well as a suitable environment while teachers consider oral presentation skills to be crucial for a successful communication [11; 12]. Most students do not possess necessary oral presentation skills and that has a negative impact on their language proficiency [13]. One of the possible solutions to this problem is encouraging and supporting students, informing them of the assessment criteria, acknowledging them with a model presentation and having a mock assessment discussion in order to prepare them for their own presentations and improve their communicative competence.

The above-mentioned findings prove the necessity to introduce a special training program in giving oral presentations which can help students to form public speaking skills. The surveys dedicated to students’ perception of the necessity to take a delivering presentations class revealed that besides learning to present ideas many students see it as the way to keep their conversation skills up and as the extension to their conversation classes [7].

The aim of this research work is to reveal common problems university students experience during their oral presentations delivery. The main tasks are to observe students’ oral presentations performance in the classroom setting, to interview participants about their perception and attitude towards delivering oral presentations and listening to the speaker, and to define the commonest problems which need to be addressed in order to make the presentations a more effective way of communicating information.

Methods and results. The survey included two parts: 1) presentations observations and 2) an interview in person aiming at defining the students’ attitude to delivering presentations and the main strategies they used to manage the possible difficulties while speaking in public. The observations
of 13 female Italian MA students giving their presentations took place at University of Perugia in Italy in November 2022 in their traditional format of studies. The students of the Cognitive semantics course delivered their presentations on topics they had chosen during the final three classes of the course. No separate preparatory course on oral presentations delivery was given to the students. The participants received all necessary instructions concerning the timing, structure and the format of the presentations beforehand and were fully aware of the assessment criteria. The presentations stage was followed by interviewing students about their attitudes to delivering presentations and listening to the speaker.

The students’ speeches were observed by an independent teacher without any interference into an organization process of the presentations and grading by the examining teacher. The observer divided the assessment criteria into four main groups: 1) speech related features, 2) body related features, 3) psychological features, and 4) presentation organization related features. The first group included the volume of the speaker’s voice, its speed, pitch variations, clarity, and management of pauses. The body related features group involved facing the audience, facial expressions, eye contact, use and position of arms and hands, and free moving of the speaker in the classroom. The third group, psychological features, comprised enthusiasm of the speakers, their confidence and the use of communicative strategies to engage the audience (humor, questions, surprising facts, etc.). The features concerning the organizational aspect of the presentation included familiarity with the content of the presentation and time management.

The assessment marks were given within the framework of 0-5 points expressing the degree of prominence or visibility of each feature. In the assessment of the volume of the voice 0 points means that the presenter spoke in a very low voice and could be hardly heard, while 5 points means that the speaker could be heard well from any part of the classroom. The pitch variations were assessed in terms of the speaker being monotonous (0 points) or using their voice to emphasize important information and draw the audience’s attention to necessary facts (up to 5 points). The degree of speaking clearly and distinctively in order to convey the message to listeners was assessed from 0 to 5 points with the 0 denoting poor pronunciation and articulation and 5 points meaning excellent pronunciation and distinctive speech. Pauses management feature means the ability of the speaker to use pauses where necessary and address the unexpected ones with the assessment range from 0 points meaning poor pauses management skills to 5 points – the excellent ones.

Assessing body related features aimed at evaluating the speakers’ skills in extra linguistic communication with the audience. The presenter’s
position facing or not facing the listeners was evaluated from 0 points for not facing them to 5 points for holding an open, facing the audience position. The facial expression included the range of emotions from boredom and indifference which scored 0 points to adequately vivid emotions corresponding to the message conveyed which scored up to 5 points. Eye contact which is considered very important in interpersonal communication and usually accompanying facing the audience position was evaluated from 0 points meaning keeping no eye contact with the listeners to 5 points meaning keeping it continually. The position of arms and hands and the ability to use them to a reasonable extent in order to attract the audience involves keeping arms open, not folded during the presentation. Taking this into account, the lowest assessment point was given for not using hands and arms at all and keeping the speaker’s body in a closed position while the most effective use of them scored 5 points. The speakers’ moving in the classroom was viewed as their ability to walk if necessary from one side of the room to another, approach the listeners, distribute materials, etc. and scored from 0 points in cases of keeping the speaker’s legs crossed and holding a still position to 5 points if the speaker managed to hold the audience’s attention by moving in the room purposefully.

