

**Self-efficacy (SE).** A one-item self-efficacy assessment which was formulated as: *Supposing that now you need to give the presentation you are preparing for in the real situation, please rate how certain you are that you can successfully give the presentation.*

The item was rated on a scale from 0 (highly certain cannot do) to 10 (highly certain can do).

**Presentation Performance (PP).** The rubric for oral presentations developed by the University of Wisconsin–Madison (“Oral presentation rubric”) was used to evaluate people’s speech performance and presentation content after the training. The rubric consisted of ten items, which were rated on a four-point scale from 1 (poor) to 4 (excellent). The rubric consisted of four items evaluating the presentation content (i.e., subject knowledge, organization, visuals, and mechanics), five delivery-related items evaluating both nonverbal (eye contact, body language, and poise) and verbal skills (enthusiasm and speaking skills), and one timing item. In this study, the timing item was excluded as the presentation lengths and their timing requirement varied between participants.

**Length of answers (LA).** The lengths of the presentation and answers to the questions was taken as a measure for confidence or avoidance behaviour in the question phase of the closing presentation.

**Utility questionnaire (UQ).** A 12-item utility questionnaire was designed consisting of five items evaluating the practice process and seven items on the effectiveness in improving presentation performance (Table 1). All the items were rated on a seven-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Table 1. Questionnaire items for measuring presence response and utility.**

Questionnaire and dimension		Item
Presence response		Q1 To what extent did you find your emotional response and thoughts during the experience similar to those in a real presentation situation?
		Q2 How often did you find yourself almost automatically behaving within the room as if it was a real presentation?
		Q3 To what extent did you feel as if you were in a real presentation situation?
Utility questionnaire	Practice process	Q1 I like practicing in this way.
		Q2 I find such practice enjoyable.
		Q3 Little additional effort is needed to practice in this way.
		Q4 This method motivates me to practice.
		Q5 It is an efficient way to prepare my presentation.
	Presentation performance	Q6 It helps me to get used to speaking in front of an audience.
		Q7 It helps me to cope with different audiences.
		Q8 It helps me to become less nervous.
		Q9 It helps me to have more eye contact with the audience.
		Q10 It helps me to consider the audience.
		Q11 It helps me to consider unexpected events during presentation.
		Q12 It helps me to consider what questions I may get from the audience.

**Heart rate (HR).** Heart rate and heart rate variability (HRV) indexes. The HRV indexes are SDNN (i.e., standard deviation of normal to normal heartbeat intervals), RMSSD (root mean square differences of successive heartbeat intervals), and LF/HF (the ratio of low- and high-frequency power).

**Subjective unit of discomfort (SUD).** This item measures the levels of anxiety experienced by the participants. It is rated on a scale from 0 (no anxiety at all) to 10 (the highest level of anxiety that you can imagine).

**Presence response (PR).** A 3-item questionnaire (Table 1) reflects presence by comparing participants' responses to what these would have been in a similar real situation – with respect to their overall behaviour, their emotional responses and their thoughts. All the items were rated on a seven-point scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much).

**Personal report of confidence as a speaker (PRCS)** (Paul, 1966). It is a 30-item self-report scale, which assesses both behavioural and affective responses to public speaking situations. The questions are answered in a true–false format, and the questionnaire score ranges from 0 (i.e., no fear of public speaking) to 30 (i.e., highest level of fear).

## References

Oral presentation rubric. Retrieved from [http://www.uwplatt.edu/system/files/UW-Mad\\_Oral\\_presentation\\_rubric.pdf](http://www.uwplatt.edu/system/files/UW-Mad_Oral_presentation_rubric.pdf). Accessed: 2015-02-05

Paul, G. L. (1966). *Insight vs desensitization in psychotherapy*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.