The psychological features such as enthusiasm, confidence and engaging strategies also contributed greatly to communicating ideas to the listeners and making a presentation an interactive event. 0 points were awarded to a monotonous and passive speaker’s behavior which did not create a positive feedback from the audience, while 5 points were given to an enthusiastic speaker able to engage the listeners into a process of discussion. The speaker’s confidence leads to creating more persuasive and trustful effect on the audience, so a confident speaker could score 5 points, while anxiety and stage freight made the presenter look weak and pitiful thus scoring 0 points. The use of communicative strategies to keep the listeners engaged during a presentation was evaluated from 0 to 5 points depending on their presence and quantity in a presenter’s speech. They could include jokes, unexpected turns, interesting facts, etc.

The organizational features such as the speaker’s familiarity with the content of the presentation and time management showed the level of the speaker’s preparedness for the speech with 0 points meaning the low level and 5 points high level. The familiarity with the topic could be seen in the answers the speaker gave to the questions from the teacher or the audience, and time management skills showed how well the speech was organized and if the speaker managed to meet all the requirements for the presentation.
The results of the students’ presentations observations assessed by an independent teacher are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. Assessment points for the students presentations features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>S11</th>
<th>S12</th>
<th>S13</th>
<th>Total group score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocal and speech related features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch variations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body related features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facing the audience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial expression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye contact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and position of arms and hands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free moving</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm of the speakers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of communicative strategies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with the content of the presentation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>3,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it could be seen from the results of the students’ presentations observation the participants received high points (≥4) for the volume of their voice (4,8 points) and the speed of speaking (4,5 points) as well as familiarity of the speakers with the contents of the presentation (5,0 points) and time
management skills (4.3 points). That means that the majority of students possessed a good level of English to be able to make a report on certain linguistic issues and could control their timing. They seemed well-prepared with the topic of their speech and materials involved which was obviously seen from the presentation slides. The only limitation to assessing their presentation contents awareness was the fact that all the speakers read their speeches from the scripts. So the confidence of the speakers and their enthusiasm scored middle range points (≥3) but in their highest degree (3.8 and 3.9 points respectively). Most students spoke clearly enough to be understood by their peers (3.9 points) and used their voice pitch to attract attention of the audience (3.8 points). No fixed folded arms were noticed by the observer which sometimes happens to the speakers when they are extremely stressed which means that these students felt relatively comfortable and relaxed speaking to their peers (3.9 points). The students could easily point their hands to the screen in order to draw the audience’s attention to some examples written on slides. Free moving in the classroom was limited partly by the necessity to show and read from the slides on the screen and partly by the unwillingness of the speakers to leave the place behind the front desk in the room (3.3 points). Sometimes there arose some brief pauses caused by the speakers themselves when they started and could not finish the phrase or occasionally lost the line from the script they were reading from. In those situations the students usually looked a little confused until they could find the needed words. Such interruptions might signify either a relatively high level of anxiety the students were experiencing at the moment of delivering a presentation in public or a lack of communicative skills to fill an unexpected gap in speaking. Thus their ability to manage the pauses scored 3.0 points. Reading from the script or slides also affected the speakers’ facing the audience (3.5 points) and keeping eye contact with the audience (2.8 points) and their facial expression (2.2 points) as they had to distribute attention to what was written there, their peers and the teacher whom they gave more attention than the other students. This created the general impression of reporting to the teacher in turns and not communicating with the audience. The facial expression of the speakers remained mainly serious and concerned with the necessity to report everything which was planned and written.

The lowest points were awarded for the use of communicative strategies to engage the audience in an active listening and participation (0.3 points). Only one student out of the group of 13 participants managed to fill in the pause by a joke and presented some interesting examples during the speech.
The remarks which the observer made upon each presentation apart from the assessment marks from Table 1 allow defining several common features of some participants. These could be divided into two groups: 1) drawbacks (keeping eye contact with the examiner but not with the audience; no plan of the presentation announced before delivering a speech; the speaker’s reading from the script or slides; the text on the screen was too small for the audience to read from the back rows in the room) and 2) benefits (technical performance of the presentation, layout and design of the slides; greeting and thanking the audience (4 speakers); ability to answer the questions, preparing frequently asked questions with answers beforehand and writing them on the slide (3 speakers).

In order to see the students’ own perception of the main difficulties while delivering oral presentations a series of questions was asked to each participant.

The students’ interviews concerning their attitudes to delivering presentations and listening to the speaker included 7 questions: 5 questions to the speaker and 2 questions to the audience member.

1. What are your main fears in delivering a presentation?
2. What strategies do you use to reduce your fear of delivering a presentation?
3. What is your goal while delivering a presentation?
4. What do you do to get the message across to the audience?
5. Do you like answering questions from the audience while or after your presentation? Why / Why not?
6. Do you prefer reading from the screen, listening to the speaker or both while listening to the presentation?
7. How often do you ask questions to the speaker? Why / Why not?

The students’ responses to the first question could be divided into two groups: 1) fears connected with communicating with the audience and looking unprofessional, for example, if someone asks a question which the speaker does not know the answer to (9 students), and 2) feeling and looking stressed thus gesticulating too much (2 students) or forgetting the words (2 students). The second question dealing with strategies to reduce fears received three types of responses: 1) taking actions to master oral performance, for example, rehearsing the speech, checking pronunciation and timing (7 students), 2) anticipating possible questions from the audience and preparing answers to them (4 students), and 3) making breathing exercises (2 students). Question 3 concerning the goal which students set while delivering an oral presentation obtained two types of answers: 1) making the presentation interesting and interactive for the listeners (5 students) and 2) to
show how passionate the speaker is about the topic under the discussion (5 students) or how important the topic is (3 students). The students’ answers concerning the ways to get the message across to the audience (Question 4) were almost unanimous: to use catchy images and visually schematic layout of information on the slides (12 students) while 2 students mentioned asking the audience questions in order to initiate interaction. 10 students out of 13 expressed their unwillingness to answer questions from the audience mentioning fear to look incompetent. 3 students said that they would prefer to answer any questions after the presentation and not to be interrupted while delivering it. Questions 6 and 7 were supposed to be answered from the point of the audience member’s view. The students’ preferences concerning reading from the screen, listening to the speaker or both appeared to be unanimous: all participants chose both reading and listening to the speaker because that would keep them more focused on the problem of the presentation. The same unanimity was observed in the answers to the last question about the frequency of asking the speaker questions as the audience member. All students admitted asking them rarely or never questioning the speaker but the reasons they gave could be divided into three main groups: 1) the listeners were not interested in the topic of the presentation (6 students), 2) the listeners did not want to interrupt or make the speaker nervous (4 students), and 3) the speaker was clear enough and no questions arose during the presentation (3 students). Such indifference or ‘protection’ of the speaker from stress was obviously caused by one-way delivery of presentations where the audience had to consume information and did not take part in discussions.

The analysis of the interview findings allowed reconsidering grouping the students’ answers into two main categories: 1) answers focused on the speaker’s feelings, perceptions and behavior and 2) answers focused on communication with the audience.

In order to receive more reliable results a larger number of students were asked the same questions with their answers being analyzed and placed in groups. 16 Italian and 31 Ukrainian BA students took part in the interview in December 2022. The answers to the questions defining the speaker’s point of view were divided into two categories – speaker-centered and audience-centered responses. The findings of Italian and Ukrainian students’ responses concerning perceptions to delivering presentations (n=16 and 31 respectively) are shown in Table 2.
Table 2.

Students’ perceptions of delivering presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Students’ answers (Italian/Ukrainian)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker-centered</td>
<td>Audience-centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What are your main fears in delivering a presentation?</td>
<td>11/26</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What strategies do you use to reduce your fear of delivering a presentation?</td>
<td>14/29</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What is your goal while delivering a presentation?</td>
<td>9/18</td>
<td>7/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What do you do to get the message across to the audience?</td>
<td>11/21</td>
<td>5/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Do you like answering questions from the audience while or after your presentation? Why / Why not?</td>
<td>10/28</td>
<td>6/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The answers to the first question about the main fears experienced by the speaker were interpreted as speaker-centered and audience-centered with the first category containing almost four times as many answers as the first category (37 and 10 respectively). The examples of such answers were the following: ‘I am afraid to look stupid’, ‘I don’t want to be laughed at’, ‘I fear to forget the words and look ridiculous’. Only 10 students mentioned the remarks like ‘disability to convey information to the audience’ and ‘the audience will feel bored and reluctant to answer my questions’. As it could be seen in the examples, most students were concerned about their own image as a presenter because they obviously viewed speaking in public as a delivery of information rather than interaction.

As possible strategies to cope with fear the majority of participants mentioned ‘rehearsing a lot’, ‘recording their presentation and reviewing it’, ‘doing breathing exercises’, and ‘drinking stress reliving tea’ which also focused on the personality of the speaker being quite logical with such a question. Meanwhile 4 students chose to cope with their stress by starting a presentation with a joke or a funny fact which would break the ice and foster communication with the audience.

As the goal of delivering a presentation, the score was close (27 and 20), as on the one hand, the students mentioned ‘to show the importance of
the topic’ and ‘to inform the audience about the issue’, which could be considered as speaker-centered responses, and, on the other hand, they gave answers which could be characterized by more communicative and interactive features and look to be more audience-centered, for example, ‘to make sure the audience get the idea’, ‘to discuss important issues’, and ‘to persuade other students in the importance of the problem’.

Question 4 revealed the students’ vision of the ways to make the ideas conveyed to the listeners, which appeared to be more speaker-focused rather than audience-centered as the majority of answers implied creating ‘attractive pictures’, ‘using bright colors’ or ‘include special effects on the slides’. Only 15 students out of 47 chose to involve their peers into communication by ‘asking questions’ or ‘inviting to perform some actions’.

The last question referring to preferences in being asked questions by the audience received 41 responses where students claimed to feel more comfortable when they were asked questions after their presentation. The reasons explaining their choice varied from ‘not to be interrupted or bothered during the speech’ and ‘not to distract the speaker from the point of the presentation’, being speaker-centered type of responses, to ‘letting the audience receive the whole scope of information before asking questions’, constituting the audience-centered type. Several students expressed their agreement to be asked during their speech (6 answers) explaining that by their openness to the audience and readiness to enter into discussion which also confirmed the audience-focused nature of their responses.

The findings of Italian and Ukrainian students’ perceptions concerning the audience’s communication with the speaker are given in Table 3.

**Table 3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Students’ answers (Italian/Ukrainian)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Willingness to communicate with the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Do you prefer reading from the screen, listening to the speaker or both while listening to the presentation?</td>
<td>7/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>How often do you ask questions to the speaker? Why / Why not?</td>
<td>3/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions 6 and 7 implied the students’ perceptions of listening to the presentations as members of the audience. The majority of participants gave their preferences to both listening and reading from the screen, but the explanations which they provided enabled dividing the responses into two categories: 1) willingness to communicate with the speaker and 2) unwillingness to communicate with the speaker. The examples of the answers showing willingness to communicate are the following: ‘I feel more focused when the speaker explains what is written on the screen and I can ask a clarifying question’, ‘when the speaker shows some information on the board, he moves and I don’t feel bored’, ‘I don’t need the speaker if I can read a presentation on slides myself, so if he makes logical passages between pieces of information be showing something or explaining something, it makes a presentation more interactive and looks like a dialogue, not a monologue’. Those students, who chose reading and listening to the speaker at the same time, but nevertheless seemed to be reluctant to communicate, gave their own reasons: ‘when the speaker reads what is written on the screen, it helps me understand if I don’t see it clearly’, ‘it is common practice to show the text of the presentation on the slides’. There were two participants who did not see any benefits in listening to the speaker because they could ‘perceive ideas better by reading not by hearing’ and thought ‘there is no need to repeat information which is written on the slides’. Only 14 participants admitted asking questions to the speaker. They explained that by ‘the chance to develop the conversation’, ‘a desire to know more information’, and ‘to challenge the speaker in order to create a discussion’. The majority of the students (33) said that they never or hardly ever asked the speakers any questions because did not want to make them ‘feel stressed’ or ‘confused and nervous’. 4 students prefer to ask the same question ‘What are the perspectives of your research?’ or ‘Why did you choose this topic?’ which could be applied to any presentation and relieved them from getting too deep into the problem. Such attitude confirms the above-mentioned findings by R. Miles who claimed that students while delivering their presentations mainly focus on foreign language performance and pay less attention to communicating with the audience [6]. It is interesting to mention that no significant difference between the answers of Italian and Ukrainian students was established. The majority of students showed the lack of communicative skills in giving presentations which affected their perception of the usefulness and the aim of speaking and presenting information in public.

**Conclusions.** Oral presentation performance being one of the most popular practices applied in teaching foreign languages involves more than just a second language performance. It also implies communicating with the
audience, keeping their attention and making sure the information is conveyed to the listeners. The commonest problems revealed during this survey are the following: no speaker-audience contact, focus on linguistic features of the presentation delivery rather than its communicative aspect, fear to look incompetent in front of the audience leading to the audience’s passive and ‘protective’ behavior towards the speaker. The interviews went in line with these results and found out that most students were more concerned about their own image of the speaker rather than the ways to convey information to the audience. Most students showed their unwillingness to enter a discussion with the speaker of a presentation caused both by indifference towards the topic and the desire to relieve the presenter of stress. These implications lead to the necessity to introduce students to the principles of effective communication and contribute forming their interactive presentation skills which could foster their successful education and career. The results of the survey supported recent findings of students’ oral presentation research and showed that extra linguistic communication, engaging the audience into communication during the presentation and active listening accompanied by asking questions could turn an oral production into an effective interaction beneficial both for the speaker and the listeners.
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